

**Moderator: Richard Lucey**  
**April 9, 2008**  
**1:30 PM ET**

Operator: Good day, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome to your OSDFS Models Program. At this time all participants are in a listen-only mode. Later, there will be a question and answer session, which instructions will be given at that time. If anyone should require assistance, you can press star, then zero, and an operator will assist you. And as a reminder, this conference call is being recorded.

And now, it's my pleasure to announce your host, Richard Lucey.

Richard Lucey: Thank you, John.

Good afternoon, folks. This is Rich Lucey with the Department of Education's Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, and welcome to our national technical assistance conference call for this year's campus-based models program grant competition.

Before I get started with all of the specifics regarding this year's grant program, let me quickly review the agenda that I have put together for this afternoon's call. Briefly, we'll talk about the goal of the grant competition. And then, I will review for you the organization of the application package that we released this past Friday. I will talk briefly about the two different project periods that we will have in play for this year's awardees. And then, I'll move into a discussion of the four elements of the absolute priority, the three different recognition types, the requirements of this year's competition, the three selection criteria, and then I'll finish up the call with some grant proposal organization tips and a brief overview of the peer review process.

My intention during the call is to allow you to ask questions as you have them. And I will certainly be able to notify the operator when the appropriate time is for that to happen. My intent is to discuss each of these blocks of information and then open it up for questions. So, I would suggest that, as thoughts come to you or questions arise in your mind, to briefly jot them down on a piece of paper so you don't forget them. And then we'll take your questions and I'll answer them as we go along.

I do expect to take the full two hours for this call, covering all of the items that I just mentioned on the agenda.

To start off with the goals of the grant competition this year, it is a significant change from the way in which we have conducted this grant program in the past. As many of you may know, we've conducted this competition since 1999 as a result of direct

appropriation from Congress. And as a result of our experiences over the last couple of years, we have moved to a three-tiered level of recognition program that I think also will allow schools to be recognized by the Department of Education for their different programs.

And for that reason, the goals of this grant competition this year are for the Department of Education to identify and disseminate information about exemplary and effective alcohol or other drug abuse prevention programs that are being implemented on college campuses. And through this grant competition starting this year we also will recognize colleges and universities whose programs, while not yet exemplary or effective, show evidence that they are promising.

The application package for this year's competition became available this past Friday, on April 4th. The application transmittal deadline for the competition is May 19th of 2008. And later on during the grant proposal organization tips part of this presentation I will discuss the different intricacies that are resulting from how you submit your application. Because we do allow not only the electronic submission of an application, but also submission in paper format, by mail or by hand.

We are estimating to make five new awards this year. And that does not necessarily mean five exemplary, five effective or five promising programs. It indeed can be any mix of those three levels of recognition. I also will state that that number is simply an estimate and we are not bound by that number. But based on the amount of money that we have appropriated to us by Congress, it is our estimate that five new awards will be made this year.

If you've had an opportunity to print off a complete copy of the application package, I will point out that there are four major sections of the application package. Section one deals with the application submission procedures and the instructions by which you follow, depending on the method for which you will submit your application.

Section two is the program background information. And it is here that we give you some background information, specifically on preventing alcohol and other drug abuse among college students. We talk about the funding priority, as well as the four elements that must be met by an applicant in order to meet that priority, which we'll discuss in just a bit. We also talk about the three selection criteria in this section, as well as provide you with some answers to some frequently asked questions.

In section three of the application package are the legal and regulatory documents that drive this particular grant program. This is a copy of the Notice of Proposed Priority, which was first published in the Federal Register on December 26th of 2007. And then we have the Notice of Final Priority, which was published in the Register on April 1st, as well as the Notice Inviting Applications.

And then, finally, in section four you will see the general application instructions and information. And this is the guidance that we provide for you on how to prepare for putting your application together, how to organize it, as well as the instructions for all of the standard federal forms that you must submit with your proposal. And lastly, a checklist for preparing for submitting your application.

We do intend to make these awards by August 1st of 2008. There are two different project periods that will be in play, mainly because of the fact that we have established three different levels of recognition. So, for a school that we recognize as having an

exemplary or an effective program, they will be awarded an 18-month grant that will start August 1st of 2008 and go through January 31st of 2010. And for a school that we recognize as having a promising program, it will be awarded a 12-month grant which will begin August 1st of 2008 through July 31st of 2009. And later on in the presentation I will explain the difference in that 6-month period between the 18 months and 12 months, depending on the level of recognition that you might be recognized for.

