U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice

The U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice is seeking applications for funding social science research in forensic science. This program furthers the Department's mission by sponsoring research to provide objective, independent, evidence-based knowledge and tools to meet the challenges of crime and justice, particularly at the State and local levels.

Solicitation: Social Science Research in Forensic Science

Eligibility

(See "Eligibility," page 4)

Deadline

Registration with Grants.gov is required prior to application submission.
(See "Registration," page 3)

All applications are due **April 13, 2009, 11:59 p.m. eastern time.**

Contact Information

For assistance with the requirements of this solicitation, contact Katharine Browning, Senior Social Science Analyst, at 202–616–4786 or katharine.browning@usdoj.gov. For questions specific to the rape kit sections, please contact Catherine McNamee, Social Science Analyst, at 202–514–7936, or catherine.mcnamee@usdoj.gov; or Bethany Backes, Social Science Analyst, at 202–305–4419, or bethany.backes@usdoj.gov.

This application must be submitted through Grants.gov. For technical assistance with submitting the application, call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 1–800–518–4726 or send an e-mail to support@grants.gov.

Note: The Grants.gov Support Hotline hours of operation are Monday–Friday from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. eastern time.

Grants.gov Funding Opportunity No. NIJ–2009–2009

SL# 000865

CONTENTS

Overview 3

Deadline: Registration 3

Deadline: Application 3

Eligibility 4

Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations 4

American Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Tribes and/or Tribal Organizations 5

Specific Information 5

Performance Measures 9

How to Apply 10

What an Application Must Include 11

Selection Criteria 14

Review Process 15

Additional Requirements 16

Social Science Research in Forensic Science
CFDA No. 16.560

Overview

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) is the research, development, and evaluation agency of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and a component of the Office of Justice Programs (OJP). NIJ provides objective, independent, evidence-based knowledge and tools to enhance the administration of justice and public safety. NIJ solicits applications to inform its search for the knowledge and tools to guide policy and practice.

Forensic science, particularly in the area of DNA, has experienced numerous advances over the last decade. Improvements in science and technology have increased capabilities to use DNA in terms of the amount of evidence needed to obtain DNA, the speed of DNA processing, and the range of crimes DNA can help solve. NIJ is interested in stimulating research to examine the impact of these forensic advances on the criminal justice system as well as the impact of changes in policies to adapt to the more widespread use of DNA.

Deadline: Registration

Registering with Grants.gov is a one-time process; however, processing delays may occur and **it can take up to several weeks for first-time registrants to receive confirmations/user passwords.** OJP highly recommends that applicants start the registration process as early as possible to prevent delays in submitting an application package to our agency by the application deadline specified. The registration process for organizations involves these steps: (1) Obtain a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number; (2) Register your organization with the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) database; (3) Register with Grants.gov's Credential Provider and obtain a username and password; (4) Register with Grants.gov to establish yourself as an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR); and (5) The E-Business Point of Contact (POC) assigns the "Authorized Applicant Role" to you. For more information about the registration process, go to www.grants.gov. **Note: Your CCR must be renewed once a year. Failure to renew the CCR may prohibit submission of a grant application through Grants.gov.**

Deadline: Application

The due date for applying for funding under this announcement is **April 13, 2009, 11:59 p.m. eastern time.**

Within 24 to 48 hours after submitting your electronic application, you should receive an e-mail validation message from Grants.gov. The validation message will tell you whether the application has been received and validated or has been rejected, and why.

Important: You are urged to submit your application at least 72 hours prior to the due date of the application to allow time to receive the validation message and to correct any problems that may have caused the rejection notification.

If you experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond your control, you must contact OJP staff **within 24 hours after the due date** and request approval to submit your application. At that time, OJP staff will require you to e-mail the complete grant application along with your DUNS number and provide a Grants.gov Help Desk tracking number(s). After OJP reviews all of the information submitted and contacts Grants.gov to validate the technical issues reported by the applicant, OJP will contact you to either approve or deny the request.

