

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention](#) (OJJDP) is seeking applications for funding under the fiscal year (FY) 2017 Second Chance Act: Implementing County and Statewide Plans To Improve Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System Program. This program furthers the Department's mission to implement systemwide policy, practice, and resource allocation changes that will reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for youth in contact with the juvenile justice system.

OJJDP FY 2017 Second Chance Act: Implementing County and Statewide Plans To Improve Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System

Applications Due: June 29, 2017

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are limited to units of local government¹ and states that have developed a countywide or statewide plan to reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for youth in contact with the juvenile justice system. Eligible applicants must have developed and attached a completed jurisdictionwide plan to the application. Refer to Section C for additional Eligibility requirements.

OJJDP welcomes applications under which two or more entities would carry out the federal award; however, only one entity may be the applicant. Any others must be proposed as subrecipients ("subgrantees").² The applicant must be the entity that would have primary

¹ A "unit of local government" means—

- (a) Any city, county, township, town, borough, parish, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a state.
- (b) Any law enforcement district or judicial enforcement district that—
 - (i) Is established under applicable state law, and
 - (ii) Has the authority to, in a manner independent of other state entities, establish a budget and impose taxes.
- (c) For the purposes of assistance eligibility, any agency of the government of the District of Columbia or the federal government that performs law enforcement functions in and for—
 - (i) The District of Columbia, or
 - (ii) Any Trust Territory of the United States.

² For additional information on subawards, see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

responsibility for carrying out the award, including administering the funding and managing the entire program. Under this solicitation, only one application by any particular applicant entity will be considered. An entity may, however, be proposed as a subrecipient (“subgrantee”) in more than one application.

For information on eligibility, see “[Section C. Eligibility Information.](#)”

Deadline

Applicants must register with [Grants.gov](#) prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time (ET) on June 29, 2017.

To be considered timely, an application must be submitted by the application deadline using Grants.gov, and the applicant must have received a validation message from Grants.gov that indicates successful and timely submission. OJP urges applicants to submit applications at least 72 hours prior to the application due date to allow time for the applicant to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

OJP encourages all applicants to read this [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov.](#)

For additional information, see [How To Apply](#) in Section D. Application and Submission Information.

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 800–518–4726 or 606–545–5035, or via email to support@grants.gov. The [Grants.gov](#) Support Hotline operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on federal holidays.

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must email the National Criminal Justice Reference Service Response Center (Response Center) at grants@ncjrs.gov **within 24 hours after the application deadline** in order to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. Additional information on reporting technical issues appears under “Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues” in the [How to Apply](#) section.

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact the Response Center by telephone at 800–851–3420 or TTY: 301–240–6310 (hearing impaired only), by email at grants@ncjrs.gov, or by [web chat](#). Response Center hours of operation are 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. ET, Monday through Friday, and 10 a.m. to 8 p.m. ET on the solicitation close date. Answers to frequently asked questions that may assist applicants are posted at www.ojjdp.gov/grants/solicitations/FY2017/FAQ/SCAOutcomes.pdf.

Grants.gov number assigned to this solicitation: OJJDP-2017-11025

Release date: May 15, 2017

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	4
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables	5
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices	10
B. Federal Award Information	10
Type of Award	11
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	11
Budget Information	12
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement	12
Preaward Costs (also known as Preaward Costs)	12
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	13
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	13
Costs Associated With Language Assistance (if applicable)	13
C. Eligibility Information	14
D. Application and Submission Information	14
What an Application Should Include	14
How To Apply	31
E. Application Review Information	35
Review Criteria	35
Review Process	35
F. Federal Award Administration Information	37
Federal Award Notices	37
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements	39
General Information About Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	38
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	38
H. Other Information	38
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a)	38
Provide Feedback to OJP	39
Application Checklist	40

OJJDP FY 2017 Second Chance Act: Implementing County and Statewide Plans To Improve Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System

CFDA #16.812

A. Program Description

Overview

Section 101 of the Second Chance Act authorizes the Department of Justice to award grants to counties and states to improve reentry outcomes for incarcerated youth. The Second Chance Act Program supports counties and states in refining and implementing improved collaborative strategies to address the challenges that reentry and recidivism reduction pose. Implementing a cooperative and wide-ranging plan for reducing recidivism is challenging for even the most sophisticated juvenile justice agencies and requires an intensive systemwide realignment to address gaps in programs and services to improve outcomes for youth in contact with the juvenile justice system.

This program will provide grants to support counties and states that have developed a recidivism reduction plan to better align juvenile justice policy, practice, and resource allocation with what research shows works to reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for youth in contact with the juvenile justice system. OJJDP expects that a committee, task force, or working group will designate an agency to act as the legal applicant for this grant program. This solicitation will support counties and states that illustrate their readiness to implement a planning strategy developed and coordinated among multiple systems, to track implementation progress, and to show progress toward sustainable changes.

Statutory Authority: This program is authorized pursuant to Section 101 of the Second Chance Act, 42 U.S.C. § 3797w; Pub. L. No. 110–199.

Program-Specific Information

Over the past decade, the nation has made significant progress in reducing juvenile incarceration rates as the number of juveniles in residential placement fell 50 percent between 1999 and 2013.³ Although this is a significant accomplishment, essential work remains to be done to reduce recidivism and improve other outcomes, such as education and behavioral health, for youth in contact with the juvenile justice system.

Significant barriers to improving youth outcomes include (1) insufficient fidelity to the program model or strategy when implementing research-based improvement strategies; (2) limited

³ Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement [machine-readable data files]. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.

collaboration across government agencies, service systems, and state/local lines; and (3) a lack of data to track and measure progress and hold agencies and providers accountable for results.

To address these challenges, counties and states need a comprehensive implementation plan to better align their juvenile justice policies, practices, and resource allocation with what works to improve outcomes for youth.

Successful applicants will use OJJDP funding to implement existing countywide or statewide planning strategies to reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for youth. These plans must have been formalized through legislation, appropriations, and/or administrative policy and/or have resulted from two or more state or county agencies collaborating on key policy and practice changes. These plans and all implementation activities should reflect the key principles and practices for improving outcomes for youth outlined in Appendix A, "Second Chance Act Grantees: What You Need to Know to Ensure Your Program Is Built on Principles of Effective Practice." OJJDP will provide funding and technical assistance to grantees to support and guide adherence to these principles and practices.

Target Population

This solicitation will support the implementation of a countywide or statewide plan to improve outcomes for youth in contact with the juvenile justice system. As a result, the target population should be all youth involved in the juvenile justice system, with a specific emphasis on youth assessed in the strategic plan, using a validated risk assessment tool, as moderate and high risk for reoffending; under community supervision; and placed in and returning from a period of incarceration in state, local, and privately run facilities.

Award recipients must admit targeted youth to the program prior to their 18th birthday. However, they may continue to implement their plan for these individuals beyond their 18th birthday. OJJDP does not have a set timeline for terminating these services; instead, they can continue as long as is deemed necessary per the statewide plan for providing services.

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

The goal of this program is for selected counties and states to (1) implement an existing plan for systemwide improvement to reduce juvenile recidivism rates and (2) improve other outcomes for youth countywide or statewide. To support this program, OJJDP will provide grants to county and state government agencies to commence implementation strategies over a 2-year period. Successful applicants must be able to develop and execute a strategy to:

- Implement an existing statewide plan to better align juvenile justice policy, practice, and resource allocation with what the research shows works to reduce recidivism and improve other outcomes for youth in contact with the juvenile justice system.
- Implement policy, practice, and resource allocation changes with fidelity to research-based strategies.
- Track recidivism rates and other youth outcomes to measure implementation progress, share these data with system leaders and policymakers, use data to hold providers and agencies accountable for results, and guide implementation improvements.

Mandatory Requirements

Section 101 of the Second Chance Act outlines the following mandatory requirements that applicants must include in their applications to be eligible to secure Section 101 funding. Applicants under this solicitation must provide and demonstrate all of the following:

1. A reentry strategic plan that describes the jurisdiction's long-term reentry strategy, including measurable annual and 5-year performance outcomes, and that uses, to the maximum extent possible, random assigned and controlled studies to determine the effectiveness of the program in relation to the long-term goals of increasing public safety and reducing recidivism. One goal of the plan shall be a 50-percent reduction in the recidivism rate over a 5-year period. Applicants should describe and attach their current reentry strategic plan with the understanding that if they receive a grant, OJJDP will provide intensive technical assistance and the state will work toward a comprehensive data- and research-driven plan to reduce recidivism. Additionally, OJJDP will provide specific guidance on how to set reasonable, yet achievable, recidivism reduction goals during the early implementation process.
2. A detailed reentry implementation schedule and sustainability plan for the program.
3. If presently a recipient of a Second Chance Act grant award, describe implementation program gaps that would be addressed if additional funding is awarded through this solicitation, and how the proposed funding would augment and further advance implementation strategies.
4. Documentation that reflects the establishment and ongoing engagement of a reentry task force composed of relevant state, tribal, territorial, or local leaders and representatives of relevant agencies, service providers, nonprofit organizations, and other key stakeholders.
 - The task force should examine ways to pool resources and funding streams, and share data and best practices in reentry between stakeholder agencies and organizations.
 - The task force and the strategic planning requirement above should provide a key opportunity for state and local policymakers to work together to identify and address local barriers to effective reentry, including barriers that are policy or procedural in nature. (See mandatory criterion 10 below.)
5. Discussion of the role of local and county government agencies; nonprofit organizations; continuums of care; state, county, or local interagency councils on homelessness; and community stakeholders that will coordinate and collaborate during the implementation of the reentry strategy. The applicant will provide letters of support or memoranda of understanding regarding the involvement of such agencies and organizations. These partners and participants in the creation of the reentry strategy should include representatives from the fields of public safety, corrections, housing (including partnerships with the public housing authorities), homeless services providers, health, education, substance abuse, children and families, victims' services, employment, and business.