Before I get into the four elements of the absolute priority, let me indicate that I do serve as the competition manager for this grant program. And all administrative questions, any questions that you have or clarification that you may need about the grant program, the priority, the selection criteria or the process should be directed to me, either by email -- and my email address is located in several places in the application package, but I will give it to you now so that you have it. My email address is Richard.Lucey@ed.gov. Or, you can reach me by telephone, and that number is 202-205-5471.

I do not dissuade people from contacting me by telephone but, typically, email is the best route to take mainly because it's sometimes easier to just simply jot a note or an answer back to someone by email, but also to protect not only myself and the answers I give you, but you as the potential applicant, it is best to have my responses to you in writing.

So, we'll now move on to the four elements of the absolute priority. And I will be quite direct in how I present this information because I know it takes a lot of time and effort to put a proposal together. And it truly would be a shame to have your application screened out and not even read by the peer reviewers simply because you did not address all four mandatory elements of the priority in your application. So, I'm going to cover all four of those elements right now and, after I discuss the four, I'll open it up for any questions that you might have on information presented to this point.

So, as I indicated earlier, we released or published a Notice of Final Priority in the Federal Register on April 1st. And essentially, that means that we've issued an absolute priority, which means that potential applicants may not deviate from the priority that we have established for this program. And as such, to meet the priority in its application, an applicant must do four things. Your failure to address any or all four of these items will cause your application to be screened out and, therefore, it will not be assigned to a peer review panel and considered for funding.

The first element of the priority is that the applicant must describe the program that has, for at least two full years, been implemented on its campus. And as part of the description of that program you must discuss the structure and the content of the program, the specific student population that is targeted by the program, as well as any unique features of the program.

Since the deadline for this application is May 19th, you basically should be looking at the latter part of April or the early part of May of 2006 as the time for, after that date, would not be eligible. So, anything that was created prior to the end of April or the early part of May, 2006, up until this point, would be considered at least two full years. And it does not necessarily matter if it's based on a quarter system or a semester system. But, the important thing is for you to clearly indicate in your application the start date of the program that you are proposing to the Department of Education as an exemplary, effective or promising program so that we can clearly see that this program has been in place on your campus for at least two full years.

The second element within the absolute priority is you must provide the detailed theoretical basis for the program's effectiveness. Not only that it works, but why it works. And a lot of this information will naturally flow from your responses to the three selection criteria that I'll discuss a little bit later on. But, we do want to see in your application that basis or that theory for why this particular strategy or program that you're submitting to us works.

The third element of the absolute priority is crucial to getting your application screened, and that is for you to provide the specific data that demonstrates the program's impact on the specific targeted student population you identified. And that includes any evidence of cognitive or behavioral changes, or both, among the target population. It is not enough simply to say that evidence of the effectiveness of your program was a decrease, for example, in high-risk drinking. What we would want to see is for you to specifically identify the percentage decrease, or the point decrease that you've actually seen among your student population targeted by the program. So, just as I'll discuss later in the proposal tips, be very clear and be very specific in providing the data that demonstrates the program's impact.

The fourth and final element of the absolute priority -- and this is new this year, even though the element itself is not new -- is for you to consent to a site visit to clarify information in the application and to verify evaluation data.

The site visit is a unique aspect of the peer review process for this particular grant program, and I'll talk about it a bit later. And the site visit is not something that occurs for every single applicant. We've indicated that in the Frequently Asked Questions, that not all applicants receive a site visit as part of the peer review process. But, the purpose of that site visit is simply to provide another source of information about each project to the Department of Education. And when the site visitors go out to your campus, they are going to be there for two main purposes. One is to clarify information that may have come up during the first stage peer review process, and to verify information that you've included in your application package. So, it's a clarify and verify process.

I also have indicated in the Frequently Asked Questions section of the application package, since this is a new element for this year's grant program, is where do you actually put that consent. And we've indicated that applicants have the discretion as to where they clearly consent to the site visit in their application. But, we do recommend that you clearly consent to it, not only in the abstract section of your proposal, but also in your narrative response to Sub-Element A under Project Evaluation.

When we go through the screening process, we are not necessarily reading your application word for word -- I'll discuss this later in the peer review process piece. But what I want to be able to see as a screener of the application is quickly locate where you've consented to that site visit. So I, if in your shoes, would basically put that right up front in the abstract, and then I would also put it in the project evaluation section since that is the area where you talk about the evidence of the effectiveness of your program.