To ensure a fair competition for limited discretionary funds, the following conditions are not valid reasons to permit late submissions: (1) failure to begin the registration process in sufficient time; (2) failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its website; (3) failure to follow all of the instructions in the OJP solicitation; and (4) technical issues experienced with the applicant's computer or information technology (IT) environment.

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov are posted on the OJP funding Web page, www.ojp.gov/funding/solicitations.htm.

Eligibility

In general, NIJ is authorized to make grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, States (including territories), local governments (including federally recognized Indian tribal governments that perform law enforcement functions), nonprofit and profit organizations (including tribal nonprofit and profit organizations), institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education), and certain qualified individuals. Foreign governments, foreign organizations, and foreign institutions of higher education are not eligible to apply.

Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations: Consistent with Executive Order 13279, dated December 12, 2002, and 28 C.F.R. Part 38, faith-based and other community organizations that statutorily qualify as eligible applicants under DOJ programs are invited and encouraged to apply for assistance awards to fund eligible grant activities. Faith-based and other community organizations will be considered for awards on the same basis as other eligible applicants and, if they receive assistance awards, will be treated on an equal basis with all other grantees in the administration of such awards. No eligible applicant or grantee will be discriminated for or against on the basis of its religious character or affiliation, religious name, or the religious composition of its board of directors or persons working in the organization.

Faith-based organizations receiving DOJ assistance awards retain their independence and do not lose or have to modify their religious identity (e.g., remove religious symbols) to receive assistance awards. DOJ grant funds, however, may not be used to fund any inherently religious activity, such as prayer or worship. Inherently religious activity is permissible, although it cannot occur during an activity funded with DOJ grant funds; rather, such religious activity must be separate in time or place from the DOJ-funded program. Further, participation in such activity by individuals receiving services must be

voluntary. Programs funded by DOJ are not permitted to discriminate in the provision of services on the basis of a beneficiary's religion.

If your organization is a faith-based organization that makes hiring decisions on the basis of religious belief, it may be entitled, under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb, to receive Federal funds and yet maintain that hiring practice, even if the law creating the funding program contains a general ban on religious discrimination in employment. For the circumstances under which this may occur, and the certifications that may be required, please see the section titled "Funding to Faith-Based Organizations" on the "Other Requirements for OJP Applications" Web page at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

Applicants are also encouraged to review the "Civil Rights Compliance" section of the "Other Requirements for OJP Applications" Web page, which also can be found at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

American Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Tribes and/or Tribal Organizations: If a grant application is being submitted on behalf of a tribe or tribal organization, a current authorizing resolution of the governing body of the tribal entity or other enactment of the tribal council or comparable government body authorizing the inclusion of the tribe or tribal organization named in the application must be included with the application.

Specific Information—Social Science Research in Forensic Science

Forensic science has experienced numerous advances over the last decade, particularly in the area of DNA. Improvements in science and technology have increased the capabilities of using DNA in terms of the amount of evidence needed to obtain DNA, the speed of DNA processing, and the range of crimes DNA can help solve. As the use of DNA evidence increases, backlogs in crime laboratories and property rooms may develop. Thus, there is a need for research examining the impact of these forensic DNA advances on the criminal justice system as well as the impact of changes in policies to adapt to the greater use of DNA.

NIJ has identified several specific areas of interest for this solicitation: (1) the rape kit backlog in the United States, (2) rape kit reporting practices, and (3) arrestees in DNA databases. Within each of these areas of interest, NIJ has proposed specific research questions, but applicants may propose other research questions that address the area of interest. Research proposed under this solicitation should have direct implications for policy and/or practice for DNA forensics in the criminal justice system, and these implications should be clearly stated in the application.

