

**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) 2018 Family Drug Court Research and Evaluation Program. This program furthers the Department's mission to reduce substance abuse<sup>1</sup> (including opioid abuse) by supporting rigorous research and evaluation efforts that inform the development of and improvements to family drug courts designed to address parental substance abuse and promote family reunification.

## **OJJDP FY 2018 Family Drug Court Research and Evaluation Program**

**Applications Due: June 14, 2018**

### **Eligibility**

Eligible applicants are limited to states (including territories), units of local government,<sup>2</sup> federally recognized tribal governments as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, nonprofit organizations<sup>3</sup> and for-profit organizations (including tribal nonprofit and for-profit organizations), and institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education). All recipients and subrecipients (including any for-profit organization) must forgo any profit or management fee. Foreign governments, foreign organizations, and foreign colleges and universities are not eligible to apply.

Under this solicitation, an applicant entity may submit more than one application, as long as each application submitted is unique (i.e., includes a nonduplicative program narrative and

---

<sup>1</sup> When describing substance abuse, the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition* uses the term "substance use disorder" for the clinical and functional assessment of an individual's recurrent use of alcohol and/or drugs that cause significant impairment, such as health problems; disabilities; or failure to meet work, school, or home responsibilities. For more information, see <https://www.samhsa.gov/disorders/substance-use>.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> See <https://ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SolicitationRequirements/OrganizationalRequirements.htm> for additional information on demonstrating nonprofit status.

budget). An entity may also be proposed as a subrecipient (subgrantee) in more than one application.

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).<sup>4</sup> The applicant must be the entity that would have primary responsibility for carrying out the award, including administering funding, managing the entire research project, and monitoring and appropriately managing any subawards (“subgrants”).

OJJDP may elect to fund applications submitted under this FY 2018 solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on, among other considerations, the merit of the applications and the availability of appropriations.

## Deadline

Applicants must register with Grants.gov at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html> prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time (ET) on June 14, 2018.

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, 606--545–5035, at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html>, or at [support@grants.gov](mailto: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](mailto:grants@ncjrs.gov) **within 24 hours after the application deadline** 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) or by email at

---

<sup>4</sup> For additional information on subawards, see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

[grants@ncjrs.gov](mailto:grants@ncjrs.gov). 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. General information on applying for OJJDP awards can be found at <https://www.ojjdp.gov/funding/funding.html>. Answers to frequently asked questions that may assist applicants are posted at <https://www.ojjdp.gov/grants/solicitations/FY2018/FAQ/FDCResearch.pdf>.

Grants.gov number assigned to this solicitation: OJJDP-2018-13550

Release date: April 30,2018.

## Contents

A. Program Description .....	5
Overview .....	5
Program-Specific Information .....	5
Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products .....	7
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
Preagreement 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.....	36
F. Federal Award Administration Information .....	38
Federal Award Notices .....	38
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements .....	38
General Information About Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements .....	39
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s) .....	39
H. Other Information.....	39
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a) .....	39
Provide Feedback to OJP .....	40
Application Checklist .....	41

# OJJDP FY 2018 Family Drug Court Research and Evaluation Program

CFDA # 16.585

## A. Program Description

### Overview

The Family Drug Court Research and Evaluation Program aligns with the Attorney General's priority to reduce drug abuse (including opioid abuse) by supporting research efforts that inform the development of and improvements to family drug courts that are designed to address parental substance abuse and promote family reunification. Family drug courts (FDCs) are specialized courts within the justice system that handle cases of child abuse and neglect that involve substance abuse by the child's parents or guardians. These cases are coordinated closely with child protective services and often involve parental rights, in which parents who are substance abusers are motivated to seek treatment in order to maintain or restore custody of their children. Studies under this program will assess the effectiveness and cost efficiency of this approach, particularly in helping to address the country's opioid epidemic.

**Statutory Authority:** Any awards made under this solicitation are authorized pursuant to 34 U.S.C. 10619.

### Program-Specific Information

Substance abuse by adults negatively impacts the lives of children who depend on their parents and guardians for care and supervision. Based on data from the 2009 and 2014 National Surveys on Drug Use and Health, researchers estimated that about 1 in 8 children in the United States who are younger than age 18 (8.7 million) live in households with at least 1 parent who has a substance use disorder (SUD). SUDs are characterized by recurrent use of alcohol or drugs (or both) that results in significant impairment.<sup>5</sup> While not all parents who are substance abusers neglect or abuse their children, research indicates the majority (an estimated 60 to 80 percent) of substantiated child abuse and neglect cases in the United States involve substance abuse by a custodial parent or guardian.<sup>6</sup> These findings highlight the scope of the problem and the need for FDCs to address substance abuse and treatment concerns for parents, children, and the family as a whole. With the rise of opioid abuse,<sup>7</sup> there is also a critical demand to understand how FDCs may assist with coordinated case management and service delivery to advance recovery among parents who abuse opioids and to protect and support their children.

---

<sup>5</sup> Lipari, R.N., and Van Horn, S.L. 2017. *Children Living With Parents Who Have a Substance Use Disorder*. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality. Available at [https://www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/report\\_3223/ShortReport-3223.html](https://www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/report_3223/ShortReport-3223.html).

<sup>6</sup> Young, N., Boles, S., and Otero, C. 2007. Parental substance use disorders and child maltreatment: Overlap, gaps, and opportunities. *Child Maltreatment* 12:137–149. Available at <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1077559507300322>.

<sup>7</sup> Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. 2017. Key substance use and mental health indicators in the United States: Results from the 2016 National Survey on Drug Use and Health. HHS Publication No. SMA 17-5044, NSDUH Series H-52. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality. Available at <https://www.samhsa.gov/data/>.

FDCs emerged in the mid-1990s to address the significant proportion of substantiated child abuse and neglect cases that involved substance abuse by a parent or guardian.<sup>8</sup> They aim to improve access to substance abuse treatment for parents and improve court, child welfare, and substance abuse outcomes for the families involved. FDCs were also created to help keep families together and address the poor outcomes of family reunification programs that left many children in foster care for years, instead of being raised in stable, permanent homes.<sup>9</sup> Families may be served by FDCs when children are exposed to parental drug abuse either prenatally or after birth.