So, those are the four elements of the Absolute Priority. As I indicated, all four of those elements are a requirement under the priority. And a failure to include and address any or all of them in your application will cause you to be screened out and your application will be deemed ineligible.

So, at this time I will ask the operator to open this up for questions and we will take it from there.

Operator: Ladies and gentlemen, at this time, if you do have a question or comment, you can press the digit one on your touchtone telephone. If your question has been answered and you wish to remove yourself from the queue, please press the pound key. Once again, if you do have a question or comment, please press the one key at this time.

I do show a couple questions coming in.

Richard Lucey: Okay.

Operator: Our first question is coming from Caller 1 from Finger Lakes Community College.

Caller 1: Hi, Rich. I'm calling for two reasons. One, for budgetary purposes, are stipends allowable for faculty to tailor, for instance, the Most Valuable Players' curriculum to meet the needs of a community college?

Richard Lucey: Generally, to answer your question around the allowability of stipends as a budget item, they are allowed. We have in the past allowed grantees to budget for stipends to faculty members, for example if they were going to take part in a curriculum infusion component of a project, or if they were going to help mentor students that's typically outside of their normal faculty hours or such like that. So I would say, based on just the general nature of your question in a universal way that such a stipend would be acceptable.

Caller 1: And the second question is, in reading the application, what is a "state point of contact?"

Richard Lucey: Okay. The state point of contact. Not all states participate in this particular process. But, if you've printed out a copy of the application package itself, it is going to be one of the last few pages. It might actually be the third or fourth page from the end of the package. It's included in Section Four, where we talk about the intergovernmental review of federal programs.

And basically, this executive order allows a state to review and provide comment on an application that you are planning to submit. We have provided for you in that brief section about intergovernmental review a website link that you can click on to view a list of the states that participate in the intergovernmental review process. As I mentioned, not all states do. So, if you do not see your state listed once you've clicked on that link, then basically you can indicate on your application cover page, which is the 424. I believe that it is question 19 on the coverage page. It asks if the application was subject to review by the state under the Executive Order 12372 process.

You never check block C. So for all of you that are listening, this is a tip for all of you. The whole grant program is subject to review. So, that is why you do not want to indicate C. You simply can check block or item B if your state is not listed because, as I've said, not all states participate. And if your state is listed, then that means you are required to notify your state that you are planning to submit a proposal for this grant program and ask them what the process is by which they want to review your application.

Many states, even though they participate in the process, will not review your application and that's fine. But with your application that you submit to us, you are required to include a copy of the letter or email message, whatever other written notification or documentation that you have, that you sent to the state single point of contact to notify them that you were planning to submit a proposal under this grant program.

Caller 1: Thank you.

Operator: Okay, thank you. Our next question is coming from Caller 2 from California State University.

Caller 2: Hi, Rich.

Richard Lucey: Hi, Caller 2.

Caller 2: I had a question about the site visit parts again. I just didn't hear the whole thing.

Richard Lucey: Okay.

Caller 2: You want us to address the site visit, allow that, in the abstract and in the review section?

Richard Lucey: Right. You have the discretion to place the consent wherever you want. But as part of the Priority, the fourth element is a proactive consent on the part of the applicant to a site visit, if chosen, to clarify information that's in your application and to verify your evaluation data.

Caller 2: Okay.

Richard Lucey: We have said that the easiest place for us to locate that is for you to simply state it right up front in the abstract. And how you state it is up to you, but you can just -- it could really be as simple as, "Our university consents to a site visit to clarify information in our application and verify evaluation data." It really can be that simple.

Caller 2: Okay. That's what I thought.

Richard Lucey: Yeah.

Caller 2: Okay. Just basically addressing it and allowing it.

Richard Lucey: Just basically -- and I would suggest in the abstract and then, just to be safe, put it in the project evaluation section as well.

Caller 2: Okay. Thank you, Rich.

Richard Lucey: You're welcome.

Operator: Thank you. Our next question is coming from Caller 3 from University of Houston.

Caller 3: Hi, Rich. I have a question about the site visit, too.

Richard Lucey: Okay.

Caller 3: Just wondering, during that visit will they want to meet with key stakeholders on campus? And how many -- will it be a couple days' site visit, or--?