The Rape Kit Backlog in the United States

As sexual assault forensic evidence collection practices have advanced and been adopted by jurisdictions throughout the country, the "rape kit" has emerged as the field's primary forensic evidence collection tool in sexual assault cases. Jurisdictions "use these kits to collect such evidence as foreign materials on the body, hair, oral and anogenital swabs and smears, body swabs, and blood or saliva samples for DNA analysis and comparison from a victim's body after they report the assault." This

collected evidence is intended to assist in the investigation and prosecution of crimes of sexual violence, hold offenders accountable, and prevent additional victimizations.[1] In recent years, there have been concentrated efforts and new resources designed to reduce the Nation's backlog in untested rape kits (referred to herein as the "rape kit backlog"). Policymakers, the media, and criminal justice practitioner groups have expressed concern that in spite of these efforts and resources, the national rape kit backlog remains formidable, and, according to some, may have actually increased.

Accurate information about this backlog and the rape kits themselves is lacking. The law enforcement, forensic, policy, and victim advocacy communities currently do not fully understand the nature of this backlog. In particular, we do not currently know if the backlog primarily consists of cases whose outcomes would hinge on the presence of DNA or other forensic evidence. If not, the impact of this backlog on case processing and the provision of justice to victims would not be as significant. However, if the national backlog does consist of cases in which case processing and outcomes rely on DNA evidence, then policymakers and criminal justice professionals would be justified in devoting additional resources and expanding the national rape kit backlog reduction strategy beyond its current limits.

To expand our knowledge of the national rape kit backlog and inform policy in this arena, NIJ is calling for the submission of applications that focus on this understudied criminal justice area. Priority research areas include studies that:

- Explore the nature of the current rape kit backlog in the United States, including the types of sexual assault cases that populate this backlog (e.g., stranger vs. nonstranger), and determine whether the evidence contained in these kits would have value in the processing and adjudication of these cases if analyzed. Applicants are encouraged to develop projects that incorporate a multisite design.
- Examine the costs and benefits of applying forensic laboratory resources to reduce the rape kit backlogs in public crime laboratories and police agencies around the country and the effect of such investment on case outcomes.
- Explore the scientific and evidentiary value of specific items collected through rape kits as well as the best protocols and techniques to collect them from suspected victims and perpetrators of sexual violence.

Rape Kit Reporting Practices

Pursuant to the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 ("VAWA 2005"), 42 U.S.C. § 3796gg-4(d), States that receive money under the STOP Violence Against Women formula grant program may not require a victim of sexual assault to participate in the criminal justice system or otherwise cooperate with law enforcement in order to receive a free or reimbursable forensic medical examination. To be eligible to receive STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grants, all States must comply with this new requirement by January 2009.

Prior to the recent reauthorization, some jurisdictions have been offering a "Jane Doe Kit," which provides the victim with anonymity. The new VAWA 2005 requirement

[1] National Protocol for Sexual Assault Medical Forensic Examinations: Adults/Adolescents, NCJ 206554. Kristin Littel; OVW, September 2004.

mandates that States provide a kit regardless of victim cooperation with the criminal justice system, but does not necessarily require anonymity in the reporting, storage, or retention practices. Jurisdictions that have been providing “Jane Doe Kits” claim that the anonymity encourages more victims to come forward and have forensic evidence collected and preserved and empowers victims to cooperate with the criminal justice system on their own volition. It is expected that the new VAWA 2005 requirement will have the same effect.

To assess the impact of anonymous reporting and the potential impacts the new VAWA 2005 requirement may have, NIJ is interested in studying current practices, policies, and outcomes in jurisdictions that have adopted anonymous reporting and those that are beginning to adopt the new VAWA 2005 requirement. NIJ anticipates that the research will provide useful information to jurisdictions that are implementing anonymous reporting, the VAWA 2005 requirement, or both. Priority research areas include studies that:

- Examine how jurisdictions that have allowed anonymous reporting handle evidence collection and retention, and determine the role that collection and retention play in case outcomes (i.e., Does the retention period for evidence allow adequate time for a victim to come forward? What are the effects of different evidence retention policies? What is the impact of this policy on already existing rape kit backlogs in crime laboratories and property rooms?).

- Analyze practices, victim reporting, and case outcomes among jurisdictions implementing the VAWA 2005 requirement, those that have been practicing rape kit anonymity, and those who have not implemented either intervention.