As of 2016, approximately 370 FDCs nationwide have entered into partnerships across courts, child welfare agencies, substance abuse treatment agencies, and other community agencies.<sup>10</sup> OJJDP has worked to advance the field by funding demonstration sites and issuing FDC guidelines<sup>11</sup> and a national strategic plan.<sup>12</sup>

Compared to standard services, FDC outcomes have shown significantly higher rates of parents' participation in substance abuse treatment, longer stays in substance abuse treatment, higher rates of family reunification, less time for children in foster care, and decreased incidence of repeat maltreatment and return to out-of-home care compared to non-FDC participants.<sup>13 14 15</sup> However, further methodologically rigorous research is needed to examine the efficacy of program components (and their combination) in achieving treatment completion, reducing parental drug abuse, increasing parenting competencies, addressing the well-being of children, and advancing permanency planning in a timely fashion.

Areas of research interest include:

1. Examining which program components of FDCs are associated with the best outcomes for children and families, and what combination of program components works for specific populations of children and families. It is also important to identify if the FDC intervention or particular components are producing any unintended negative side effects.

---

<sup>8</sup> Development Services Group, Inc. 2016. "Family Drug Courts." Literature review. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available at [https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Family\\_Drug\\_Courts.pdf](https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Family_Drug_Courts.pdf).

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Children and Family Futures. (March 2017). National Strategic Plan for Family Drug Courts. [http://www.cffutures.org/files/FDC\\_StrategicPlan\\_V1R1.pdf](http://www.cffutures.org/files/FDC_StrategicPlan_V1R1.pdf).<sup>11</sup> Children and Family Futures. 2015. *Guidance to States: Recommendations for Developing Family Drug Court Guidelines*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available at <http://www.cffutures.org/files/publications/FDC-Guidelines.pdf>.

<sup>11</sup> Children and Family Futures. 2015. *Guidance to States: Recommendations for Developing Family Drug Court Guidelines*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available at <http://www.cffutures.org/files/publications/FDC-Guidelines.pdf>.

<sup>12</sup> Children and Family Futures. 2017. *National Strategic Plan for Family Drug Courts*. Available at [http://www.cffutures.org/files/FDC\\_StrategicPlan\\_V1R1.pdf](http://www.cffutures.org/files/FDC_StrategicPlan_V1R1.pdf).

<sup>13</sup> Development Services Group, Inc. 2016. *Family Drug Courts. Literature Review*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available at [https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Family\\_Drug\\_Courts.pdf](https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Family_Drug_Courts.pdf).

<sup>14</sup> Marlowe, D.B., and Carey, S.M. 2012. *Research Update on Family Drug Courts*. Alexandria, Va.: National Association of Drug Court Professionals. Available at <https://www.nadcp.org/sites/default/files/nadcp/Reseach%20Update%20on%20Family%20Drug%20Courts%20-%20NADCP.pdf>.

<sup>15</sup> Children and Family Futures. Family Drug Court Literature Review through August 2015. Available at <https://www.cffutures.org/publication/family-drug-court-literature-review>.

2. Investigating strategies and approaches designed to address the opioid epidemic. A key research question is whether the traditional FDC model works for opioid abusers or if adaptations are necessary. Such a research effort might entail launching a partnership with a funded demonstration site in order to evaluate the development, implementation, and evaluation of FDCs addressing the opioid crisis.
3. Studying the development and implementation of FDCs to assess their effectiveness and cost efficiency. Cost considerations are a key policy issue as jurisdictions strive to secure initial financial support, implement potentially costly treatment, and subsequently sustain FDC services.
4. Addressing the concerns of small, high-poverty, and rural jurisdictions, which may not have the resources to support or the client flow to necessitate the establishment of separate FDC dockets. For these jurisdictions, there is a need to systematically identify core components necessary for infusion of FDC strategies into existing dependency court and child welfare systems.

Findings from this FDC Research and Evaluation Program will be disseminated widely and integrated into OJJDP program planning and technical assistance/training delivery to ensure that federally funded FDCs are informed about the evidence base to improve outcomes for children and their parents.

Applicants should propose to conduct the most scientifically rigorous research studies feasible, with an emphasis on informing policy and practice regarding FDCs. Applicants may propose single or multisite research efforts. The proposed study designs may include, but are not limited to:

- Impact evaluations (potentially with accompanying process evaluations), including randomized experiments and quasi-experiments (with a comparison condition).
- Cost effectiveness analysis.
- Extended or expanded data collection (for example, adding questions to a survey instrument or accessing juvenile justice records) for ongoing/existing studies, including longitudinal studies.

OJJDP will require applicants to document that they have established agreements that allow for full access to data and study populations.

OJJDP will require applicants proposing to conduct an evaluation to document that they have established a collaborative partnership with a program implementer(s) currently delivering FDC services.

Funding under this solicitation will support only research/evaluation-related expenses; OJJDP will not fund costs associated with routine service delivery under this solicitation.

### **Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products**

The goal of this research and evaluation program is to better understand the overall impact of FDCs on reducing parental substance abuse (particularly opioid abuse) and improving child welfare, and to better understand the populations served in and practices implemented by the courts. It is expected that the findings will result in more effective policy and practice in the design and implementation of FDCs. The specific objectives will examine the overall problems

that FDCs address along with the impact and cost efficiency of FDCs. In order to advance practice, the program will also examine which program components are associated with effects, including those practices identified in operational standards and those geared to the opioid epidemic. Outcomes to be examined would include measures of reduction in parental substance abuse and improvement in child welfare and family reunification.

It will be incumbent upon the applicants to identify and justify their selection of the problem(s) to be addressed, the research questions to be answered, the methodology to be used, and the utility of the findings in terms of applications for policy and practice.