Richard Lucey: Glad you asked the question. Actually, it's a one-day visit. And what we do is send out a team of two non-federal reviewers. These are folks who likely -- in all likelihood did not read your application as part of the first stage review. So, this is another fresh set of eyes, if you will.

Caller 3: Okay.

Richard Lucey: And we send them out. They basically will set up the specific day, as well as the agenda with the campus. Once we've indicated to the team that we're sending you to XYZ University. And every site visit team does it differently, even though we train them with a specific protocol and what to look for. I have had campus teams or site visit teams go out and actually meet with the campus president, if that's allowed -- if the schedule allows, the VP for Student Affairs, students, of course the proposed project director, coalition members.

So, certainly the -- some of the proposed or potential key stakeholders that you've identified could be part of an agenda that is established between the site visit team and the campus. But, it is a one-day visit. It typically takes place starting in the morning, 8:30 or 9:00, will go till the mid -- till a later part of the afternoon. And that basically will cover the information that they need to report back to the Department of Education.

Caller 3: Great. Thanks a lot.

Richard Lucey: Sure.

Operator: Thank you, ma'am. Once again, ladies and gentlemen, if you do have a question or comment, please press the one key at this time. And I'm showing no further questions.

Richard Lucey: Okay. So, I will move on to the next part of our agenda, which is to talk about the recognition types that we've established for the grant program. As I indicated at the top of the call, this is a significant change from the way in which we've conducted the competition in the past. In the past, we simply identified a campus as having a model program. But our experience over the last couple of years is -- has caused us to take a step back and look at some varying tiers of recognition that we could establish for the campuses that submit a proposal and that are ultimately recommended for such by the site visit team.

So, we have established three tiers of recognition or three levels of recognition if you will, for this year's grant program. Level one is an exemplary program, level two is an effective program, and level three is a promising program. Now, I'm going to go over each of the three definitions in just a moment and try to point out the distinct characteristics, if you will, between each of the three.

But before I do that, let me indicate that it was not our intent, nor should it be your intent as you're putting a proposal together, to try and match up the three levels of recognition that we've identified with the tiers of effectiveness that have been identified by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. Many of you are likely familiar with those four tiers of effectiveness that were first identified in the NIAAA's report back in 2002. There is no direct correlation between, for example, level one, an exemplary program, and NIAAA's tier one, an effective program or strategy among college students. So, I do want to just put that out there, that these are distinct categories. They are not intended to be related, nor should you necessarily make a direct correlation to them in your application.

So with that, let me briefly go over the proposed, or rather the final definitions for you that are established for exemplary, effective and promising programs.

When we first established the program for this year, we did consciously set a rather high bar or high standard, if you will, for an exemplary program. And as such, an exemplary program in terms of its outcomes would see only one of two particular outcomes. One would be the actual reduction in alcohol or other drug use among college students. So, you're talking about prevalence rates here specifically. The other outcome that we would allow in terms of an exemplary program would be reducing the problems, or what many would commonly refer to as the negative consequences, that result from alcohol or other drug use among college students.

In the definitions, which are now firmly set in stone, you will see in all three of the definitions that we have talked about a strong theoretical basis. Well, that directly ties back to the -- one of the four sub-elements that I talked about earlier within the priority, where you had to provide the detailed theoretical basis for the program's effectiveness. So, there you will see the link between the definitions, as well as the absolute priority and, ultimately, in your response to the selection criteria.

So again, for an exemplary program, we're looking for one of only two outcomes - a reduction in use of alcohol or other drug use among college students, or a reduction in problems resulting from such use among college students, using a research design of the highest quality.

And we have gone on to say, in that definition for exemplary program, that a research design of the highest quality means an experimental design in which we know, and for that particular research method, it means students are randomly assigned to participate in the project being evaluated -- that would be your treatment group -- or to not participate in the project, and that would be your control group.

However, when we first put this together we knew that we were setting up a bit of an ethical issue by forcing experimental designs if a campus was using a strategy or a program, if you will, that has already gone through a high level research design as evidenced in the literature or in the research field. And so, as such, you will see in the extension of the definition for exemplary program we have indicated that a quasi-experimental evaluation of the program's implementation on your campus, that may be an acceptable research design if a strong, experimentally determined evidence of the program's effectiveness already exists.

Simply as an example, I will bring up the strategy of brief motivational interviews, which I know also is indicated in tier one of the NIAAA report. There is enough evidence in the literature to suggest, or to document, that brief motivational interviews are an effective strategy in reducing alcohol abuse among college students.