Arrestees in DNA databases

DNA evidence is a widely accepted investigative tool that is used to identify the perpetrators of violent crimes and, increasingly, property crimes. Much of the power of this tool is dependent upon having a large number of convicted offender DNA profiles in the CODIS (Combined DNA Index System) database. Every State currently requires that people convicted of certain felonies provide a sample of their blood or saliva so their DNA profiles can be put into a database of convicted felons. Most States collect DNA from all convicted felons. At least 11 States have gone beyond convicted offenders and have some process for collecting DNA from arrestees for certain types of offenses. Some States are just beginning to collect samples from arrestees, and some have policies that have been in operation for several years.

There are two main arguments made for adding arrestees DNA profiles to these databases. First, increasing the number of people included in the databases will lead to an increase in the number of “hits” to evidence from crime scenes, and thus an increase in the number of crimes solved. Second, collecting samples from people at the time of arrest, rather than conviction, will prevent crime as these samples are entered into the database and lead to an earlier identification. These gains obviously come with some costs, as States have to implement new procedures to obtain samples from arrestees and may run into new legal and logistical challenges not encountered with convicted offenders.

NIJ is interested in research that examines the impacts of adding arrestee profiles to State DNA databases, both in terms of the logistical issues encountered in the process and the types of offenders that have been added to the database as a result. Possible research questions include:

- Have States in which arrestee profiles have been added to the DNA database increased the number of DNA hits, suspects identified, and/or crimes solved?
- How do arrestees whose profiles are added to the database differ from the convicted offenders? Does collecting samples from people at the time of arrest actually prevent crime?
- What are the costs involved in adding arrestee profiles and how do these costs compare to the yield of increasing DNA hits? Is there a point of diminishing returns?
- What are the policy differences among States moving to inclusion of arrestees (i.e., right to refuse to provide a DNA sample, expungement, types of offenses included, etc.) and what are the outcomes of the various policies?

Evaluation Research: Within applications proposing evaluation research, funding priority will be given to experimental research designs that use random selection and assignment of participants to experimental and control conditions. When randomized designs are not feasible, priority will be given to quasi-experimental designs that include contemporary procedures like Propensity Score Matching and Regression Discontinuity Design to address selection bias in evaluating outcomes and impacts.

Evaluations that also include measurements of program fidelity and implementation as part of a thorough process assessment are desirable. Measurements of program fidelity should be included as part of an assessment of program processes and operations to ensure that policies, programs, and technologies are implemented as designed. As one aspect of a comprehensive evaluation, assessments of program processes should include objective measurements and qualitative observations of programs as they are actually implemented and services are delivered. These may include assessment of such aspects as adherence to program content and protocol, quantity and duration, quality of delivery, and participant responsiveness.

Proposed evaluation research designs with multiple units of analysis and multiple measurements will also be given priority. Design aspects that contribute to the validity of results are necessary to effectively address issues of generalizability and representativeness of findings.

Finally, applications that include additional costs/benefits analysis will be given priority. Costs/benefits analysis is viewed by NIJ as an effective way to communicate and disseminate findings from evaluation research.

Please note: All applicants under this solicitation must comply with Department of Justice regulations on confidentiality and human subjects protection. See “Other Requirements for OJP Applications” at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

What will *not* be funded:

1. Provision of training or direct service.
2. Proposals primarily to purchase equipment, materials, or supplies. (Your budget may include these items if they are necessary to conduct applied research, development, demonstration, evaluation, or analysis.)
3. Work that will be funded under another specific solicitation.

Cost of proposed work: NIJ anticipates that up to a total of up to $2,000,000 may become available for awards made through this solicitation. **All NIJ awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and to any modifications or additional requirements that may be imposed by law.** NIJ expects to make up to two to eight awards depending on funds available, the number of high-quality applications, and other pertinent factors. If you propose a project that exceeds the amount of money that may be available for this solicitation, we recommend that you divide the project into phases, stages, or tasks so that NIJ can consider making an award for a specific portion of the work. NIJ cannot guarantee that subsequent phases, stages, or tasks will be funded. Such additional funding depends on, among other things, NIJ resources, strategic priorities, and your satisfactory completion of each phase, stage, or task. Note: Deliverables (e.g., a final report) will be required at the end of each phase, stage, or task.