The objectives of the program include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Identifying a gap or need for research on FDCs and the outcomes for children, parents, and families.
- Documenting the status of the current literature on the research question(s) and the capacity to answer the question(s) proposed.
- Investigating the research question(s) via a scientifically valid and feasible research/evaluation design and methodology.

Successful applicants should translate the research/evaluation findings into meaningful feedback and recommendations for policymakers and FDC practitioners, as well as the broader field.

OJJDP also anticipates the following deliverables:

- Practitioner-friendly overview documents highlighting the project's goals and objectives, as OJJDP requires. (Refer to *OJJDP News @ a Glance* and JuvJust publications for examples of the type of documents requested: [www.ojjdp.gov/enews/enews.html](http://www.ojjdp.gov/enews/enews.html).)
- Practitioner-friendly interim reports highlighting the project's progress and interim findings, as OJJDP requires.
- A draft project plan with the application. OJJDP will review and approve the plan with a timeline.
- A detailed progress report to OJJDP every 6 months describing the status of the evaluation, methodological and implementation issues, progress toward the project goals, and any other issues relevant to the project's completion. At the conclusion of the project, the final progress report should summarize the extent to which the goals and objectives were met throughout the period of performance under the award.
- Electronic copies of (1) a final technical report summarizing the research questions or objectives, methods, and analytical techniques of the study and the findings and conclusions, similar to the type of information reported in a refereed journal and (2) a plain language executive summary of the final technical report suitable for a nontechnical audience. Both documents will be developed and disseminated at OJJDP's discretion. (See <https://www.ojjdp.gov/research/research-grantee.html> for more information.)

- All new materials, protocols, procedures, manuals, evaluation-related training materials, etc. developed under this program.

Required Data Sets and Associated Files and Documentation. Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be expected to submit to the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) all data sets that result in whole or in part from the work funded by the award, along with associated files and any documentation necessary for future efforts by others to reproduce the project’s findings and/or to extend the scientific value of the data set through secondary analysis. For more information, see Program Narrative in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

In addition to these deliverables (and the required reports and data on performance measures described in [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#)), OJJDP expects scholarly products to result from each award under this solicitation, taking the form of one or more published, peer-reviewed, scientific journal articles, and/or (if appropriate) law review journal articles, book chapter(s) or book(s) in the academic press, technological prototypes, patented inventions, or similar scientific products.

The Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products are directly related to the performance measures that demonstrate the results of the work completed.

**Performance Measures**

OJP will require each successful applicant to submit regular performance data that demonstrate the results of the work carried out under the award (see “[General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements](#)” in [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#)).

Applicants should visit OJP’s performance measurement page at [www.ojp.gov/performance](http://www.ojp.gov/performance) to view the specific reporting requirements for this grant program.

The application should demonstrate the applicant’s understanding of the performance data reporting requirements for this grant program and detail how the applicant will gather the required data should it receive funding.

Applicants are **not** required to submit performance data with the application. Performance measures information is included as an alert that successful applicants will be required to submit performance data as part of the reporting requirements under an award.

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Recipient Provides
To advance knowledge building and innovation in both policy and practice through the conduct of purposeful research and evaluation efforts in the area of family drug courts.	Number of deliverables that met the expectations of the project.	List of deliverables, including citation(s) to all scholarly products, that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the OJJDP award.  Identified gaps that can be addressed by the proposed research as demonstrated by the scholarly products that result in whole or in part from work funded under the OJJDP award

		<p>(published, peer-reviewed, scientific journal articles, technical reports, and/or (as appropriate for the funded project) law review journal articles, book chapter(s) or book(s) in the academic press, or similar scientific products).</p> <p>Quarterly financial reports, semi-annual and final progress reports, a final technical report, and a plain language executive summary of the work performed under the OJJDP award.</p>
--	--	--

**Evaluation Research**

If an application includes an evaluation research component (or consists entirely of evaluation research), the application is expected to propose the most rigorous evaluation design appropriate for the research questions to be addressed. If the primary purpose of the evaluation is to determine the effectiveness or impact of an intervention (e.g., program, practice, or policy), the most rigorous evaluation designs may include random selection and assignment of participants (or other appropriate units of analysis) to experimental and control conditions. In cases where randomization is not feasible, applicants should propose a strong quasi-experimental design that can address the risk of selection bias.

Applications that include evaluation research should consider the feasibility of including cost/benefit analysis. In cases where evaluations find that interventions have produced the intended benefit, cost/benefit analysis provides valuable and practical information for practitioners and policymakers that aids decisionmaking.

Evaluation research projects may also address a wide range of research questions beyond those focused on the effectiveness or impact of an intervention. Different research designs may be more appropriate for different research questions and at different stages of program development. The intervention strategies, setting, other contextual factors, and resources should be taken into account when selecting an evaluation design. In all cases, applications are expected to propose the most rigorous evaluation design appropriate for the research questions to be addressed.

Applicants are encouraged to review evidence rating criteria at [https://www.crimesolutions.gov/about\\_starttofinish.aspx](https://www.crimesolutions.gov/about_starttofinish.aspx) for further information on high-quality evaluation design elements.

**B. Federal Award Information**

OJJDP expects to make two to four awards with an estimated total amount awarded of up to \$2,000,000. Individual awards are expected to range from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 for a total period of performance as long as 5 years. Individual awards would provide support for the entire project period.

To allow time for (among other things) any necessary post-award review and financial clearance by OJP of the proposed budget and for any associated responses or other action(s) that may be required of the recipient, applicants should propose an award start date of October 1, 2018.

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 to make any award under this solicitation 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.

**Note:** Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to comply with DOJ regulations on confidentiality and protection of human subjects. See “Requirements related to Research” under [“Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 Awards”](#) in the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

### **Financial Management and System of Internal Controls**

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities<sup>16</sup>) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements<sup>17</sup> 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.

---

<sup>16</sup> For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase “pass-through entity” includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward (“subgrant”) to carry out part of the funded award or program.

<sup>17</sup> 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.

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 at <https://ojpfgm.webfirst.com/>. (This training is required for all OJP recipients.)