Since that well researched and well defined information is already documented, a school does not necessarily need to do an experimental design on their campus of brief motivational interviews. That is why we've allowed for a quasi-experimental evaluation of brief motivational interviews if that's the research design that you've used to show evidence of that particular strategy on your campus.

So again, just to briefly review what are the two outcomes of an exemplary program, it would be a reduction in use among students, or a reduction in problems associated with such use among college students, using a research design of the highest quality.

Moving on to effective program, you will see the distinction between it and exemplary is in the outcomes. Again, we talk about a strong theoretical base. We talk about the



programming -- program having been evaluated using either an experimental or a quasi-experimental research design. So, you'll see just in that there is not much difference -- no difference really at all -- between exemplary and effective. But for an effective program, we have opened up the options for you in terms of outcomes.

We still are looking at reduction in alcohol or other drug abuse or use among college students, the reduction of problems resulting from such use. But we've now opened it up to include the reduction of risk factors, or the enhancement of protective factors, or any combination of those. That is the primary difference between an exemplary program and an effective program is in the outcomes.

For an exemplary program, if what you're going to show as the evidence of your effectiveness is a program that used a quasi-experimental design that didn't result in a reduction in use, and did not result in a reduction in negative consequences from such use, but did reduce risk factors and did enhance protective factors, that would automatically bump you out of exemplary, but it would allow you to be considered for effective. Because, again, that's the primary difference between the two categories is in the outcomes.

Moving on to promising, there is a similar distinction and it primarily comes down to the research designs. If you've seen and had a chance to read through the application package and the various definitions that we've established for exemplary, effective and promising, you will see that for the outcomes for promising programs, they are the same as potential outcomes for effective programs -- reduction in use, reduction in consequences, reduction in risk factors, enhancement of protective factors, or any combination of those impacts.

The difference between a promising program and an effective program will be in the research design. And in this particular case, what we have established for a promising program, we have indicated that there is still a strong theoretical base and you have evidence, using limited research methods, that the program has these outcomes. We've gone on to identify what limited research methods are. And the lowest common denominator or the -- I should say the lowest, or at the least, type research design we would want to see is a pre- and post-test, or pre- and post-treatment measurement of the program, either on a single subject or group of subjects.

So again, the difference primarily between a promising program and an effective program is in the research design. And if you've proposed a program that has seen some outcomes in terms of reductions in use, reductions in consequences, but the only research design that you've used and are able to show is a simple pre/post test, that is what will put you into consideration for a promising program as opposed to an effective program.

The other things that I want to mention before I open it up for questions, because I know that's a lot to digest in terms of the definitions, is some guidance for you as you're putting your proposals together.

First of all, as an applicant, what you should not do is identify the level for which you want recognition. We have indicated that very thing in the Frequently Asked Questions section of the application package. Your job as a potential applicant is to provide a comprehensive response to all three selection criteria and their sub-elements.

We select an institution of higher ed for recognition as exemplary, effective or promising based on the recommendation from the two individuals who conduct the site visit. But

we also want to go on to say that, just because you receive a site visit, that does not ensure recognition as an exemplary, effective or promising program by the Department of Ed. It is very possible that the team of two site visitors may come back and indicate that we do not recommend this particular campus for being recognized at any of these three levels, in which case we would not make the award, nor designate you for a certain recognition level.

So, it is not up to you to specifically say in your application, "We are applying for promising program status," or, "Our program should be considered in the exemplary level of recognition." Simply provide a comprehensive response to all three selection criteria, as well as their respective sub-elements and let the designation naturally fall out from not only the first stage review with the panel of three peer reviewers, but more importantly with the duo of site visitors that may come to your campus.

So, the last bit of guidance we give to folks on this particular piece is that you really should focus on the exemplary and the effective parts of these two levels of recognition. The only deviation I would say to that is, going back to the limited research design, is again, if the only research design or evaluation design that you have had in play for your program is simple pre and post-tests, that will automatically bump you down to promising status without the ability to bump up, just simply because of the definition which indicates that you have evidence of effectiveness but it's using limited research designs.

So again, don't identify the level for which you want recognition. Let that fall out naturally during the peer review process. And primarily for you, focus on providing a comprehensive response to all three selection criteria.

So, at this time I will stop and take any questions that you may have.

Operator: Okay. Once again, if you do have a question or comment, please press the one key at this time. Okay. I'm showing one question at the moment coming from Caller 4 from University of Pennsylvania.