Applicants should be aware that the total period for an award, including one that receives additional funding, ordinarily will not exceed three years.

A grant made by NIJ under this solicitation may account for up to 100 percent of the total cost of the project. See "Cofunding," under "What an Application Must Include."

Limitation on use of award funds for employee compensation; waiver: No portion of any award of more than $250,000 made under this solicitation may be used to pay any portion of the total cash compensation (salary plus bonuses) of any employee of the award recipient whose total cash compensation 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. (The salary table for SES employees is available at http://www.opm.gov.)

This prohibition may be waived at the discretion of the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs. An applicant that wishes to request a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative for the application. The justification should include: the particular qualification and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of the service being provided, the individual's specific knowledge of the program or project undertaken with the grant funds and a statement explaining that the individual's salary is commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with her/his qualifications and expertise, and for the work that is to be done.

Performance Measures

To assist in fulfilling the Department's responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), P.L. 103–62, applicants who receive funding under this solicitation must provide data that measure the results of their work. Performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Performance Measures	Data Grantee Provides
Develop and analyze information and data having clear implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.	Relevance to the needs of the field as measured by whether the grantee's substantive scope did not deviate from the funded proposal or any subsequent agency modifications to the scope. Quality of the research as assessed by peer reviewers. Quality of management as measured by whether significant interim project milestones were achieved, final deadlines were met, and costs remained within approved limits. If applicable, number of NIJ final grant reports, NIJ research documents, and grantee research documents published.	A final report providing a comprehensive overview of the project and a detailed description of the project design, data, and methods; a full presentation of scientific findings; and a thorough discussion of the implications of the project findings for criminal justice practice and policy. Quarterly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports, and a final progress report. If applicable, each data set that was collected, acquired, or modified in conjunction with the project. If applicable, citation to report(s)/document(s).

How to Apply

DOJ participates in Grants.gov—a "one-stop storefront" that provides a unified process for all customers of Federal grants to find funding opportunities and apply for funding.

Grants.gov Instructions: Complete instructions can be found at www.grants.gov. If you experience difficulties at any point during this process, please call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at **1–800–518–4726**, Monday–Friday from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. eastern time.

Funding Opportunities With Multiple Purpose Areas: Some OJP solicitations posted to Grants.gov contain multiple purpose areas, denoted by the individual Competition ID. If you are applying to a solicitation with multiple Competition IDs, you must select the appropriate Competition ID for the intended purpose area of your application. The application will be peer reviewed according to the requirements of the purpose area under which it is submitted.

Note: OJP's Grants Management System (GMS) does not support Microsoft Vista or Microsoft 2007. Therefore, OJP will not review any application whose attachments are in Microsoft Vista or Microsoft 2007 format. GMS downloads applications from Grants.gov and is the system in which OJP reviews applications and manages awarded grants. Applications submitted via GMS must be in the following formats: Microsoft Word (*.doc), Word Perfect (*.wpd), Microsoft Excel (*.xls), PDF files (*.pdf), or Text Documents (*.txt). GMS is not yet compatible with Vista and cannot yet process Microsoft Word 2007 documents saved in the new default format with the extensions of ".docx." Please ensure the documents you are submitting in Grants.gov are saved using "Word 97–2003 Document (*.doc)" format. Additionally, 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."

CFDA Number: The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for this solicitation is 16.560, titled "National Institute of Justice Research, Evaluation, and Development Project Grants," and the Grants.gov funding opportunity number is **NIJ–2009–2009.**

A DUNS number is required: The Office of Management and Budget requires that all businesses and nonprofit applicants for Federal funds include a DUNS (Data Universal Numeric System) number in their application for a new award or renewal of an award. Applications without a DUNS number are incomplete. A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit sequence recognized as the universal standard for identifying and keeping track of entities receiving Federal funds. The identifier is used for tracking purposes and to validate address and point-of-contact information for Federal assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. The DUNS number will be used throughout the grant life cycle. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, simple, one-time activity. Obtain one by calling 1–866–705–5711 or by applying online at http://www.dnb.com/us. Individuals are exempt from this requirement.