6. Extensive evidence of collaboration with state, county, and local government agencies within the target area(s) overseeing health, mental health, housing, homeless services, child welfare, education, substance abuse treatment, victims' services, state child support, and employment services, and with local law enforcement agencies.
7. Comprehensive discussion of the role of state juvenile corrections departments, community corrections agencies, and local detention systems in ensuring successful reentry of youth leaving out-of-home placement and returning to their communities. Applications must include letters of support from corrections officials responsible for facilities or the reentry population to be served through this project (see "What an Application Should Include," page 14, in Section D. Application and Submission Information).
8. Documentation that reflects explicit support of the chief executive officer of the applicant's county or state and how this office will remain informed about and connected to the implementation of this program.
9. A description of the evidence-based methodology and outcome measures that the state or county will use to evaluate the program and a discussion of how such measures will provide a valid assessment of the program's impact. The primary objective of the Second Chance Act is to reduce recidivism. Based on reliable research findings, there are eight fundamental strategies of evidence-based practices that are widely accepted as efficacious in reducing future criminal behavior. These eight strategies are outlined in Appendix A. Applicants must clearly articulate how these evidence-based strategies are integrated into their program design and how the program will ensure participants take part in evidence-based services and programs that occur both pre- and post-release.
10. A description of how the county or state could broadly replicate the project if it is demonstrated to be effective.
11. A plan for analyzing the statutory, regulatory, rules-based, and practice-based hurdles to reintegration of formerly incarcerated youth into the community. (Note: this may be integrated into the strategic planning requirement and guided by the local task force discussed above.) OJJDP encourages applicants to review the database of the American Bar Association National Study on the Collateral Consequences of Criminal Convictions, which catalogs statutes and administrative rules that contain a collateral consequence. The database (www.abacollateralconsequences.org) will help attorneys, policymakers, and the public more easily identify what consequences follow from particular criminal offenses.
12. A baseline recidivism rate for the proposed target population, including documentation to support the development of the rate. OJJDP will require all grantees to provide a baseline recidivism rate upon award.

Deliverables

Successful applicants are required to:

- **Convene or draw upon an existing countywide or statewide task force to oversee the implementation of the reentry strategic plan.** This task force should be composed of a bipartisan team of lawmakers, judicial leaders, prosecutors, defense counsel, and

executive branch officials that the governor or county executive designates; local government partners as warranted; and other key stakeholders, such as local, county, or state mental health, child welfare, and educational agencies. The task force will oversee the implementation of the strategic plan and should review progress reports, at least annually, on recidivism rates and other youth outcomes.

- **Identify a lead county or state agency responsible for implementation activities and designate a point of contact at the deputy director level (or equivalent) or above.** This point of contact will be responsible for project activities and deliverables, facilitating task force meetings, data collection, and progress reporting, and will serve as the primary liaison with OJJDP and the National Reentry Resource Center (NRRC).
- **Modify an existing implementation plan, as applicable.** The implementation plan should identify the strategy, deliverables, action steps, timelines, and responsible parties for implementation of the countywide or statewide plan, including key grant activities and related improvement efforts that the grant does not fund.
- **Report on implementation progress at least annually, including data on recidivism rates and other youth outcomes.** The lead agency will provide the task force with a minimum of annual reports and an in-person presentation that details progress made on the key deliverables of the implementation plan along with recidivism rates and other outcomes for the target population.

Allowable use of funds. Counties and states may use funds to implement new policies, programs, and practices identified in the statewide improvement plan that align with what works to reduce recidivism and improve other youth outcomes. Based on reliable research findings, there are eight fundamental principles and practices that are demonstrated to reduce recidivism and improve positive outcomes for youth in the juvenile justice system. These principles and practices are outlined in Appendix A of this solicitation. Applicants must clearly articulate how their implementation activities will reflect these principles.

Collaboration with other federal agencies. OJJDP and the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) are collaborating closely on the Second Chance Act implementation to support both juvenile and adult reentry efforts. Similarly, BJA and OJJDP are working with the National Institute of Justice to support the research and evaluation activities called for in the Act. For more information on the implementation of the Second Chance Act initiatives and frequently asked questions, visit the NRRC website. OJJDP will require successful applicants to work with OJJDP and NRRC, the OJJDP technical assistance provider, to help guide implementation activities and achieve the deliverables outlined in this solicitation. OJJDP must specifically approve the use of all other consultants and technical assistance providers through the use of grant funds.

Racial and ethnic disparity. Addressing the disproportionate number of members of minority groups who come into contact with the juvenile justice system is a priority of OJJDP. Applicants should describe their plan for working with the relevant system actors to address disparities in the juvenile justice system.

Priority considerations. OJJDP will give priority consideration to applicants who can best demonstrate that their proposal will:

1. Focus their initiative on geographic areas with a disproportionate population of system-involved youth released from confinement.
2. Include input from nonprofit organizations in any case where relevant input is available and appropriate to the grant application, consultation with crime victims, youth released from youth facilities, and coordination with families of justice-involved youth.
3. Demonstrate effective case assessment and management abilities to provide comprehensive and continuous reentry, including planning while youth are in a facility, prerelease transition housing, and community release; establishing prerelease planning procedures to ensure that the youth's eligibility for federal or state benefits upon release is established prior to release, subject to any limitations in law, and to ensure that returning youth obtain all necessary referrals for services; and delivering continuous and appropriate drug treatment, medical care, job training and placement, educational services, or any other service or support needed for successful functioning in their communities.
4. Review the process by which the applicant adjudicates violations of parole, probation, or supervision following placement under supervision and/or release from a youth facility, taking into account public safety and the use of graduated, community-based sanctions for minor and technical violations of parole, probation, or supervision (specifically those violations that are not otherwise, and independently, a violation of law).
5. Provide for an independent evaluation of reentry programs that include, to the maximum extent possible, random assignment and controlled studies to determine the effectiveness of such programs.
6. Target high-risk, justice-involved youth for community supervision programs through validated assessment tools.

Family engagement. OJJDP envisions a transformed juvenile justice system that recognizes and builds on the strengths, values, and diversity of families and communities to best serve the children and youth who come into contact with the system and to improve both safety and quality of life for all. This system will honor and support families before, during, and after their children have contact with the system. Applicants should describe how the proposed program will include a family engagement component.

The Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables are directly related to the performance measures set out in the table in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#), under "Program Narrative."

Equitable Access to OJJDP-funded Programs

OJJDP promotes an unbiased juvenile justice system in which all youth are treated fairly and have equal access to the services and programs they need. Research indicates that failure to provide equitable treatment may perpetuate and exacerbate a cycle of arrest and incarceration that disproportionately impacts vulnerable youth. OJJDP may give priority consideration to

applications that document the applicant's capacity to serve all vulnerable youth. Such capacity may be documented by articulating a plan for meeting the needs of all youth or by demonstrating a record of such service. Applicants should also review the OJP Standard Assurances for information about the applicable nondiscrimination provisions.

Evidence-Based Programs or Practices

OJP strongly emphasizes the use of data and evidence in policymaking and program development in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services. OJP is committed to:

- Improving the quantity and quality of evidence OJP generates.
- Integrating evidence into program, practice, and policy decisions within OJP and the field.
- Improving the translation of evidence into practice.

OJP considers programs and practices to be evidence-based when their effectiveness has been demonstrated by causal evidence, generally obtained through one or more outcome evaluations. Causal evidence documents a relationship between an activity or intervention (including technology) and its intended outcome, including measuring the direction and size of a change, and the extent to which a change may be attributed to the activity or intervention. Causal evidence depends on the use of scientific methods to rule out, to the extent possible, alternative explanations for the documented change. The strength of causal evidence, based on the factors described above, will influence the degree to which OJP considers a program or practice to be evidence-based. Applicants may use the OJP CrimeSolutions.gov website and the [OJJDP Model Programs Guide](#) website to find information about evidence-based programs in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services.

Performance Partnership Pilots. Applicants under this OJJDP program may be eligible to apply for or participate as a partner in the Performance Partnership Pilots program, subject to funding availability. The Performance Partnership Pilots is authorized by Section 526 of Division H of P.L. 113–76, and further extended through subsequent appropriations acts for FYs 2015 and 2016, including Section 219 of Division B of P.L. 113–235 and Section 219 of Division B of P.L. 114–113. The Pilots program seeks to identify cost-effective, outcome-focused strategies at the state, regional, and local levels that support improved outcomes for disconnected youth (individuals between the ages of 14 and 24 who are low income and either homeless, in foster care, involved in the juvenile justice system, unemployed, or not enrolled in or at risk of dropping out of an educational institution). The program is particularly designed for organizations that have multiple sources of federal funding from the participating agencies. Find more information about the program and the application process at <http://youth.gov/youth-topics/reconnecting-youth/performance-partnership-pilots/consultation/p3-overview>.