Caller 4: Hi. This is actually Caller 4. We're in the room together here. I had two questions, a bit basic, but I just wanted to be clear. When we're talking about the exemplary program, you were saying that the reductions need to be illustrated among college students. That would be prevalence data. Would you be speaking to the entire population on our campus, or just the target group that our program was targeted towards?

Richard Lucey: The evidence of effectiveness is speaking directly to the population of students that's targeted by the program.

Caller 4: Okay. So, the target population.

Richard Lucey: Um-hum

Caller 4: Great. And also -- and again, this is pretty basic, but just to be 100 percent clear--.

Richard Lucey: --That's okay--.

Caller 4: --If the reductions that we're showing, a reduction in alcohol and other drug use, a reduction in negative consequences, also reductions in risky behaviors and increases in

productive factors, that would still qualify for exemplary if the other criteria were also met.

Richard Lucey:

Right.

Caller 4:

Okay.

Richard Lucey:

Yeah. The thing is, you would have to have at least the reductions in use or the reduction in negative consequences to be eligible for exemplary status. If the risk or protective factors come into play and that -- and you don't have the other two and you just have reduction in risk factors or an enhancement of protective factors, that bumps you out of exemplary and puts you on the path potentially for being recognized as an effective program.

Caller 4:

Fantastic. And the third and final is, is there a benchmark or a standard of percentage in reduction that the -- that you are looking for?

Richard Lucey:

No. We have not identified that, nor is it our place, really, to identify that just because every campus is different, every student population is different. And what might be statistically significant for your campus wouldn't be necessarily for someone else. So, we do allow our applicants to have the discretion in simply identifying what they're stating is the evidence of effectiveness and, in fact, why is it evidence of effectiveness and to clearly indicate that in their proposals.

Caller 4:

Fantastic. Thank you.

Richard Lucey:

Um-hum.

Operator:

Thank you. Once again, ladies and gentlemen, if you do have a question or comment, please press the one key at this time. I show no further questions at the moment.

Richard Lucey:

Okay. So now I'll move on to the requirements of this year's competition. And the first has to do with the eligible applicants. The only eligible applicants for the competition are institutions of higher education that offer an associate's or baccalaureate's degree. So therefore, a consortia could not apply. A public or private non-profit organization could not apply. Nor could an individual apply. The only entity that's eligible is an institution of higher education that offers an associate or baccalaureate degree.

There are some limitations on eligibility that will come into play in future iterations of this particular grant program, and I'm briefly going to review those for you because they have a bearing on the potential applicants for this year.

We have established as one of the requirements a limitation on eligibility that states that any program that we recognize this year as having an exemplary or effective program will be ineligible for three years to reapply. In the past there was a five-year prohibition of that if we had recognized your campus as having a model program, and you were prohibited from reapplying for a period of five years. We've actually reduced that to three years and it only applies to those that we recognize as exemplary or effective.

That being said -- and I'm going to talk about promising in just a moment -- any campus that we recognized as having a model program in fiscal years 2004, 2005, 2006 or 2007 are eligible again for this year to reapply. And the reason being is because we've established now a brand new program, three new levels of recognition that were never in

play before, and the limitations on eligibility that we've established will only apply to those programs that we recognize as a result of this year's program forward. So again, for fiscal year 2008, for any institution that we recognize as having an exemplary or an effective program, will be ineligible to reapply for a period of three years.

For promising programs, it gets just a tad trickier. But I think if you just follow through on what I'm about to talk about, you should understand it. And if not, certainly ask the question and I'll try my best to rephrase it for you.

A promising program, as I indicated earlier on in today's conference call, will be awarded a 12-month grant. Now, that means that their grant period would be August 1st of this year through July 31st of 2009. For those of you who have had a Department of Education grant in the past, you know that there is the potential for a current grantee to extend their project for a period of up to 12 months to finish incomplete activities, otherwise known as a no-cost extension. That regulation is still in play. And anybody that we award under this program will still have that as an option for themselves.

But for a campus that we recognize as having a promising program, you are ineligible to apply as long as your current grant is active. So, let's just say for the sake of argument that we award you this year as a promising program and you finish everything up that you are supposed to complete by July 31st of 2009. The earliest you would be eligible to reapply would be in 2010 simply because, by July of 2009, next year's grant program will already have come and gone in terms of the application deadline date. So, the earliest you'd be able to apply is the year after that.