Central Contractor Registration (CCR) is required: In addition to the DUNS number requirement, OJP requires that all applicants (other than individuals) for Federal financial assistance maintain current registrations in the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) database. The CCR database is the repository for standard information about Federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. Organizations that have previously submitted applications via Grants.gov are already registered with CCR, as it is a requirement for Grants.gov registration. Please note, however, that applicants must update or renew their CCR at least once per year to maintain an active status. Information about registration procedures can be accessed at www.ccr.gov.

What an Application Must Include

An application must include the following:

Standard Form 424

Program Narrative

The Program Narrative includes:

a. Abstract (not to exceed 600 words).

The abstract should state the problem under investigation (including goals and objectives of the proposed project) and the anticipated relevance of the project to criminal justice public policy, practice, or theory applicable to the United States. It should describe the proposed method and/or research design, including data to be used in addressing research questions, data collection procedures and instrumentation, access to data, and other methods or procedures of the proposed study. It should also describe procedures for data analysis and all expected products, including interim and final reports, instrumentation, devices, and data sets to be submitted in accordance with the Data Archiving Strategy (see

below). If applicable, it should describe the subjects who will be involved in the proposed project, including the number of participants; participants' age, gender, and race/ethnicity; and other pertinent characteristics, such as methods used to gain access to subjects.

b. Resubmit response (if applicable).

If you are resubmitting a proposal that was submitted, but not funded, under a previous solicitation, you must provide a response indicating that your proposal is a revision and that it was submitted before. You should prepare a two-page response to the earlier panel review that includes (1) the title, submission date, and NIJ-assigned application number of the previous proposal, and (2) a brief summary of responses to the review and/or revisions to the proposal. Insert the response after the abstract.

c. Table of contents.

d. Main body.

The main body of the Program Narrative should describe the project in depth and include the following sections:

- Purpose, goals, and objectives.
- Review of relevant literature.
- Research design and methods.
- Implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.
- Management plan and organization.
- Dissemination strategy.

e. Appendixes.

Appendixes are not counted against program narrative page limit and must include:

- Bibliography/References (if applicable).
- Data Archiving Strategy (see "Other Program Attachments" below).
- List of key personnel (required).
- Résumés of key personnel (required).
- List of previous and current NIJ awards (required).
- Letters of cooperation/support or administrative agreements from organizations collaborating in the project (if applicable).
- Chart for timeline, research calendar, or milestones (required).
- Other materials required by the solicitation.

Budget Detail Worksheet

The Budget Detail Worksheet should address the full scope, duration, and cost of the project. The Budget Detail Worksheet should include a breakdown of costs associated with each budget category, including itemizations and calculations where necessary.

The budget must be broken down on a year-by-year basis over the length of the project. That is, if the proposed project is 3 years, then there should be a separate budget for year one, year two, and year three.

Templates for filling out the Budget Detail Worksheet may be found online at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/forms/budget_detail.pdf, OJP Standard Forms & Instructions. If you have any questions, please contact the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's Customer Service Center at 1–800–458–0786.

Budget Narrative

The Budget Narrative is a plain language description of each of the proposed expenditures listed in the Budget Detail Worksheet. It should clearly explain the purpose and reason for all expenditures in the budget. There should be no ambiguities about any budget item. The narrative should also include details for calculated rates or other figures.

As with the Budget Detail Worksheet, the Budget Narrative must be broken down on a year-by-year basis.

Indirect Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Applicants that do not have a federally negotiated indirect cost rate and wish to establish one can submit a proposal to their "cognizant" Federal agency. Generally, the cognizant Federal agency is the agency that provides the preponderance of direct Federal funding. This can be determined by reviewing an organization's schedule of Federal financial assistance. If DOJ is your cognizant Federal agency, obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/financialguide/part3/part3chap17.htm.