B. Federal Award Information

OJJDP expects to make up to four awards ranging from \$750,000 to \$1,000,000, with an estimated total amount awarded of up to \$3,500,000. OJJDP expects to make awards for a 24-month period of performance, to begin on October 1, 2017.

All awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funds, and to any modifications or additional requirements that may be imposed by law.

Type of Award

OJJDP expects that any award under this solicitation will be made in the form of a grant. See [Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements](#), under [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#), for a brief discussion of important statutes, regulations, and award conditions that apply to many (or in some cases, all) OJP grants.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities⁴) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements⁵ as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303:

- (a) Establish and maintain effective internal control over the Federal award that provides reasonable assurance that [the recipient (and any subrecipient)] is managing the Federal award in compliance with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal award. These internal controls should be in compliance with guidance in “Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government” issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and the “Internal Control Integrated Framework”, issued by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO).
- (b) Comply with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal awards.
- (c) Evaluate and monitor [the recipient’s (and any subrecipient’s)] compliance with statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of Federal awards.
- (d) Take prompt action when instances of noncompliance are identified including noncompliance identified in audit findings.
- (e) Take reasonable measures to safeguard protected personally identifiable information and other information the Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity designates as sensitive or [the recipient (or any subrecipient)] considers sensitive consistent with applicable Federal, state, local, and tribal laws regarding privacy and obligations of confidentiality.

To help ensure that applicants understand applicable administrative requirements and cost principles, OJP encourages prospective applicants to enroll, at no charge, in the DOJ Grants Financial Management Online Training, available [here](#).

⁴ For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase “pass-through entity” includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward (“subgrant”) to a subrecipient (“subgrantee”) to carry out part of the funded award or program.

⁵ The “Part 200 Uniform Requirements” means the DOJ regulation at 2 C.F.R Part 2800, which adopts (with certain modifications) the provisions of 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

Budget Information

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement (cash or in-kind)

As required by the Second Chance Act, federal funds awarded under this solicitation may not cover more than 50 percent of the total costs of the project. An applicant must identify the source of the 50 percent nonfederal portion⁶ of the total project costs and how it will use match funds. If a successful applicant's proposed match exceeds the required match amount and OJP approves the budget, the total match amount incorporated into the approved budget becomes mandatory and subject to audit. ("Match" funds may be used only for purposes that would be allowable for the federal funds.) Recipients may satisfy this match requirement with either cash or in-kind services. See the [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#) for examples of "in-kind services." The formula for calculating the match is:

$$\frac{\text{Federal Award Amount}}{\text{Federal Share Percentage}} = \text{Adjusted (Total) Project Costs}$$

$$\text{Required Recipient's Share Percentage} \times \text{Adjusted Project Cost} = \text{Required Match}$$

Example: 50% match requirement: for a federal award amount of \$350,000, calculate match as follows:

$$\frac{\$350,000}{50\%} = \$700,000 \quad 50\% \times \$700,000 = \$350,000 \text{ match}$$

Match Waiver: The Attorney General may waive the match requirement upon a determination of fiscal hardship. To be considered for a waiver of match, a letter of request defining the fiscal hardship and signed by the Authorized Representative must be submitted with the application. Fiscal hardship may be defined in terms related to reductions in overall correctional budgets, furloughing or reductions in force of correctional staff, or other similar documented actions that have resulted in severe budget reductions. **Detailed information must be provided with match waiver requests.**

A match waiver request must be submitted as a separate attachment to the application and titled as the "Match Waiver."

Preagreement Costs (also known as Preaward Costs)

Preagreement costs are costs incurred by the applicant prior to the start date of the period of performance of the federal award.

OJP does **not** typically approve preagreement costs; an applicant must request and obtain the prior written approval of OJP for all such costs. All such costs incurred prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of the applicant. (Generally, no applicant should incur project costs *before* submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs.) Should there be extenuating circumstances that make it appropriate for OJP to consider approving preagreement costs, the applicant may contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this solicitation for the requirements concerning written requests for approval. If approved in advance by OJP, award funds may be used for preagreement costs, consistent with

⁶ Indian tribes and tribal organizations that otherwise are eligible for an award may be able to apply certain types of funds received from the federal government (for example, certain funds received under an Indian "self-determination contract") to satisfy all or part of a required "nonfederal" match.

the recipient's approved budget and applicable cost principles. See the section on Costs Requiring Prior Approval in the [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#) for more information.

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, a recipient may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the recipient at a rate that exceeds 110 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the federal government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.⁷ The 2017 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management [website](#). Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with nonfederal funds. (Nonfederal funds used for any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds, where match requirements apply.) If only a portion of an employee's time is charged to an OJP award, the maximum allowable compensation is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

The Assistant Attorney General for OJP may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, this limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant that requests a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of its application. An applicant that does not submit a waiver request and justification with its application should anticipate that OJP will require the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

The justification should address—in the context of the work the individual would do under the award—the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of a service the individual will provide, the individual's specific knowledge of the proposed program or project, and a statement that explains whether and how the individual's salary under the award would be commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with his/her qualifications and expertise, and for the work he or she would do under the award.

Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs

OJP strongly encourages every applicant that proposes to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity (or similar event) to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP and DOJ policy and guidance on approval, planning, and reporting of such events, available at

www.ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm. OJP policy and guidance (1) encourage minimization of conference, meeting, and training costs; (2) require prior written approval (which may affect project timelines) of most conference, meeting, and training costs for cooperative agreement recipients, as well as some conference, meeting, and training costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, which include a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

Costs Associated With Language Assistance (if applicable)

If an applicant proposes a program or activity that would deliver services or benefits to individuals, the costs of taking reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to those services or benefits for individuals with limited English proficiency may be allowable. Reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to services or benefits may include interpretation or translation services, where appropriate.

⁷ OJP does not apply this limitation on the use of award funds to the nonprofit organizations listed in Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

For additional information, see the "Civil Rights Compliance" section under "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards](#)" in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

C. Eligibility Information

States, counties, and local units of government are eligible to apply for funding only if they meet all of the following criteria:

- Established a statewide, countywide, or jurisdictionwide plan to reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for youth in contact with the juvenile justice system. This plan must have been formalized through legislation, appropriations, and/or administrative policy and/or have resulted from two or more agencies collaborating on key policy and practice changes.
- Obtained letters of support or memoranda of understanding from key state, county, or local leaders for this plan.
- Aligned the plan with what research has shown works to reduce recidivism and improve other youth outcomes, from diversion through reentry.
- Developed the capacity to collect data for all major juvenile justice system points at the individual youth or case level and have the ability to interpret those data to evaluate progress and inform decisionmaking.

In order to meet the eligibility criteria of this program, applicants must provide written documentation that shows their plan exists and has been endorsed by the appropriate state and/or local officials.⁸

For information on cost sharing or match requirements, see [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

This section describes in detail what an application should include. An applicant should anticipate that failure to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements may negatively affect the review of the application; and, should a decision be made to make an award, it may result in the inclusion of award conditions that preclude the recipient from accessing or using award funds until the recipient satisfies the conditions and OJP makes the funds available.

Moreover, an applicant should anticipate that an application that OJP determines is nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that OJP determines does not include the application elements that OJJDP has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer

⁸ Additional eligibility requirements applicable to applicants that have ever received a grant authorized pursuant to 42 USC 3797w can be found at 42 USC 3797w(l).

review nor receive further consideration. For this solicitation, OJJDP has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet or Budget Narrative and a completed jurisdictionwide plan to the application. An applicant may combine the Budget Narrative and the Budget Detail Worksheet in one document. However, if an applicant submits only one budget document, it must contain **both** narrative and detail information. Review the “Note on File Names and File Types” under [How To Apply](#) to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

OJP strongly recommends that applicants use appropriately descriptive file names (e.g., “Program Narrative,” “Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative,” “Timelines,” “Memoranda of Understanding,” “Résumés”) for all attachments. Also, OJP recommends that applicants include résumés in a single file.

1. Information To Complete the Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)

The SF-424 is a required standard form used as a cover sheet for submission of preapplications, applications, and related information. Grants.gov and the OJP Grants Management System (GMS) take information from the applicant’s profile to populate the fields on this form. When selecting “type of applicant,” if the applicant is a for-profit entity, select “For-Profit Organization” or “Small Business” (as applicable).

To avoid processing delays, an applicant must include an accurate legal name on its SF-424. Current OJP award recipients, when completing the field for “Legal Name,” should use the same legal name that appears on the prior year award document, which is also the legal name stored in OJP’s financial system. On the SF-424, enter the legal name in box 5 and Employer Identification Number (EIN) in box 6 exactly as it appears on the prior year award document. An applicant with current, active awards must ensure that its GMS profile is current. If the profile is not current, the applicant should submit a Grant Adjustment Notice (GAN) updating the information on its GMS profile prior to applying under this solicitation.

A new applicant entity should enter the Official Legal Name and address of the applicant entity in box 5 and the EIN in box 6 of the SF-424. An applicant must attach official legal documents to its application (e.g., articles of incorporation, 501(c)(3), etc.) to confirm the legal name, address, and EIN entered into the SF-424.