If in the year 2010 you apply and you are once again designated as a promising program, it is at that point that we will invoke the three-year ineligibility rule and basically prohibit you from reapplying for that time period.

So, in looking at the three levels of recognition once again, if you're designated as exemplary or effective this year, you're ineligible for three years after that from reapplying. And if you are designated this year as having a promising program, you're allowed to submit another application when your current grant expires. And if at that time you're designated once again as promising, you then are prohibited from reapplying for a period of three years. So, that's where we're looking at in terms of the eligibility limitations.

The third and final requirement that I simply want to mention in terms of something that's new for this particular year are the funding limits that we've established. This is the first time that we have set maximum award amounts. And, in my opinion, they actually help out the campuses in one regard because of the indirect cost issue. Specifically, we have established for exemplary or effective programs a maximum award amount of no more than \$150,000 plus indirect costs. So, that is not inclusive of indirect costs. It's \$150,000 plus indirect costs. And for promising programs, the maximum award amount is no more than \$100,000 plus indirect costs.

Let me just touch on a few nuances with these figures and then I'll get ready to open it up for questions if you have any.

First of all, the difference between the two dollar amounts. If you are designated as having a promising program and you proposed dissemination activities in your budget proposal, which you should do because that speaks directly to some of the selection criteria and their sub-elements, we will strip all of that out of your proposed budget.

Because, for a promising program, during the 12-month period we will want you to focus solely on the enhancement of your program and the further evaluation of it with no dissemination activities to other institutions of higher education.

For effective or exemplary programs, we certainly want to have that type information disseminated to other institutions of higher education that may be interested in adopting a similar approach on their particular campuses. This is not to say that we think that your dissemination efforts cost \$50,000. Because you may look and say, well, if they're going to give promising programs \$50,000 less, then that means they just might figure dissemination costs that much. That's not the case at all. But the bottom line here is that, for a promising program, we will indeed strip out all of the dissemination activities, as well as related budget items from your budget so that you can focus solely on the enhancement and evaluation part of your project.

As for the indirect costs, some guidance for you on this, which we do explain in the Frequently Asked section -- or Frequently Asked Questions section of the proposal. If you claim indirect costs, you are allowed to use your university's federally negotiated indirect cost rate. However, some additional guidance on that is that, because these are not research grants, like some universities may be used to with the Department of Health and Human Services or the NIAAA or the National Institute on Drug Abuse, we do not fund pure research grants and, therefore, it is not appropriate for a campus to apply their federally negotiated indirect cost rate for research on these projects. Rather, a campus would use their federally negotiated indirect cost rate for what is often referred to on the indirect cost rate agreement as "other sponsored activities."

So, my advice to you is, as you're putting your budget proposals together and you get ready to submit proof of your federally negotiated indirect cost rate with your proposal, is to take a look at the agreement -- which your business office or your fiscal folks should be able to provide for you -- and take a look at it and see if you see a line on there that simply indicates on-campus, other sponsored activities. That's the appropriate rate to use with this particular project.

So again, when you're putting your proposals together, you do not need to worry about the \$150,000 being inclusive of indirect costs. It's \$150,000 for exemplary or effective programs plus indirect costs. It's \$100,000 maximum award for promising programs, but it's \$100,000 plus indirect costs.

So, at this point I'll stop there since I've covered the requirements. And before we get into the selection criteria, let me open it up for any questions that you might have on any of those three requirements that I just discussed.

Operator: Okay. Once again, ladies and gentlemen, if you do have a question or comment, please press the one key at this time. And I'm showing one question coming from Caller 5 from Montclair State University.

Caller 5: Hi, Rich. I was just wondering, is there any restriction if a campus is presently implementing a program with Department of Ed funds?

Richard Lucey: Do you want to clarify that a bit more?

Caller 5: If we are -- if a campus already has a funded program--.

Richard Lucey: --Um-hum--.

Caller 5: --Presently--.

Richard Lucey: --Right--.

Caller 5: --Are they also able to then apply for a model program?

Richard Lucey: Yes. First of all, our grant competitions, the various 8 to 12 that we may have in each different year, are distinct and separate and apart from each other. We sometimes have a provision in our grant programs that a current or active grantee under that program is not eligible to apply. That is not the case for this year's campus-based models program because of the nature of the fact that we've established these three new levels of recognition.