Other Program Attachments

These include several forms, available on OJP's funding page at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/forms.htm.

Data Archiving Strategy: NIJ requires that each data set resulting from funded research be submitted as a grant product or deliverable for archiving with the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data. (Data sets are to be submitted 90 days before the end of the project period.) Applications for NIJ research grants must include a brief (one- or two-page) data archiving strategy. For purposes of research replication and extension, the inclusion of only the final data set often prevents other researchers from replicating or extending the study because there are no original data, intermediate data, or documentation detailing how the data changed throughout the project. This data archiving strategy therefore must briefly describe the—

- Anticipated manipulations of original, intermediate, and final data sets (as applicable).
- Methods of documentation of such manipulations.
- Preparation of original, intermediate, and final data sets for archive submission.

The data archiving strategy should be submitted as an appendix to the application and will NOT count toward the 30-page limit. Please label this appendix "Data Archiving Strategy."

Page limit: The program narrative section of your application must not exceed 30 double-spaced pages in 12-point font with 1-inch margins. Abstract, resubmit response, table of contents, charts, figures, appendixes, and government forms do not count toward the 30-page limit for the narrative section.

Cofunding: A grant made by NIJ under this solicitation may account for up to 100 percent of the total cost of the project. You must indicate whether you believe it is feasible for you to contribute cash, facilities, or services as non-Federal support for the

project. Your application should identify generally any such contributions that you expect to make and your proposed budget should indicate in detail which items, if any, will be supported with non-Federal contributions.

Selection Criteria

Successful applicants must demonstrate the following:

Statement of the Problem/Program Narrative (Understanding of the problem and its importance)—15%

1. Clarity of problem statement.
2. Awareness of relevant research.
3. Connection between proposed research and problem.

Project/Program Design and Implementation (Quality and technical merit)—30%

1. Awareness of the state of current research or technology.
2. Soundness of methodology and analytic and technical approach.
3. Feasibility of proposed project and awareness of pitfalls.
4. Innovation and creativity (when appropriate).

Capabilities/Competencies (Capabilities, demonstrated productivity, and experience of applicants)—20%

1. Qualifications and experience of proposed staff.
2. Demonstrated ability of proposed staff and organization to manage the effort.
3. Adequacy of the plan to manage the project, including how various tasks are subdivided and resources are used.
4. Successful past performance on NIJ grants and contracts (when applicable).

Budget—15%

1. Total cost of the project relative to the perceived benefit.
2. Appropriateness of the budget relative to the level of effort.
3. Use of existing resources to conserve costs.

Impact/Outcomes and Evaluation (Relevance to policy and practice)—15%

1. Potential for significant advances in scientific or technical understanding of the problem.
2. Potential for significant advances in the field.
3. Relevance for improving the policy and practice of criminal justice and related agencies and improving public safety, security, and quality of life.
4. Affordability and cost-effectiveness of proposed end products, when applicable (e.g., purchase price and maintenance costs for a new technology or cost of training to use the technology).
5. Perceived potential for commercialization and/or implementation of a new technology (when applicable).

Dissemination Strategy—5%

1. Well-defined plan for the grant recipient to disseminate results to appropriate audiences, including researchers, practitioners, and policymakers.
2. Suggestions for print and electronic products NIJ might develop for practitioners and policymakers.

Relevance of the project for policy and practice.

Higher quality applications clearly explain the practical implications of the project. They connect technical expertise with criminal justice policy and practice. To ensure that the project has strong relevance for policy and practice, some researchers and technologists collaborate with practitioners and policymakers. You may include letters showing support from practitioners, but they carry less weight than clear evidence that you understand why policymakers and practitioners would benefit from your work and how they would use it. While a partnership may affect State or local activities, it should also have broader implications for others across the country.

Review Process

OJP is committed to ensuring a standardized process for awarding grants. NIJ reviews the application to make sure that the information presented is reasonable, understandable, measurable, achievable, and consistent with program or legislative requirements as stated in the solicitation.