Also, applicants should be aware that OJP collects information from applicants on their financial management and systems of internal controls (among other information) which is used to make award decisions. Under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#), applicants may access and review the OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (<https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/FinancialCapability.pdf>) that OJP requires **all** applicants (other than an individual applying in his/her personal capacity) to download, complete, and submit as part of the application.

## **Budget Information**

### What will not be funded:

- Applications primarily to purchase equipment, materials, or supplies. (A budget may include these items if they are necessary to conduct research, development, demonstration, evaluation, or analysis.)
- Applications that include funding for direct delivery of services.
- Applications that are not responsive to this solicitation focused on research and evaluation of FDCs.
- Funds may not be used to support biomedical or behavior control experimentation on individuals or any research involving such experimentation.

## **Cost Sharing or Match Requirement**

This solicitation does not require a match. However, if a successful application proposes a voluntary match amount, and OJP approves the budget, the total match amount incorporated into the approved budget becomes mandatory and subject to audit.

For additional cost sharing and match information, see the DOJ Grants Financial Guide at <https://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/index.htm>.

## **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 the recipient's approved budget and applicable cost principles. See the section on "Costs

Requiring Prior Approval” in the DOJ Grants Financial Guide at <https://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/index.htm> 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.<sup>18</sup> The 2018 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management website at <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/salary-tables/18Tables/exec/html/ES.aspx>. 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 OJJDP Administrator 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/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](http://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 and of 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.

---

<sup>18</sup> 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 2018 Awards](#)" in the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

## C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see the title page.

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 if it fails to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements, it may negatively affect the review of its 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, including the funding limit, or that OJP determines does not include the application elements that OJJDP has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. For this solicitation, OJJDP has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative, and résumés/curriculum vitae of key personnel. (For purposes of this solicitation, "key personnel" means the principal investigator and any and all coprincipal investigators.)

**NOTE:** OJP has combined the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative in a single document collectively referred to as the Budget Detail Worksheet. See "Budget Information and Associated Documentation" below for more information about the Budget Detail Worksheet and where it can be accessed.

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

Please review the "Note on File Names and File Types" under [How to Apply](#) to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

### 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 OJP's 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. On the SF-424, current OJP award recipients, when completing the field for "Legal Name" (box 8a), 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). Also, current recipients should enter the Employer Identification Number (EIN) in box 8b exactly as it appears on the prior year award document. An applicant with a current, active award(s) 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 its official legal name in box 8a, its address in box 8d, its EIN in box 8b, and its Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number in box 8c of the SF-424. A new applicant entity should attach official legal documents to its application (e.g., articles of incorporation, 501(c)(3) status documentation, organizational letterhead, etc.) to confirm the legal name, address, and EIN entered into the SF-424. OJP will use the System for Award Management (SAM) to confirm the legal name and DUNS number entered in the SF-424; therefore, an applicant should ensure that the information entered in the SF-424 matches its current registration in SAM. See the [How to Apply](#) section for more information on SAM and DUNS numbers.

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

## 2. Project Abstract

The project abstract is a very important part of the application, and serves as an introduction to the proposed project. OJJDP uses the project abstract for a number of purposes, including assignment of the application to an appropriate review panel. If the application is funded, the project abstract typically will become public information and be used to describe the project.

Applications should include a high-quality project abstract that summarizes the proposed project in 250–400 words. Project abstracts not submitted in the template below 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 describe—

- The purpose of the project, the problem to be investigated, and the anticipated relevance to FDC policy and practice.

- The proposed approach to conducting statistical analyses and disseminating findings to the public, and addressing each of the key activities identified in the “Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products” section on pages 7–9.
- The expected key deliverables identified in the “Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products” section on pages 7–9.
- Key partners involved in conducting the research and/or collaborating with jurisdiction(s)/service provider(s).

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

Project abstracts should follow the detailed template available at [ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf](http://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf). Formatting cannot be altered in this template; therefore, the above formatting requirements do not apply.

### 3. Program Narrative

The program narrative section of the application should not exceed 30 double-spaced pages in 12-point font with 1-inch margins. If included in the main body of the program narrative, tables, charts, figures, and other illustrations count toward the 30-page limit for the narrative section. The project abstract, table of contents, bibliographical references, résumés, appendices, and government forms do not count toward the 30-page 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 and research questions, (2) program design and implementation, (3) potential impact, and (4) capabilities/competencies. The applicant should clearly delineate the connections between and among each of these sections. For example, the project design section should clearly explain how the program’s structure and activities will respond to the problem statement identified in the previous section. The program narrative must be fully responsive to the program-specific information for this solicitation.

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

#### Program Narrative Guidelines:

##### **a. Title Page** (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit).

The title page should include the title of the project, submission date, funding opportunity number, and the name and complete contact information (that is, address, telephone number, and email address) for both the applicant and the principal investigator.

##### **b. Resubmit Response** (if applicable) (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit).

If an applicant is resubmitting an application presented previously to OJJDP, but not funded, the applicant should indicate this. A statement should be provided, no more than two pages, addressing (1) the title, submission date, and OJJDP-assigned application number of the previous application and (2) a brief summary of revisions to the application, including responses to previous feedback received from OJJDP.

**c. Table of Contents and Figures** (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit).

**d. Main Body.**

The main body of the program narrative should describe the proposed project in depth. The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative:

- **Statement of the Problem and Research Questions.** The statement of the problem should address the need for research/evaluation to advance policy, practice, and theory in the area of FDCs in keeping with the program-specific information noted on page 5. Applicants should discuss current gaps in data, research, and knowledge, such as those associated with FDC components/approaches/standards, service delivery for a diversity of populations and jurisdictions, policy and practice challenges, FDC outcomes, cost effectiveness, and emerging areas such as the opioid crisis. As part of this discussion, applicants should present a review of previous literature and discuss previous research related to these problems.

This section should also identify the proposed research questions and discuss the purpose, goals, and objectives of the proposed project.