Intergovernmental Review: This solicitation (“funding opportunity”) **is not** subject to [Executive Order 12372](#). (In completing the SF-424, an applicant must answer question 19 by selecting the response that the “Program is not covered by E.O. 12372.”)

2. Project Abstract

Applications should include a high-quality abstract that summarizes the proposed project in 400 words or less. Project abstracts should be—

- Written for a general public audience.
- Submitted as a separate attachment with “Project Abstract” as part of its file name.
- Single-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (such as Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins.

The abstract should briefly describe the project's purpose, the population to be served, and the activities that the applicant will implement to achieve the project's goals and objectives. The abstract should describe how the applicant will measure progress toward these goals. The abstract should indicate whether the applicant will use any portion of the project budget to conduct research, as described in Note on Project Evaluations on page 23. All project abstracts should follow the detailed template available at ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf.

As a separate attachment, the project abstract will **not** count against the page limit for the program narrative.

Permission To Share Project Abstract With the Public: It is unlikely that OJP will be able to fund all applications submitted under this solicitation, but it may have the opportunity to share information with the public regarding unfunded applications, for example, through a listing on a webpage available to the public. The intent of this public posting would be to allow other possible funders to become aware of such applications.

In the project abstract template, each applicant is asked to indicate whether it gives OJP permission to share the applicant's project abstract (including contact information for individuals) with the public. Granting (or failing to grant) this permission will not affect OJP's funding decisions. Moreover, if the application is not funded, providing permission will not ensure that OJP will share the abstract information, nor will it assure funding from any other source.

Note: OJP may choose not to list a project that otherwise would have been included in a listing of unfunded applications, should the abstract fail to meet the format and content requirements noted above and outlined in the project abstract template.

3. Program Narrative

Applicants must submit a program narrative that presents a detailed description of the purpose, goals, objectives, strategies, design, and management of the proposed program. The program narrative should be double-spaced with 1-inch margins, not exceeding 30 pages of 8½ by 11 inches, and use a standard 12-point font, preferably Times New Roman. Pages should be numbered "1 of 30," etc. The tables, charts, pictures, etc., including all captions, legends, keys, subtext, etc., may be single-spaced and will count in the 30-page limit. Material required under the Budget and Budget Narrative and Additional Attachments sections will not count toward the program narrative page count. Applicants may provide bibliographical references as a separate attachment that will not count toward the 30-page program narrative limit. If the program narrative fails to comply with these length-related restrictions, OJJDP may consider such noncompliance in peer review and in final award decisions.

The program narrative should address the following selection criteria: (1) statement of the problem; (2) goals, objectives, and performance measures; (3) program design and implementation; and (4) capabilities/competencies. The applicant should clearly delineate the connections between and among each of these sections. For example, the applicant should derive the goals and objectives directly from the problems to be addressed. Similarly, the project design section should clearly explain how the program's structure and activities will accomplish the goals and objectives identified in the previous section. In addition, if applicants are current OJJDP grant recipients, the program narrative should discuss how

current OJJDP funding will be used to support, supplement, or enhance proposed implementation activities.

The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative:⁹

- a. **Statement of the Problem.** To the extent possible, applicants should use data to identify current statewide recidivism rates and positive youth outcomes associated with the juvenile reentry population and the challenges associated with collecting the data. Applicants should briefly describe their current reentry system and process (assessment, pre- and post-release services, monitoring); to what extent this system and process reflect the adoption, integration, and effective implementation of the principles and practices that research demonstrates improve youth outcomes; and the key policy and practice barriers to improved youth outcomes. Applicants should describe the target population and any previous or current attempts to address the problem.

Applicants should describe any research or evaluation studies that relate to the problem and contribute to their understanding of its causes and potential solutions. While OJJDP expects applicants to review the research literature for relevant studies, they should also explore whether unpublished local sources of research or evaluation data are available.

- b. **Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures.** Applicants should describe the goals of the proposed program and identify its objectives. When formulating the program's goals and objectives, applicants should be cognizant of the performance measures that OJJDP will require successful applicants to provide.

Goals. Applicants should describe the program's intent to change, reduce, or eliminate the problem noted in the previous section and outline the project's goals.

Program Objectives. Applicants should explain how the program will accomplish its goals. Objectives are specific, quantifiable statements of the project's desired results. They should be clearly linked to the problem identified in the preceding section and measurable. (Examples of measurable objectives include the following: to improve education, employment, and behavioral health outcomes for 45 high-risk youth involved in the juvenile justice system and reduce the recidivism rate by 50 percent over 5 years.)

Performance Measures. OJP will require each successful applicant to submit specific performance measures data as part of its reporting under the award (see "[General Information About Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements](#)" in [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#)). The performance measures correlate to the goals, objectives, and deliverables identified under "Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables" in [Section A. Program Description](#).

The application should describe the applicant's plan for collection of all of the performance measures data listed in the table below under "Data Recipient Provides," should it receive funding. OJJDP does not require applicants to submit performance measures data with their application. Performance measures are included as an alert that OJJDP will require successful applicants to submit specific data as part of their reporting requirements.

⁹ For information on subawards (including the details on proposed subawards that should be included in the application), see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

OJJDP encourages award recipients to use information from existing program records to fulfill performance measures reporting requirements rather than initiating new data collection activities for this purpose.

OJJDP will require award recipients to submit semiannual performance metrics of relevant data through the [Data Reporting Tool](#). Performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Description	Data Recipient Provides
Implement an existing countywide or statewide reentry plan to reduce recidivism and improve other outcomes for youth in contact with the juvenile justice system.	Number of agencies/ organizations participating in reentry plan activities. Number of coordinating groups established.	Number of agencies and organizations participating in countywide or statewide reentry plan initiatives during the reporting period.	Number of agencies and/or organizations participating in reentry plan activities. Number of coordinating groups established during the reporting period.
	Number of current system-level initiatives implemented.	Number of current system-level initiatives implemented during the reporting period. Program records are the preferred data source.	Number of current system-level initiatives.
Implement policy, practice, and resource allocation changes with fidelity to the research.	Number of policies or procedures that have been created, amended, or rescinded.	Number of agency policies or procedures created, amended, or rescinded based on best practice models during the reporting period. A policy is a plan or specific source of action that guides the general goals and directives of programs and/or agencies. Include policies that are relevant to the topic area of the program or that affect program operations. Program records are the preferred data source	Number of program/ agency policies or procedures created, amended, or rescinded.

<p>Track recidivism rates and other youth outcomes to measure progress, hold leaders accountable, and guide improvements.</p>	<p>Number of released youth served by the reentry program.</p>	<p>The intent of this indicator is to measure the change in the number of offenders who are enrolled in reentry services.</p> <p>The number of youth enrolled represents the number of youth who actually end up in the program.</p> <p>Program records are the preferred data source.</p>	<p>Number of youth enrolled in the reentry program during the reporting period.</p>
	<p>Number of program youth served during the reporting period.</p>	<p>An unduplicated count of the number of youth served by the program during the reporting period. The number of youth served for a reporting period is the number of program youth carried over from the previous reporting period, plus new admissions during the reporting period.</p> <p>Program records are the preferred data source.</p>	<p>Number of program youth carried over from the previous reporting period.</p> <p>New admissions during the reporting period.</p>
	<p>Percent of youth served with whom an evidence-based best practice model was used.</p>	<p>Number and percent of youth with whom a best practice was used. Best practice models include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance abuse. Model programs can come from many valid sources (e.g.,</p>	<p>Number of youth served using an evidence-based best practice model or program during the reporting period.</p> <p>Number of youth served during the reporting period.</p>

		CrimeSolutions.gov, OJJDP's Model Programs Guide, SAMHSA's Model Programs, etc.).	
	<p>Number of services provided to youth.</p> <p>Number of youth assessed as needing services (by type of service).</p>	<p>This measure is designed to assess both need and program capacity. Report the number of youth who are assessed as needing various types of services during the reporting period, and also the number of youth who actually receive various services during the reporting period.</p>	<p>Number of services provided to youth (by type of service).</p> <p>Number of youth assessed as needing substance use counseling/ services during the reporting period.</p> <p>Number of youth enrolled in substance use counseling/ services during the reporting period.</p> <p>Number of youth assessed as needing mental health services during the reporting period.</p> <p>Number of youth enrolled in mental health services during the reporting period.</p> <p>Number of youth assessed as needing housing services during the reporting period.</p> <p>Number of youth who successfully found housing during the reporting period.</p> <p>Other.</p>
	Percent of program youth who were adjudicated during the reporting period (short and long term).	Number and percent of participating program youth who were adjudicated for a new delinquent offense during the reporting period (short term) or program youth who exited the	Number of program youth who exited the program 6–12 months ago and were recommitted to a juvenile residential facility as a result of a new adjudication during the reporting period.