Peer reviewers will be reviewing the applications submitted under this solicitation as well. NIJ may use either internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination of both to review the applications under this solicitation. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the field of the subject matter of a given solicitation who is NOT a current U.S. Department of Justice employee. An internal reviewer is an expert in the field of the subject matter of a given solicitation who is a current U.S. Department of Justice employee. Applications will be screened initially to determine whether the applicant meets all eligibility requirements. Only applications submitted by eligible applicants that meet all other requirements (such as timeliness, proper format, and responsiveness to the scope of the solicitation) will be evaluated, scored, and rated by a peer review panel. Peer reviewers' ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only. In addition to peer review ratings, considerations may include, but are not limited to, underserved populations, strategic priorities, past performance, and available funding.

After the peer review is finalized, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO), in consultation with NIJ, conducts a financial review of all potential discretionary awards and cooperative agreements to evaluate the fiscal integrity and financial capability of applicants; examines proposed costs to determine if the budget and budget narrative accurately explain project costs; and determines whether costs are reasonable, necessary, and allowable under applicable Federal cost principles and agency regulations. OCFO also reviews the award document and verifies the OJP Vendor Number.

When awards will be made: All applicants, whether they are accepted or rejected, will be notified. The review and approval process takes about 6 months. You should not propose to begin work until at least 6 months after the application deadline on the cover

of this solicitation. Also, you should not expect to receive notification of a decision for at least 6 months after that date. Lists of awards are updated regularly on NIJ's Web site at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/funding/welcome.htm.

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, all final grant award decisions will be made by the Assistant Attorney General (AAG), who may also give consideration to factors including, but not limited to, underserved populations, strategic priorities, past performance, and available funding when making awards.

Additional Requirements

Successful applicants selected for award must agree to comply with additional applicable requirements prior to receiving grant funding. We strongly encourage you to review the list below pertaining to these additional requirements prior to submitting your application. Additional information for each can be found at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

- Civil Rights Compliance
- Funding to Faith-Based Organizations
- Confidentiality and Human Subjects Protection
- Anti-Lobbying Act
- Financial and Government Audit Requirements
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
- DOJ Information Technology Standards
- Single Point of Contact Review
- Nonsupplanting of State or Local Funds
- Criminal Penalty for False Statements
- Compliance with Office of Justice Programs Financial Guide http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/financialguide/
- Suspension or Termination of Funding
- Nonprofit Organizations
- For-Profit Organizations
- Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)

- Rights in Intellectual Property

- Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA)

If your proposal is funded, you will be required to submit several reports and other materials, including:

Final substantive report: The final report should be a comprehensive overview of the project and should include, among other things, a detailed description of the project design, data, and methods; a full presentation of scientific findings; and a thorough discussion of the implications of the project findings for criminal justice practice and policy in the United States. It must contain an abstract of no more than 600 words and an executive summary of 2,500 to 4,000 words.

A draft of the final report, abstract, and executive summary must be submitted 90 days before the end date of the grant. The draft final report will be peer reviewed upon submission. The reviews will be forwarded to the principal investigator with suggestions for revisions. The author must then submit the revised final report, abstract, and executive summary by the end date of the grant. The abstract, executive summary, and final report must be submitted in both paper and electronic formats.

For program evaluation studies, the final report should include a section on measuring program performance. This section should outline the measures used to evaluate program effectiveness, modifications made to those measures as a result of the evaluation, and recommendations regarding these and other potential performance measures for similar programs. (This information will be particularly valuable to NIJ and other Federal program agencies in implementing performance measures for federally funded criminal justice programs.)

Interim reports: Grantees must submit quarterly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports, a final progress report, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with Office of Management and Budget Circular A–133. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent.

Data sets: NIJ requires submission of all data sets (original, intermediate, and final) produced or collected for the project, and any artifact associated with the project data. Included with the final sets of data should be the plan outlined in the Data Archiving Strategy section of the proposal.