- **Project Design and Implementation.** Applicants should provide a detailed description of the strategies to implement this research project and address the research questions. Design elements should follow directly from the research project's goals and objectives and address the program-specific information noted on page 5. Applicants should describe the research methodology in detail and demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the data they will collect. Applicants should consider the rigor and soundness of the methodology and analytical and technical approaches for the proposed research/evaluation and address the feasibility of the proposed project and potential challenges. Applicants should address any anticipated problems associated with carrying out the activities under this program and should propose potential solutions.

Applicants should address the major activities of their proposed research/evaluation and how they will implement them. Components should include the following, as applicable:

- Linkage, coordination, and collaboration with program partners and sites, including discussion of access to necessary data and subjects. Clear identification of how access would be secured, particularly if the research

design entails securing the approval of agency and tribal institutional review boards.

- Methodology that clearly identifies the hypotheses to be tested and how the methodology will maximize the applicant's ability to test the hypotheses, with use of an appropriately rigorous design.
- Recruitment and retention of research subjects, including justification of the adequacy of the sample size and anticipated challenges, such as attrition and nonrespondent bias, and how the applicant will address them.
- Description of quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis methods and the tools to be used, addressing the applicant's expertise in these techniques under "Capabilities/Competencies."
- Discussion of the design/use of culturally, developmentally, and gender-appropriate tools that are both reliable and valid measures of key variables.
- Discussion of how the applicant will provide research sites with the training and support to collect the data that the research/evaluation design requires.
- Other anticipated limitations and barriers in the research approach.
- Procedures for collecting, managing, storing, and transmitting data and identifying software and data verification procedures, and procedures to remove identifying information from data prior to submission to OJJDP for transfer to NACJD.
- **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" at [www.ojjdp.gov/grantees/timelines.html](http://www.ojjdp.gov/grantees/timelines.html)).

Applicants should submit the timeline as a separate attachment, as stipulated in "Appendices" on page 20.

- **Potential Impact.** Applicants should describe the potential impact of the research and how it may inform or improve FDC-related policy, practice, or theory in the United States. This includes a description of plans to disseminate to broader audiences as well as a description of:
  - How the proposed approach will assist OJJDP, courts, child welfare, and collaborating service providers in building evidence that has substantial implications for FDC policy and practice.

- How the proposed research would produce findings that are generalizable for additional jurisdictions/sites and, in the case of program evaluations, are suitable for possible replication or adaptation of program approaches found to be effective.
- How applicants will complete the deliverables stated in the Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products section on page 7, with specification of planned products. Applicants should delineate how findings would be effectively disseminated to the target audience, including who would be included in the target audience.

- **Capabilities/Competencies.** This section should describe the experience and capability of the applicant organization, key staff, and any proposed subgrantees (including consultants) that the applicant will use to implement and manage this effort and the federal funds under this award, highlighting any previous experience implementing projects of similar scope, design, and magnitude. Applicants should address:

- Experience and capacity to work with the proposed data sources in the conduct of similar research/evaluation efforts.
- Experience and capacity to design and implement rigorous research, conduct data analysis, and produce meaningful products with translation of research findings for policy and practice applications.
- Experience producing and disseminating meaningful deliverables.
- Experience and capacity to develop innovative strategies to enhance public accessibility and utility of complex data sets and related analyses.
- Expertise in the subject-matter areas related to FDCs, such as substance abuse and its treatment, child welfare, and dependency courts.

Applicants should describe the roles and responsibilities of project staff and clearly highlight their capabilities. Résumés/curriculum vitae are required (as an appendix) for all key personnel.

Applicants should explain the program's organizational structure and operations. Applicants should include a copy of an organizational chart (as an appendix) 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.

Applicants should also highlight their experience/capability/capacity to manage subawards (if applicable), 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 address whether an advisory board will be included in the development and review of the research methodology.

**e. Appendices** (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit) include:

- Bibliography/references.
- Any tools/instruments, questionnaires, tables/charts/graphs, or maps pertaining to the proposed project that are supplemental to such items included in the main body of the narrative.
- Curriculum vitae or résumé of the principal investigator and any and all coprincipal investigators. In addition, curriculum vitae, résumé, or biographical sketches of all other individuals (regardless of “investigator” status) who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposed project (including, for example, individuals such as statisticians used to conduct proposed data analysis).
- Organizational chart.
- To assist OJP in assessing actual or apparent conflicts of interest (including such conflicts on the part of prospective reviewers of the application), a complete list of the individuals named or otherwise identified anywhere in the application (including in the budget or in any other attachment) who will or may work (or advise or consult) on the proposed research, development, or evaluation project. This applies to all such individuals, including, for example, individuals who are or would be employees of the applicant or employees of any proposed subrecipient entity, any individuals who themselves may be a subrecipient, and individuals who may (or will) work without compensation (such as advisory board members). This appendix to the program narrative is to include, for each listed individual: name, title, employer, any other potentially pertinent organizational affiliation(s), and the individual's proposed roles and responsibilities in carrying out the proposed project. If the application identifies any specific entities or organizations (other than the applicant) that will or may work (or advise or consult) on the proposed project, without also naming any associated individuals, the name of each such organization also should be included on this list.
- If the application (including the budget) identifies any proposed noncompetitive agreements that are or may be considered procurement "contracts" (rather than subawards) for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements, the applicant also must list the entities with which the applicant proposes to contract. Applicants should provide this list as a separate sheet titled "Proposed noncompetitive procurement contracts."

For information on distinctions—for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements—between subawards and procurement contracts under awards, see “Budget and Associated Documentation,” below.

- Proposed project timeline for the entire project period and expected milestones.