		<p>program 6–12 months ago (long term). This does NOT include technical violations and is appropriate for any youth-serving program.</p> <p>A juvenile residential facility is a place where young persons who have committed offenses may be housed overnight. A facility has living and sleeping units, such as wings, floors, dorms, barracks, or cottages.</p> <p>Official records (police, juvenile court) are the preferred data source.</p>	<p>Number of youth who exited the program 6–12 months ago and were sentenced to adult prison as a result of a new adjudication during the reporting period.</p> <p>Number of youth who exited the program 6–12 months ago and were given some other sentence as a result of a new adjudication during the reporting period.</p> <p>Number of program youth who exited the program 6–12 months ago and were tracked for new adjudications during the reporting period.</p>
	<p>Percent of program youth who had technical violations during the reporting period (short and long term).</p>	<p>Number and percent of program youth who had a violation of the terms of their supervision (commonly referred to as a technical violation) during the reporting period (short term) or program youth who exited the program 6–12 months ago (long term).</p> <p>A juvenile residential facility is a place where young persons who have committed offenses may be housed overnight. A facility has living and sleeping units, such as wings, floors, dorms, barracks, or cottages.</p>	<p>Number of program youth who were committed to a juvenile residential facility as a result of a technical violation during the reporting period or 6–12 months after exiting the program.</p> <p>Number of youth who were sentenced to adult prison as a result of a technical violation during the reporting period or 6–12 months after exiting the program.</p> <p>Number of youth who received some other sentence as a result of a technical violation during the reporting period or 6–12 months after exiting the program.</p>

		Program records are the preferred data source.	Number of program youth tracked for technical violations during the reporting period or 6–12 months after exiting the program.
	Percent of youth completing program requirements (short term).	<p>Number and percent of program youth who have successfully fulfilled all program obligations and requirements. This does not include youth who are still in ongoing programs. Program obligations will vary by program, but should be a predefined list of requirements or obligations that clients must meet before program completion.</p> <p>The total number of youth (the “B” value) includes those youth who have exited successfully and unsuccessfully.</p> <p>Program records are the preferred data source.</p>	<p>Number of program youth who exited the program having completed all program requirements during the reporting period.</p> <p>Total number of youth who exited the program during the reporting period (either successfully or unsuccessfully).</p>
	Percent of program youth who have exhibited a desired change in a target behavior (short and long term).	<p>Number and percent of program youth who have exhibited a desired change in a target behavior during the reporting period (short term) or program youth who exited the program 6–12 months ago (long term).</p> <p>Self-report or staff ratings are the most likely data sources.</p>	<p>Number of program youth served during the reporting period with the noted behavioral change during the reporting period or 6–12 months after exiting the program.</p> <p>Total number of youth receiving services for the target behavior during the reporting period or 6–12 months after exiting the program.</p>

Note on Project Evaluations

An applicant that proposes to use award funds through this solicitation to conduct project evaluations should be aware that certain project evaluations (such as systematic investigations to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge) may constitute “research” for purposes of applicable DOJ human subjects protection regulations. However, project evaluations that are intended only to generate internal improvements to a program or service, or are conducted only to meet OJP’s performance measures data reporting requirements, likely do not constitute “research.” Each applicant should provide sufficient information for OJP to determine whether the particular project it proposes would either intentionally or unintentionally collect and/or use information in such a way that it meets the DOJ definition of research that appears at 28 C.F.R. Part 46 (“Protection of Human Subjects”).

Research, for purposes of human subjects protection for OJP-funded programs, is defined as “a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.” 28 C.F.R. 46.102(d).

For additional information on determining whether a proposed activity would constitute research for purposes of human subjects protection, applicants should consult the decision tree in the “Research and the protection of human subjects” section of the [“Requirements related to Research”](#) webpage of the [“Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards,”](#) available through the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#). Every prospective applicant whose application may propose a research or statistical component also should review the “Data Privacy and Confidentiality Requirements” section on that webpage.

- c. Project Design and Implementation.** Applicants should detail how the project will operate throughout the funding period and describe the strategies that they will use to achieve the goals and objectives identified in the previous section. Applicants should describe how they will complete the deliverables stated in the Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables section on page 5. OJJDP encourages applicants to select evidence-based practices for their programs.

This section should also include details regarding any leveraged resources (cash or in-kind) from local sources to support the project and discuss plans for sustainability beyond the grant period.

Logic Model. Applicants should include a logic model that graphically illustrates how the performance measures are related to the project’s problems, goals, objectives, and design. See sample logic models [here](#). Applicants should submit the logic model as a separate attachment, as stipulated in Additional Attachments, page 28.

Timeline. Applicants should submit a realistic timeline or milestone chart that indicates major tasks associated with the goals and objectives of the project, assigns responsibility for each, and plots completion of each task by month or quarter for the duration of the award, using “Year 1,” “Month 1,” “Quarter 1,” etc., not calendar dates (see “Sample Project Timelines” [here](#)).

Applicants should submit the timeline as a separate attachment, as stipulated in Additional Attachments, page 28. On receipt of an award, the recipient may revise the timeline, based on training and technical assistance that OJJDP will provide.

- d. Capabilities and Competencies.** This section should describe the experience and capability of the applicant organization and any contractors or subgrantees that the applicant will use to implement and manage this effort and its associated federal funding, highlighting any previous experience implementing projects of similar design or magnitude. Applicants should highlight their experience/capability/capacity to manage subawards, including details on their system for fiscal accountability. Management and staffing patterns should be clearly connected to the project design described in the previous section. Applicants should describe the roles and responsibilities of project staff and explain the program's organizational structure and operations. Applicants should include a copy of an organizational chart showing how the organization operates, including who manages the finances; how the organization manages subawards, if there are any; and the management of the project proposed for funding.

Letters of Support/Memoranda of Understanding. If submitting a joint application, as described under [Section C. Eligibility Information](#), applicants should provide signed and dated letters of support or memoranda of understanding for all key partners and subrecipients that include the following:

- Expression of support for the program and a statement of willingness to participate and collaborate with it.
- Description of the partner's current role and responsibilities in the planning process and expected responsibilities when the program is operational.
- Estimate of the percentage of time that the partner will devote to the planning and operation of the project.

Letters of support may be addressed to the OJJDP Administrator. Only letters of support that are submitted by the due date and with the full application will be considered during the review process.

4. Budget and Associated Documentation

Applicants should provide a budget that (1) is complete, allowable, and cost effective in relation to the proposed activities; (2) shows the cost calculations demonstrating how they arrived at the total amount requested; and (3) provides a brief supporting narrative to link costs with project activities. The budget should cover the entire award period.

Applicants should set aside at least \$5,000 to attend OJJDP-approved TTA activities and meetings.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#).

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf. An applicant that submits its budget in a different format should use the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet should break out costs by year.

b. Budget Narrative

The budget narrative should thoroughly and clearly describe every category of expense listed in the Budget Detail Worksheet. OJP expects proposed budgets to be complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities).

Applicants should demonstrate in their budget narrative how they will maximize cost effectiveness of award expenditures. Budget narratives should generally describe cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project. For example, a budget narrative should detail why planned in-person meetings are necessary, or how technology and collaboration with outside organizations could be used to reduce costs, without compromising quality.

The budget narrative should be mathematically sound and correspond clearly with the information and figures provided in the Budget Detail Worksheet. The narrative should explain how the applicant estimated and calculated all costs, and how those costs are necessary to the completion of the proposed project. The narrative may include tables for clarification purposes, but need not be in a spreadsheet format. As with the Budget Detail Worksheet, the budget narrative should describe costs by year.

c. Information on Proposed Subawards (if any), as well as on Proposed Procurement Contracts (if any)

Applicants for OJP awards typically may propose to make subawards. Applicants also may propose to enter into procurement contracts under the award.

Whether—for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements—a particular agreement between a recipient and a third party will be considered a subaward or a procurement contract under the award is determined by federal rules and applicable OJP guidance. It is an important distinction, in part because the federal administrative rules and requirements that apply to subawards and to procurement contracts under awards differ markedly.

In general, the central question is the relationship between what the third party will do under its agreement with the recipient and what the recipient has committed (to OJP) to do under its award to further a public purpose (e.g., services the recipient will provide, products it will develop or modify, research or evaluation it will conduct). If a third party will provide some of the services the recipient has committed (to OJP) to provide, will develop or modify all or part of a product the recipient has committed (to OJP) to develop or modify, or will conduct part of the research or evaluation the recipient has committed (to OJP) to conduct, OJP will consider the agreement with the third party a subaward for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements.

This will be true **even if** the recipient, for internal or other nonfederal purposes, labels or treats its agreement as a procurement, a contract, or a procurement contract. Neither the title nor the structure of an agreement determines whether the agreement—for

purposes of federal grants administrative requirements—is a subaward or is instead a procurement contract under an award.

Additional guidance on the circumstances under which (for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements) an agreement constitutes a subaward as opposed to a procurement contract under an award, is available (along with other resources) on the [OJP Part 200 Uniform Requirements](#) webpage.

1. Information on proposed subawards

A recipient of an OJP award may not make subawards ("subgrants") unless the recipient has specific federal authorization to do so. Unless an applicable statute or DOJ regulation specifically authorizes (or requires) subawards, a recipient must have authorization from OJP before it may make a subaward.

A particular subaward may be authorized by OJP because the recipient included a sufficiently detailed description and justification of the proposed subaward in the application as approved by OJP. If, however, a particular subaward is not authorized by federal statute or regulation, and is not sufficiently described and justified in the application as approved by OJP, the recipient will be required, post-award, to request and obtain written authorization from OJP before it may make the subaward.

If an applicant proposes to make one or more subawards to carry out the federal award and program, the applicant should (1) identify (if known) the proposed subrecipient(s), (2) describe in detail what each subrecipient will do to carry out the federal award and federal program, and (3) provide a justification for the subaward(s), with details on pertinent matters such as special qualifications and areas of expertise. Pertinent information on subawards should appear not only in the Program Narrative, but also in the Budget Detail Worksheet and budget narrative.