- Applicants may, but are not required to, submit Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Privacy Certificate paperwork at the time of application. Applicants selected for an award will not be permitted to obligate, expend, or draw down funds for any research or statistical activity or project involving the collection, use, analysis, transfer, or disclosure of information identifiable to a private person until (1) the recipient has submitted full and complete documentation to demonstrate that it will conduct or perform research involving human subjects in accordance with an approved federalwide assurance issued by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; (2) the research has been determined, by an appropriate IRB, to be an exempt research activity, or has been reviewed and approved by an appropriate IRB in accordance with the requirements of 28 CFR Part 46; (3) the recipient has submitted a properly executed Privacy Certificate in accordance with the requirements of 28 CFR Part 22; and (4) an OJP Human Subjects Protection Officer has reviewed and approved the submitted materials. See <https://www.ojdp.gov/research/research-grantee.html>.
- A list of any previous and current OJJDP awards to the applicant and investigator(s), including the OJJDP-assigned award numbers and a brief description of any scholarly products that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the OJJDP award(s). (See “Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products” under “Program-Specific Information,” above, for a definition of “scholarly products.”)
- A list of other agencies, organizations, or funding sources to which this application has been submitted (if applicable).
- Data archiving plan. Applicants should anticipate that OJJDP will require (through special award conditions), that data sets resulting in whole or in part from projects funded under this solicitation be submitted for archiving with the NACJD (see <https://www.ojdp.gov/research/research-grantee.html>).

Applications should include as an appendix a brief plan—labeled “Data Archiving Plan”—to comply with data archiving requirements. The plan should provide brief details about proposed data management and archiving, including submission to OJJDP (through NACJD) of **all files and documentation** necessary to allow for future efforts by others to reproduce the project’s findings and/or to extend the scientific value of the data set through secondary analysis. Pertinent files and documentation include, among other things, qualitative and quantitative data produced, instrumentation and data collection forms, codebook(s), any specialized programming code necessary to reproduce all constructed measures and the original data analysis, description of necessary de-identification procedures, and (when required) a copy of the privacy certificate and informed consent protocols.

The plan should be one or two pages in length and include the level of effort associated with meeting archiving requirements.

Note that required data sets are to be submitted 30 days before the end of the period of performance.

- Letters of cooperation/support or administrative agreements from organizations collaborating in the project, such as law enforcement and correctional agencies (if applicable).

#### 4. Budget and Associated Documentation

The Budget Detail Worksheet and the Budget Narrative are now combined in a single document collectively referred to as the Budget Detail Worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet is a user-friendly, fillable, Microsoft Excel-based document designed to calculate totals. Additionally, the Excel workbook contains worksheets for multiple budget years that can be completed as necessary. **All applicants should use the Excel version when completing the proposed budget in an application, except in cases where the applicant does not have access to Microsoft Excel or experiences technical difficulties.** If an applicant does not have access to Microsoft Excel or experiences technical difficulties with the Excel version, then the applicant should use the 508-compliant accessible Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) version.

Both versions of the Budget Detail Worksheet can be accessed at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Forms/BudgetDetailWorksheet.htm>.

##### a. Budget Detail Worksheet

The Budget Detail Worksheet should provide the detailed computation for each budget line item, listing the total cost of each and showing how it was calculated by the applicant. For example, costs for personnel should show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time devoted to the project for each employee paid with grant funds. The Budget Detail Worksheet should present a complete itemization of all proposed costs.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the DOJ Grants Financial Guide at <https://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/index.htm>.

##### 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).

An applicant should demonstrate in its budget narrative how it 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.

For additional match information, see the [Cost Sharing or Match Requirement](#) section under [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

If a successful application proposes a voluntary match amount, and OJP approves the budget, the total match amount incorporated into the approved budget becomes mandatory and subject to audit.

**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 an action—for federal grants administrative purposes—is a subaward or procurement contract is a critical distinction as significantly different rules apply to subawards and procurement contracts. If a recipient enters into an agreement that is a subaward of an OJP award, specific rules apply—many of which are set by federal statutes and DOJ regulations; others by award conditions. These rules place particular responsibilities on an OJP recipient for any subawards the OJP recipient may make. The rules determine much of what the written subaward agreement itself must require or provide. The rules also determine much of what an OJP recipient must do both before and after it makes a subaward. If a recipient enters into an agreement that is a procurement contract under an OJP award, a substantially different set of federal rules applies.

OJP has developed the following guidance documents to help clarify the differences between subawards and procurement contracts under an OJP award and outline the compliance and reporting requirements for each. This information can be accessed online at <https://ojp.gov/training/training.htm>.

- [Subawards under OJP Awards and Procurement Contracts under Awards: A Toolkit for OJP Recipients.](#)
- [Checklist to Determine Subrecipient or Contractor Classification.](#)
- [Sole Source Justification Fact Sheet and Sole Source Review Checklist.](#)

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. The substance of the relationship should be given greater consideration than the form of agreement between the recipient and the outside entity.

## 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 Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, and Budget Narrative as approved by OJP. If, however, a particular subaward is not authorized by federal statute or regulation, and is not 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. All noncompetitive (sole source) procurement contracts must meet the OJP requirements outlined at <https://ojp.gov/training/subawards-procurement.htm>. 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.

If the applicant receives an award, sole source procurements that do not exceed the Simplified Acquisition Threshold (currently \$150,000) must have written justification for the noncompetitive procurement action maintained in the procurement file. If a procurement file does not have the documentation that meets the criteria outlined in 2 C.F.R. 200, the procurement expenditures may not be allowable. Sole source procurement over the \$150,000 Simplified Acquisition Threshold must have prior approval from OJP using a Sole Source GAN. Written documentation justifying the noncompetitive procurement must be submitted with the GAN and maintained in the procurement file.

#### **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 (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 (unexpired) federally approved indirect cost rate is to 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 Office of the Chief Financial Officer Customer Service Center at 800-458-0786 or at [ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov](mailto:ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov). If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, an applicant may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at <https://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 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) its 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.) For the "de minimis" rate requirements (including on eligibility to elect to use the rate), see the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, at 2 C.F.R. 200.414(f).

## **6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)**

A tribe, tribal organization, or third party that proposes to provide direct services or assistance to residents on tribal lands should include in its application a resolution, letter, affidavit, or other documentation, as appropriate, that demonstrates (as a legal matter) that the applicant has the requisite authorization from the tribe(s) to implement the proposed project on tribal lands. In those instances when an organization or consortium of tribes applies for an award on behalf of a tribe or multiple specific tribes, the application should include appropriate legal documentation, as described above, from all tribes that would receive services or assistance under the award. A consortium of tribes for which existing consortium bylaws allow action without support from all tribes in the consortium (i.e., without an authorizing resolution or comparable legal documentation from each tribal governing body) may submit, instead, a copy of its consortium bylaws with the application.

An applicant unable to submit an application that includes a fully-executed (i.e., signed) copy of legal appropriate documentation, as described above, consistent with the applicable tribe's governance structure, should, at a minimum, submit an unsigned, draft version of such legal documentation as part of its application (except for cases in which, with respect to a tribal consortium applicant, consortium bylaws allow action without the support of all consortium member tribes). If selected for funding, OJP will make use of and access to award funds contingent on receipt of the fully-executed legal documentation.

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

Every OJP applicant (other than an individual applying in his or her personal capacity) is required to download, complete, and submit the [OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire](https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/FinancialCapability.pdf) (Questionnaire) at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/FinancialCapability.pdf> as part of its application. The questionnaire helps OJP assess the financial management and internal control systems, and the associated potential risks of an applicant as part of the pre-award risk assessment process.

The questionnaire should only be completed by financial staff most familiar with the applicant's systems, policies, and procedures in order to ensure that the correct responses are recorded and submitted to OJP. The responses on the questionnaire directly impact the preaward risk assessment and should accurately reflect the applicant's financial management and internal controls system at the time of the application. The preaward risk assessment is only one of multiple factors and criteria used in determining funding. However, a preaward risk assessment that indicates that an applicant poses a higher risk to OJP may affect the funding decision and/or result in additional reporting requirements, monitoring, special conditions, withholding of award funds, or other additional award requirements.

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).

## 8. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

Each applicant must complete and submit this information. An applicant that expends any funds for lobbying activities is to provide all of the information requested on the form Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/Disclosure.pdf>. An applicant that does not expend any funds for lobbying activities is to enter “N/A” in the text boxes for item 10 (“a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant” and “b. Individuals Performing Services”).

## 9. Additional Attachments

### a. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications<sup>19</sup>

Each applicant is to 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 the identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted to OJP under this solicitation. The applicant is to disclose both 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 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 is to 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.

---

<sup>19</sup> Typically, the applicant is **not** the principal investigator. Rather, the applicant, most frequently, is the institution, organization, or company in which the principal investigator is employed.

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 and 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’s 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 is to 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 the identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted as part of this application.”

**b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity**

When 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 is to 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 is to 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 also is to 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 is to 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. Disclosure of Process Related to Executive Compensation**

An applicant that is a nonprofit organization may be required to make certain disclosures relating to the processes it uses to determine the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees.

Under certain circumstances, a nonprofit organization that provides unreasonably high compensation to certain persons may subject both the organization's managers and those who receive the compensation to additional federal taxes. A rebuttable presumption of the reasonableness of a nonprofit organization's compensation arrangements, however, may be available if the nonprofit organization satisfied certain rules set out in Internal Revenue Service (IRS) regulations with regard to its compensation decisions.

Each applicant nonprofit organization must state at the time of its application (question 9c in the "[OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire](#)" mentioned earlier) whether or not the applicant entity believes (or asserts) that it currently satisfies the requirements of 26 C.F.R. 53.4958-6 (which relate to establishing or invoking a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness of compensation of certain individuals and entities).

A nonprofit organization that states in the questionnaire that it believes (or asserts) that it has satisfied the requirements of 26 C.F.R. 53.4958-6 must then disclose, in an attachment to its application (to be titled "Disclosure of Process Related to Executive Compensation"), the process used by the applicant nonprofit organization to determine the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees (together, "covered persons").

At a minimum, the disclosure must describe in pertinent detail (1) the composition of the body that reviews and approves compensation arrangements for covered persons; (2) the methods and practices used by the applicant nonprofit organization to ensure that no individual with a conflict of interest participates as a member of the body that reviews and approves a compensation arrangement for a covered person; (3) the appropriate data as to comparability of compensation that is obtained in advance and relied upon by the body that reviews and approves compensation arrangements for covered persons; and (4) the written or electronic records that the

applicant organization maintains as concurrent documentation of the decisions with respect to compensation of covered persons made by the body that reviews and approves such compensation arrangements, including records of deliberations and of the basis for decisions.

For purposes of the required disclosure, the following terms and phrases have the meanings set out by the IRS for use in connection with 26 C.F.R. 53.4958-6: officers, directors, trustees, key employees, compensation, conflict of interest, appropriate data as to comparability, adequate documentation, and concurrent documentation.

Applicant nonprofit organizations should note that following receipt of an appropriate request, OJP may be authorized or required by law to make information submitted to satisfy this requirement available for public inspection. Also, a recipient may be required to make a prompt supplemental disclosure after the award in certain circumstances (e.g., changes in the way the organization determines compensation).

### **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 <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html>. 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.

**Important Grants.gov update.** Grants.gov has updated its application tool. The legacy PDF application package has been phased out and was retired on December 31, 2017. Grants.gov Workspace is now the standard application method for applying for grants. OJP applicants should familiarize themselves with the Workspace option now. For complete information and instructions on using Workspace (and other changes), go to the Workspace Overview page at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/workspace-overview.html>.

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, in order 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 at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/manage-subscriptions.html>. 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. Attachments are also labeled to describe the file being attached (e.g., Project Narrative, Budget Narrative, Other, etc.).

Applicants must ensure that all required documents are attached in the correct Grants.gov category and are labeled correctly. Do not embed “mandatory” attachments within another file.

**Note on File Names and File Types:** Grants.gov only permits the use of certain specific characters in 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 ( . )			

\*When using the ampersand (&) in XML, applicants must use the “&amp;” format.

**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:

### Unique Entity Identifier (DUNS Number) and System for Award Management

Every applicant entity must comply with all applicable SAM and unique entity identifier (currently, a DUNS number) requirements. SAM is the repository for certain standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit identification number provided by the commercial company Dun and Bradstreet. More detailed information about SAM and the DUNS number is in the numbered sections below.