2. Information on proposed procurement contracts (with specific justification for proposed noncompetitive contracts over \$150,000)

Unlike a recipient contemplating a subaward, a recipient of an OJP award generally does not need specific prior federal authorization to enter into an agreement that—for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements—is considered a procurement contract, **provided that** (1) the recipient uses its own documented procurement procedures and (2) those procedures conform to applicable federal law, including the Procurement Standards of the (DOJ) Part 200 Uniform Requirements (as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.317 - 200.326). The Budget Detail Worksheet and budget narrative should identify proposed procurement contracts. (As discussed above, subawards must be identified and described separately from procurement contracts.)

The Procurement Standards in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, however, reflect a general expectation that agreements that (for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements) constitute procurement "contracts" under awards will be entered into on the basis of full and open competition. If a proposed procurement contract would exceed the simplified acquisition threshold—currently, \$150,000—a recipient of an OJP award may not proceed without competition unless and until the recipient receives specific advance authorization from OJP to use a noncompetitive approach for the procurement.

An applicant that (at the time of its application) intends—without competition—to enter into a procurement “contract” that would exceed \$150,000 should include a detailed justification that explains to OJP why, in the particular circumstances, it is appropriate to proceed without competition. Various considerations that may be pertinent to the justification are outlined in the [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#).

d. Preagreement Costs

For information on preagreement costs, see [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs may be charged to an award only if:

- (a) The recipient has a current (i.e., unexpired) federally approved indirect cost rate, or
- (b) The recipient is eligible to use, and elects to use, the *de minimis* indirect cost rate described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.414(f).

An applicant with a current (that is, unexpired) federally approved indirect cost rate must attach a copy of the indirect cost rate agreement to the application. An applicant that does not have a current federally approved rate may request one through its cognizant federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant entity, or, if the applicant’s accounting system permits, applicants may propose to allocate costs in the direct cost categories.

For assistance with identifying the appropriate cognizant federal agency for indirect costs, contact the OCFO Customer Service Center at 800–458–0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf.

Certain OJP recipients have the option of electing to use the *de minimis* indirect cost rate. An applicant that is eligible to use the *de minimis* rate and that wishes to use the *de minimis* rate should attach written documentation to the application that advises OJP of both (1) the applicant’s eligibility to use the *de minimis* rate and (2) the applicant’s election to do so. If an eligible applicant elects the *de minimis* rate, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. The *de minimis* rate may no longer be used once an approved federally negotiated indirect cost rate is in place. (No entity that ever has had a federally approved negotiated indirect cost rate is eligible to use the *de minimis* rate.)

6. Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (including applicant disclosure of high-risk status)

Every applicant (other than an individual applying in his or her personal capacity) must download, complete, and submit the [OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire](#) as part of its application.

Among other things, the form requires each applicant to disclose whether it currently is designated “high risk” by a federal grant-making agency outside of DOJ. For purposes of this disclosure, high risk includes any status under which a federal awarding agency provides additional oversight due to the applicant’s past performance, or other programmatic

or financial concerns with the applicant. If an applicant is designated high risk by another federal awarding agency, the applicant must provide the following information:

- The federal awarding agency that currently designates the applicant high risk.
- The date the applicant was designated high risk.
- The high-risk point of contact at that federal awarding agency (name, phone number, and email address).
- The reasons for the high-risk status, as set out by the federal awarding agency.

OJP seeks this information to help ensure appropriate federal oversight of OJP awards. An applicant that is considered “high risk” by another federal awarding agency is not automatically disqualified from receiving an OJP award. OJP may, however, consider the information in award decisions, and may impose additional OJP oversight of any award under this solicitation (including through the conditions that accompany the award document).

7. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

Each applicant must complete and submit this information. An applicant that expends any funds for lobbying activities must provide all of the information requested on the form [Disclosure of Lobbying Activities \(SF-LLL\)](#). An applicant that does not expend any funds for lobbying activities must enter “N/A” in the text boxes for item 10 (“a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant” and “b. Individuals Performing Services”).

8. Additional Attachments

Applicants should submit the following information, as stipulated in the cited pages, as attachments to their applications. While the materials listed below are not assigned specific point values, peer reviewers will, as appropriate, consider these items when rating applications. For example, reviewers will consider résumés and/or letters of support/memoranda of understanding when assessing “capabilities/competencies.” Peer reviewers will not consider any additional information that the applicant submits other than that specified below.

a. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

Each applicant must disclose whether it has (or is proposed as a subrecipient under) any pending applications for federally funded grants or cooperative agreements that (1) include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed in the application under this solicitation and (2) would cover any identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted to OJP as part of the application under this solicitation. The applicant must disclose applications made directly to federal awarding agencies, and also applications for subawards of federal funds (e.g., applications to state agencies that will subaward (“subgrant”) federal funds).

OJP seeks this information to help avoid any inappropriate duplication of funding. Leveraging multiple funding sources in a complementary manner to implement comprehensive programs or projects is encouraged and is not seen as inappropriate duplication.

Each applicant that has one or more pending applications as described above must provide the following information about pending applications submitted within the last 12 months:

- The federal or state funding agency.
- The solicitation name/project name.
- The point of contact information at the applicable federal or state funding agency.

Federal or State Funding Agency	Solicitation Name/Project Name	Name/Phone/Email for Point of Contact at Federal or State Funding Agency
DOJ/Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS)	COPS Hiring Program	Jane Doe, 202/000-0000; jane.doe@usdoj.gov
Health and Human Services/ Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration	Drug-Free Communities Mentoring Program/North County Youth Mentoring Program	John Doe, 202/000-0000; john.doe@hhs.gov

Each applicant should include the table as a separate attachment to its application. The file should be named “Disclosure of Pending Applications.” The applicant legal name on the application must match the entity named on the Disclosure of Pending Applications statement.

Any applicant that does not have any pending applications as described above must submit, as a separate attachment, a statement to this effect: “[Applicant Name on SF-424] does not have (and is not proposed as a subrecipient under) any pending applications submitted within the last 12 months for federally funded grants or cooperative agreements (or for subawards under federal grants or cooperative agreements) that request funding to support the same project being proposed in this application to OJP and that would cover any identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted as part of this application.”

b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

If an application proposes research (including research and development) and/or evaluation, the applicant must demonstrate research/evaluation independence and integrity, including appropriate safeguards, before it may receive award funds. The applicant must demonstrate independence and integrity regarding both this proposed research and/or evaluation, and any current or prior related projects.

Each application should include an attachment that addresses **both** i. and ii. below.

- i. For purposes of this solicitation, each applicant must document research and evaluation independence and integrity by including one of the following two items:
 - a. A specific assurance that the applicant has reviewed its application to identify any actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any coprincipal investigators, and any subrecipients), and that the applicant has identified no such conflicts of interest—whether personal or financial or organizational (including on the part of the applicant entity or on the part of staff, investigators, or subrecipients)—that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, and reporting of the research.

OR

- b. A specific description of actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified—including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any coprincipal investigators, and any subrecipients—that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the research. These conflicts may be personal (e.g., on the part of investigators or other staff), financial, or organizational (related to the applicant or any subrecipient entity). Some examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations are those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse's work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former or current colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization would not be given an award to evaluate a project if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that specific project or a location implementing the project (whether funded by OJP or other sources), because the organization in such an instance might appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability of an evaluation or research product is a problem and must be disclosed.
- ii. In addition, for purposes of this solicitation, each applicant must address possible mitigation of research integrity concerns by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:
 - a. If an applicant reasonably believes that no actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. The applicant must also include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and prevent (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of

performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

OR

- b. If the applicant has identified actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) that could affect the independence and integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the research, the applicant must provide a specific and robust mitigation plan to address each of those conflicts. At a minimum, the applicant is expected to explain the specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

OJP will assess research and evaluation independence and integrity based on considerations such as the adequacy of the applicant's efforts to identify factors that could affect the objectivity or integrity of the proposed staff and/or the applicant entity (and any subrecipients) in carrying out the research, development, or evaluation activity; and the adequacy of the applicant's existing or proposed remedies to control any such factors.

- c. Logic model (see page 23).
- d. Timeline or milestone chart (see page 23).
- e. Résumés of all key personnel.
- f. Job descriptions outlining roles and responsibilities for all key positions.
- g. Letters of support/memoranda of understanding from partner organizations (see page 24).
- h. **Required:** Reentry strategic plan (see page 6).

How To Apply

Applicants must register in, and submit applications through Grants.gov, a primary source to find federal funding opportunities and apply for funding. Find complete instructions on how to register and submit an application at www.Grants.gov. Applicants that experience technical difficulties during this process should call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at **800-518-4726** or **606-545-5035**, which operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on federal holidays.

Registering with Grants.gov is a one-time process; however, **processing delays may occur, and it can take several weeks** for first-time registrants to receive confirmation of registration and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the

application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications at least 72 hours prior to the application due date to allow time for the applicant to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

OJP strongly encourages all prospective applicants to sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) regarding this solicitation. If this solicitation is cancelled or modified, individuals who sign up with Grants.gov for updates will be automatically notified.