If an applicant entity has not fully complied with the 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.

### Registration and Submission Steps

- 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.

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](http://www.dnb.com). A DUNS number is usually received within 1–2 business days.

- 2. Acquire or maintain registration with SAM.** Any applicant for an OJP award creating a new entity registration in SAM.gov must provide an original, signed notarized letter stating that the applicant is the authorized Entity Administrator before the registration will be activated. To learn more about this process change, read the FAQs at <https://www.gsa.gov/about-us/organization/federal-acquisition-service/office-of-systems-management/integrated-award-environment-iae/sam-update>. Information about the notarized letter is posted at [https://www.fsd.gov/fsd.gov/answer.do?sysparm\\_kbid=d2e67885db0d5f00b3257d321f96194b&sysparm\\_search=kb0013183](https://www.fsd.gov/fsd.gov/answer.do?sysparm_kbid=d2e67885db0d5f00b3257d321f96194b&sysparm_search=kb0013183).

All applicants for OJP awards (other than individuals) must maintain current registrations in the SAM database. Applicants will need the authorizing official of the organization and an EIN. 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 (2 more weeks to acquire an EIN).

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](http://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://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/organization-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 16.585, titled "Drug Court Discretionary Grant Program," and the funding opportunity number is OJJDP-2018-13550.
- 6. Access Funding Opportunity and Application Package from Grants.gov.** Select "Apply for Grants" under the "Applicants" column. Enter your email address to be notified of any changes to the opportunity package before the closing date. Click the Workspace icon to use Grants.gov Workspace.

7. **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 14, 2018.

Click <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/organization-registration.html> 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 its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/support.html> or the SAM Help Desk (Federal Service Desk) at <https://www.fsd.gov/fsd-gov/home.do> to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. The applicant must email the Response Center at [grants@ncjrs.gov](mailto:grants@ncjrs.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 Desks 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 at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.

## E. Application Review Information

### Review Criteria

Applications that meet basic minimum requirements will be evaluated by peer reviewers using the following review criteria. Each individual criterion is assigned a different weight based on the percentage value listed. For example, the first criterion, Statement of the Problem and Research Questions, is worth 20 percent of the score in the assessment of the application's technical merit.

**Statement of the Problem and Research Questions** (Understanding of the problem, research questions, and their importance) – 20%

1. Demonstrated understanding of the problem.
2. Demonstrated importance of research questions, goals, and objectives, including alignment with the aims of the solicitation.
3. Demonstrated awareness of the state of current research.

**Project Design and Implementation** (Quality and technical merit) – 40%

1. Soundness of methods and analytic and technical approach to addressing the stated aim(s) of the proposed project.
2. Feasibility of proposed project.
3. Awareness of potential pitfalls of proposed project design and feasibility of proposed actions to minimize and/or mitigate them.
4. Feasibility of completing the deliverables noted in the solicitation.

**Potential Impact** –15%

Potential for a significant scientific or technical advance(s) that will improve FDCs in the United States, such as:

- Potential for significantly improved understanding of the stated FDC research questions.
- Potential for innovative solution to address (all or a significant part of) the stated FDC problem.

**Capabilities/Competencies** (Capabilities, demonstrated productivity, and experience of the applicant organization and proposed project staff) – 25%

1. Qualifications and experience of proposed project staff (i.e., the principal investigator, any and all coprincipal investigators, and all other individuals (and organizations) identified in the application (regardless of “investigator” status) who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposed project).
2. Demonstrated ability of the applicant organization to implement the proposed strategies and manage the effort.
3. Relationship between the capabilities/competencies of the proposed project staff (including the applicant organization) and the scope and strategies of the proposed project.

## **Budget**

In addition, peer reviewers will consider and may comment on the following additional items in the context of scientific and technical merit.

1. Total cost of the project relative to the perceived benefit (cost effectiveness).
2. Appropriateness of the budget relative to the level of effort.
3. Use of existing resources to conserve costs.
4. Alignment of the proposed budget with proposed project activities.

## **Plan for Dissemination to Broader Audiences (if applicable to the proposed project)**

Peer reviewers may comment—in the context of scientific and technical merit—on the proposed plan (if any) to produce or to make available to broader interested audiences, such as criminal/juvenile justice practitioners or policymakers, summary information from the planned scholarly products of the project.

## **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.

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 OJJDP include geographic diversity, strategic priorities, and available funding, as well as the planned scholarly products and 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. In addition, 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 nonpublic segment of the integrity and performance system accessible through SAM (currently, the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System; "FAPPIIS").

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

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 applicant’s management systems, 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 scholarly products, and 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.

All final award decisions for research and statistics programs will be made by the OJJDP Administrator, 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, 2018. 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 and submission 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 and regulations (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 2018 Awards](#)," available in the OJP Funding Resource Center at <https://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>. 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. (An applicant is not required to submit these documents as part of an application.)

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

The webpages accessible through the "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2018 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 2018. Individual OJP awards typically also will include additional award conditions. Those additional conditions may relate to the particular statute, 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 and expected scholarly products 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, semi-annual progress reports, final financial and progress reports, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements or specific award conditions. Applicants should anticipate that progress reports will be required to follow the nonbudgetary components of the Research Performance Progress Report (RPPR) template/format. General information on RPPRs may be found at [www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/rppr/](http://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/rppr/). 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 webpage at <https://ojp.gov/funding/FAPIIS.htm>.

Data on performance measures. In addition to required reports, an award recipient under this solicitation 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 with 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 award recipient, post award, to provide performance data as part of regular progress reporting. Successful applicants will be required to access OJP's performance measurement page at [www.ojp.gov/performance](http://www.ojp.gov/performance) to view the specific reporting requirements for this grant program.

### **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](mailto:OJPSolicitationFeedback@usdoj.gov).

**IMPORTANT:** This email is for feedback and suggestions only. OJP does not send replies 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 solicitation 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@l-secb.com](mailto:ojppeerreview@l-secb.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.