Browser Information: Grants.gov was built to be compatible with Internet Explorer. For technical assistance with Google Chrome or another browser, contact Grants.gov Customer Support.

Note on Attachments: Grants.gov has two categories of files for attachments: “mandatory” and “optional.” OJP receives all files attached in both categories. Ensure that all required documents are attached in either Grants.gov category.

Note on File Names and File Types: Grants.gov only permits the use of certain specific characters in the file names of attachments. Valid file names may include only the characters shown in the table below. Grants.gov rejects any application that includes an attachment(s) with a file name that contains any characters not shown in the table below. Grants.gov forwards successfully submitted applications to the OJP Grants Management System (GMS).

Characters	Special Characters		
Upper case (A – Z)	Parenthesis ()	Curly braces { }	Square brackets []
Lower case (a – z)	Ampersand (&)	Tilde (~)	Exclamation point (!)
Underscore (_)	Comma (,)	Semicolon (;)	Apostrophe (‘)
Hyphen (-)	At sign (@)	Number sign (#)	Dollar sign (\$)
Space	Percent sign (%)	Plus sign (+)	Equal sign (=)
Period (.)	Applicants must use the “&” format in place of the ampersand (&) when using XML format for documents.		

GMS does not accept executable file types as application attachments. These disallowed file types include, but are not limited to, the following extensions: “.com,” “.bat,” “.exe,” “.vbs,” “.cfg,” “.dat,” “.db,” “.dbf,” “.dll,” “.ini,” “.log,” “.ora,” “.sys,” and “.zip.” GMS may reject applications with files that use these extensions. It is important to allow time to change the type of file(s) if the application is rejected.

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

Every applicant entity must comply with all applicable System for Award Management (SAM) and unique entity identifier (currently, a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number) requirements. If an applicant entity has not fully complied with applicable SAM and unique identifier requirements by the time OJP makes award decisions, OJP may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive an award and may use that determination as a basis for making the award to a different applicant.

An individual who wishes to apply in his/her personal capacity should search Grants.gov for funding opportunities for which individuals are eligible to apply. Use the Funding Opportunity Number (FON) to register. (An applicant applying as an individual must comply with all applicable Grants.gov individual registration requirements.)

Complete the registration form at <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRegister> to create a username and password for Grants.gov. (An applicant applying as an individual should complete all steps except 1, 2, and 4.)

- 1. Acquire a unique entity identifier (currently, a DUNS number).** In general, the Office of Management and Budget requires every applicant for a federal award (other than an individual) to include a "unique entity identifier" in each application, including an application for a supplemental award. Currently, a DUNS number is the required unique entity identifier.

A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit identification number provided by the commercial company Dun and Bradstreet. This unique entity identifier is used for tracking purposes, and to validate address and point of contact information for applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. It will be used throughout the life cycle of an OJP award. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, one-time activity. Call Dun and Bradstreet at 866–705–5711 to obtain a DUNS number or apply online at www.dnb.com. A DUNS number is usually received within 1–2 business days.

- 2. Register with SAM.** SAM is the repository for certain standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. All applicants for OJP awards (other than individuals) must maintain current registrations in the SAM database. An applicant must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Each applicant must **update or renew its SAM registration at least annually** to maintain an active status. SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete.

An application cannot be successfully submitted in Grants.gov until Grants.gov receives the SAM registration information. Once the SAM registration/renewal is complete, **the information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take as long as 48 hours.** OJP recommends that the applicant register or renew registration with SAM as early as possible.

Information about SAM registration procedures can be accessed at www.sam.gov.

- 3. Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. An applicant entity's "unique entity identifier" (DUNS number) must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process for organizations and other entities, go to <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/OrcRegister>. Individuals registering with Grants.gov should go to www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/individual-registration.html.
- 4. Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.
- 5. Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for this solicitation is 16.812, titled "SCA Statewide Juvenile Reentry Systems Reform Implementation," and the funding opportunity number is OJJDP-2017-11025.

- 6. Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application. The second will state whether the application has been validated and successfully submitted, or whether it has been rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received, and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting an application well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges each applicant to submit its application **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date, to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. Applications must be successfully submitted through Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. ET on June 29, 2017.

Click [here](#) for further details on DUNS numbers, SAM, and Grants.gov registration steps and timeframes.

Note: Application Versions

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, OJP will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted.

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues—beyond the applicant’s control—which prevent the applicant from submitting the application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov [Customer Support Hotline](#) or the [SAM Help Desk](#) (Federal Service Desk) to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. The applicant must email the Response Center at grants@ncirs.gov **within 24 hours after the application deadline** to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. The applicant's email must describe the technical difficulties and must include a timeline of the applicant’s submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant’s DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s).

Note: OJP does not automatically approve requests to submit a late application. After OJP reviews the applicant's request, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desk to verify the reported technical issues, OJP will inform the applicant whether the request to submit a late application has been approved or denied. If OJP determines that the untimely application submission was due to the applicant's failure to follow all required procedures, OJP will deny the applicant’s request to submit its application.

The following conditions generally are insufficient to justify late submissions:

- Failure to register in SAM or Grants.gov in sufficient time. (SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete. The information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take up to 48 hours.)
- Failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its website.
- Failure to follow each instruction in the OJP solicitation.
- Technical issues with the applicant’s computer or information technology environment, such as issues with firewalls or browser incompatibility.

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP [Funding Resource Center](#) webpage.

E. Application Review Information

Review Criteria

Applications that meet basic minimum requirements will be evaluated by peer reviewers using the following review criteria with the different weight given to each based on the percentage value listed after each individual criterion. For example, the first criterion, Statement of the Problem, is worth 20 percent of the entire score in the application review process.

1. Statement of the Problem/Description of the Issue (20%)
2. Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures (10%)
3. Project Design and Implementation (40%)
4. Capabilities and Competencies (20%)
5. Budget: complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narratives should demonstrate generally how applicants will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.¹⁰ (10%)

See What an Application Should Include, page 14, for the criteria that the peer reviewers will use to evaluate applications.

Review Process

OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for making awards. OJJDP reviews the application to make sure that the information presented is reasonable, understandable, measurable, and achievable, as well as consistent with the solicitation.

Peer reviewers will review the applications submitted under this solicitation that meet basic minimum requirements. For purposes of assessing whether an application meets basic minimum requirements and should proceed to further consideration, OJP screens applications for compliance with those requirements. Although specific requirements may vary, the following are common requirements applicable to all solicitations for funding under OJP programs:

- The application must be submitted by an eligible type of applicant.
- The application must request funding within programmatic funding constraints (if applicable).
- The application must be responsive to the scope of the solicitation.
- The application must include all items designated as critical elements.
- The applicant must not be identified in SAM as excluded from receiving federal awards.

¹⁰ Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

For a list of the critical elements for this solicitation, see “What an Application Should Include” under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

Peer review panels will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. OJJDP may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications on technical merit using the solicitation’s review criteria. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is not a current DOJ employee. An internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. Peer reviewers’ ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although reviewer views are considered carefully. Other important considerations for OJP include underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, and available funding, as well as the extent to which the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative accurately explain project costs that are reasonable, necessary, and otherwise allowable under federal law and applicable federal cost principles.

Pursuant to the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, before award decisions are made, OJP also reviews information related to the degree of risk posed by applicants. Among other things to help assess whether an applicant that has one or more prior federal awards has a satisfactory record with respect to performance, integrity, and business ethics, OJP checks whether the applicant is listed in SAM as excluded from receiving a federal award. If OJP anticipates that an award will exceed \$150,000 in federal funds, OJP also must review and consider any information about the applicant that appears in the non-public segment of the integrity and performance system accessible through SAM (currently, the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System; "FAPIS").

Important note on FAPIS: An applicant, at its option, may review and comment on any information about itself that currently appears in FAPIS and was entered by a federal awarding agency. OJP will consider any such comments by the applicant, in addition to the other information in FAPIS, in its assessment of the risk posed by applicants.

The evaluation of risks goes beyond information in SAM, however. OJP itself has in place a framework for evaluating risks posed by applicants for competitive awards. OJP takes into account information pertinent to matters such as—

1. Applicant financial stability and fiscal integrity.
2. Quality of the management systems of the applicant, and the applicant’s ability to meet prescribed management standards, including those outlined in the [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#).
3. Applicant's history of performance under OJP and other DOJ awards (including compliance with reporting requirements and award conditions), as well as awards from other federal agencies.
4. Reports and findings from audits of the applicant, including audits under the Part 200 Uniform Requirements.
5. Applicant's ability to comply with statutory and regulatory requirements, and to effectively implement other award requirements.

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, all final award decisions will be made by the Assistant Attorney General, who may take into account not only peer review ratings and OJJDP recommendations, but also other factors as indicated in this section.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

Award notifications will be made by September 30, 2017. OJP sends award notifications by email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions on how to access and view the award documents, and steps to take in GMS to start the award acceptance process. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9 p.m. ET on the award date.

For each successful applicant, an individual with the necessary authority to bind the applicant will be required to log in; execute a set of legal certifications and a set of legal assurances; designate a financial point of contact; thoroughly review the award, including all award conditions; and sign and accept the award. The award acceptance process requires physical signature of the award document by the authorized representative and the scanning of the fully executed award document to OJP.

Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements

If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the OJP-approved application, the recipient must comply with all award conditions, as well as all applicable requirements of federal statutes, regulations, and executive orders (including applicable requirements referred to in the assurances and certifications executed in connection with award acceptance). OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review information on post-award legal requirements and common OJP award conditions **prior** to submitting an application.

Applicants should consult the [“Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards,”](#) available in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#). In addition, applicants should examine the following two legal documents, as each successful applicant must execute both documents before it may receive any award funds.

- [Certifications Regarding Lobbying; Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements](#)
- [Standard Assurances](#)

Applicants may view these documents in the Apply section of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

The webpages accessible through the [“Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards”](#) are intended to give applicants for OJP awards a general overview of important statutes, regulations, and award conditions that apply to many (or in some cases, all) OJP grants and cooperative agreements awarded in FY 2017. Individual OJP awards typically also will include additional award conditions. Those additional conditions may relate to the particular statute or program, or solicitation under which the award is made; to the substance of the funded application; to the recipient's performance

under other federal awards; to the recipient's legal status (e.g., as a for-profit entity); or to other pertinent considerations.

General Information About Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

In addition to the deliverables described in [Section A. Program Description](#), any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to submit the following reports and data.

Required reports. Recipients typically must submit quarterly financial reports, semiannual progress reports and performance measures, final financial and progress reports, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements or specific award conditions. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent. (In appropriate cases, OJP may require additional reports.)

Awards that exceed \$500,000 will include an additional condition that, under specific circumstances, will require the recipient to report (to FAPIIS) information on civil, criminal, and administrative proceedings connected with (or connected to the performance of) either the OJP award or any other grant, cooperative agreement, or procurement contract from the federal government. Additional information on this reporting requirement appears in the text of the award condition posted on the OJP website at <http://ojp.gov/funding/FAPIIS.htm>.

Data on performance measures. In addition to required reports, an award recipient also must provide data that measure the results of the work done under the award. To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as to assist DOJ in fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111-352, OJP will require any recipient, post award, to provide the data listed as "Data Recipient Provides" in the performance measures table in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#) under "Program Narrative," so that OJP can calculate values for this solicitation's performance measures.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For OJP contact(s), see the title page.

For contact information for Grants.gov, see the title page.

H. Other Information

Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a)

All applications submitted to OJP (including all attachments to applications) are subject to the federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and to the Privacy Act. By law, DOJ may withhold information that is responsive to a request pursuant to FOIA if DOJ determines that the responsive information either is protected under the Privacy Act or falls within the scope of one of nine statutory exemptions under FOIA. DOJ cannot agree in advance of a request pursuant to FOIA not to release some or all portions of an application.

In its review of records that are responsive to a FOIA request, OJP will withhold information in those records that plainly falls within the scope of the Privacy Act or one of the statutory exemptions under FOIA. (Some examples include certain types of information in budgets, and

names and contact information for project staff other than certain key personnel.) In appropriate circumstances, OJP will request the views of the applicant/recipient that submitted a responsive document.

For example, if OJP receives a request pursuant to FOIA for an application submitted by a nonprofit or for-profit organization or an institution of higher education, or for an application that involves research, OJP typically will contact the applicant/recipient that submitted the application and ask it to identify—quite precisely—any particular information in the application that the applicant/recipient believes falls under a FOIA exemption, the specific exemption it believes applies, and why. After considering the submission by the applicant/recipient, OJP makes an independent assessment regarding withholding information. OJP generally follows a similar process for requests pursuant to FOIA for applications that may contain law-enforcement-sensitive information.

Provide Feedback to OJP

To assist OJP in improving its application and award processes, OJP encourages applicants to provide feedback on this solicitation, the application submission process, and/or the application review process. Provide feedback to OJPSolicitationFeedback@usdoj.gov.

IMPORTANT: This email is for feedback and suggestions only. OJP does **not** reply from this mailbox to messages it receives in this mailbox. Any prospective applicant that has specific questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation **must** use the appropriate telephone number or email listed on the front of this document to obtain information. These contacts are provided to help ensure that prospective applicants can directly reach an individual who can address specific questions in a timely manner.

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, email your résumé to ojppeerreview@lmsolas.com. (Do not send your résumé to the OJP Solicitation Feedback email account.) **Note:** Neither you nor anyone else from your organization or entity can be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization/entity has submitted an application.

Application Checklist

OJJDP FY 2017 Second Chance Act: Implementing County and Statewide Plans To Improve Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System

This application checklist has been created as an aid in developing an application.

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

- Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 33)
- Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 33)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 33)
- Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 33)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 33)
- Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 34)
- Sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) (optional) (see page 32)
- Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)
- Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at [ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm](#) (see page 13)

After Application Submission, Receive Grants.gov Email Notifications That:

- (1) Application has been received
- (2) Application has either been successfully validated or rejected with errors (see page 34)

If No Grants.gov Receipt, and Validation or Error Notifications are Received:

- Contact Grants.gov and/or SAM regarding technical difficulties. Refer to the section: Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues (see page 34)
- Contact the Response Center at grants@ncjrs.gov to request to submit the application after the deadline because of unforeseen technical issues. Refer to the section: Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues (see page 34)

Overview of Post-Award Legal Requirements:

- Review the "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards](#)" in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

Scope Requirement:

- The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) ranging from \$750,000 to \$1,000,000.

Eligibility Requirement: Eligible applicants are limited to units of local government and states that have developed a countywide or statewide plan to reduce recidivism and improve outcomes

for youth in contact with the juvenile justice system, and that meet the requirements outlined in [Section C. Eligibility Information](#).

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 15)
- _____ Project Abstract (see page 15)
- _____ Program Narrative (see page 16)
- _____ Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative (see page 24)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 27)
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 27)
- _____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 28)
- _____ Additional Attachments (see page 28)
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity
 - _____ Timeline or milestone chart
 - _____ Résumés of all key personnel
 - _____ Job descriptions outlining roles and responsibilities for all key positions
 - _____ Letters of support/memoranda of understanding from partner organizations
 - _____ Logic model
 - _____ A completed jurisdictionwide plan to the application.
- _____ Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable) (see page 13)

Appendix A: Second Chance Act Grantees: What You Need to Know To Ensure Your Program Is Built on Principles of Effective Practice

The following has been adapted from research-based principles recommended for juveniles [Elizabeth Seigle, Anastasia Walsh, and Josh Weber, *Core Principles for Reducing Recidivism and Improving Other Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System* (New York: Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2014).]

The primary objective of the Second Chance Act is to reduce recidivism. A review of the most rigorous juvenile justice research has established eight key principles and practices associated with reduced recidivism rates and improved outcomes for youth in the juvenile justice system.

1. Target Higher Risk Youth. Prioritize supervision and services for youth who are at higher risk to reoffend. Consistent findings from research show that supervision and services focused on lower risk youth produce little if any positive effect on recidivism and can even increase the recidivism. Maximum benefit is gained only when resources are directed to higher risk justice-involved youth.

2. Address Youth's Greatest Criminogenic Needs. Youth's criminogenic needs—dynamic risk factors that are the primary drivers behind youth's delinquent behaviors, such as antisocial tendencies, negative peer groups, dysfunctional families, and substance use—have proven to exert the most significant impact on recidivism. Supervision and services that address individual youth's specific criminogenic needs and that are tailored to youth's strengths and address their barriers to learning and motivation to change are likely to produce the largest recidivism reductions.

3. Objectively Assess Risks and Needs. The use of validated assessment instruments has proven to be the most reliable, objective way to identify youth's risk of recidivism, criminogenic needs, and responsiveness to treatment. The results from risk and needs assessments, in conjunction with mental health and substance abuse screening and assessments, should be the primary contributing factor in determining how to match youth to the supervision levels and specific services most likely to reduce recidivism.

4. Employ Effective Services. Cognitive behavioral interventions that help youth change the thinking patterns that contribute to delinquency and develop the skills to make more prosocial decisions have proven to substantially improve youth outcomes. Effective service approaches for youth also seek to strengthen parenting skills and youth-family interactions and to connect youth to other positive adults, peers, and activities in their schools and communities.

5. Coordinate Services Across Systems. The majority of youth in the juvenile justice system have significant mental health, substance use, education, and/or child welfare needs and are already involved in one or more of these service systems. Juvenile justice initiatives can work in partnership with these other systems to assess and comprehensively address youth's criminogenic needs and improve service access, quality, and efficiency.

6. Engage Families and Youth. Families are critical to youth's success. Juvenile justice systems should engage youth's families and other positive adults in case planning supervision and services while youth are in confinement and throughout the reentry process. In addition, youth are more likely to comply with supervision and services if they have opportunities for expression and meaningful participation in shaping case plans, decisions, and services.

7. Supervise Youth in a Developmentally Appropriate Manner. Supervision officers who motivate and support youth to change through cognitive behavioral and motivational approaches can play a key role in addressing their criminogenic needs. Supervision and accountability practices should also emphasize incentives and restitution; employ graduated responses to noncompliance; and ensure swift, certain, and proportional consequences when needed.

8. Prioritize Implementation Quality and Evaluation. Close fidelity to evidence-based programs and practices produces the largest effects on recidivism, while poor fidelity can result in limited or even negative effects. A system of implementation standards; the ongoing assessment of program quality, including ensuring youth receive the proper "dosage" of services; improvement processes, such as ongoing training and coaching; and data collection and outcome evaluation activities can facilitate high implementation quality and achieve expected results.