For example, Caller 5, I think specifically with your campus you were recognized in fiscal year 2006, I believe. And typically, you would have been ineligible to apply for five years from that point. We have done away with that five-year ban. So, for this year, you are eligible to apply if you wish. And if we recognize you as effective or exemplary this year, you'd be ineligible for a period of three years.

Operator: Okay. Thank you. Our next question comes from Caller 6 from University of Tennessee.

Caller 6: Hello, Richard. How you doing?

Richard Lucey: Hey, Caller 6.

Caller 6: I just want a little bit of clarification from some of the things that you mentioned today.

Richard Lucey: Um-hum.

Caller 6: If your current program fits under the category of limited research design--.

Richard Lucey: --Um-hum--.

Caller 6: --And with -- at a minimum pre/post, the way you kind of described the different levels, would you make it clear in your evaluation section that you're doing an experimental design or a quasi-experimental design for this particular proposal?

Richard Lucey: Well, it's up to you as the applicant to certainly make it very clear in your project evaluation section the research design or the methods of evaluation that you use to determine the evidence of the effectiveness of your program so that the reviewers have something on which they can base their scores and comments.

Caller 6: Okay. And maybe we don't have time for this today, but if you could answer it quickly, that would be helpful.

Richard Lucey: Um-hum.

Caller 6: If you're looking at some sort of a population level intervention on your campus, from what we've previously described, would that necessitate having a control campus also?

Richard Lucey: It's solely going to be based -- and that's not anything that I would answer, even off line, just because I'm prohibited from talking about a specific approach or design that you've used.

Caller 6: Okay.

Richard Lucey: That's certainly up to the peer reviewers to decide. But, in terms of the -- you know, what I would call the nutshell version of the definition is, you know, the experimental design is random assignment, treatment group, control group. Whereas, the quasi-experimental design would, say, be a comparison group which was not randomly assigned.

Caller 6: Okay.

Richard Lucey: So, it's up to you. Again, in the project evaluation section you're not only talking about the evidence of the effectiveness of the program, but that sub-element B, which we'll talk about in just a little bit, talks about what were the methods of evaluation that were used to determine this evidence of effectiveness. So, it'll be up to the peer reviewers to determine whether or not -- you know, how well you responded to that. Ultimately, it's the site visitors, not the first stage reviewers, who are making the recommendation to the Department as to which level, if any, we should recognize you for. They'll determine that based on what they learn during the on-campus visit.

Caller 6: Okay, great. Thank you very much, Richard.

Richard Lucey: Sure.

Operator: I am showing no further questions.

Richard Lucey: Okay. So, before we get into the proposal tips and the overview of the peer review process, I do now want to finish out the content-specific portion of the grant program for this year with a discussion of the selection criteria.

And this is where I would want to make clear that -- and it goes back to my earlier statement that you are not writing your proposal as if it's exemplary or effective or promising. And by that, I mean you're not self-identifying the level of recognition that you're competing for. Your job, if that's what we want to call it, or your goal in putting a proposal together, whether it's this program or any other grant program, is to provide a comprehensive response to all of the sub-elements that are listed for the selection criteria. These are the elements that the peer reviewers will be assessing you against in terms of your response.

So, you don't want to give short-shrift or to ignore any of them because doing so puts you at a distinct disadvantage. And there's no easier way to lose points and be knocked out of the competition by basically ignoring or omitting or forgetting to include, or any other thing you want to come up with, that means you did not address all of the elements. So, I'm going to review for you quickly the instructions that we'll be giving to peer reviewers in terms of what they should be looking for as it relates to your responses to the criteria.

There are three selection criteria. They are worth a total of 100 points. Significance is the first criterion. It's worth 20 points. Project design is worth 40 points, and it's the second selection criterion. And project evaluation also is worth 40 points, and it's the third criterion. And I'm going to review each of the sub-elements for you now, starting with significance.

In the application package you will see that we have weighted each of the sub-elements in terms of a point value. So, significance is worth a total of 20 points. Sub-element A is worth 15, sub-element B is worth 5.

In your response to significance, here is where you're providing the detailed description of your program that's been implemented on your campus for at least two full years. This is another way of addressing one of the four elements in that absolute priority. So we -- you will see that we've established those four elements in the priority. Hopefully, you will see how each of those play out and get discussed in your responses to these three selection criteria.

That sub-element A is the contribution of the program to the advancement of theory and knowledge to the field at large. What is the significance of this program being recognized as exemplary, effective or promising for the field? And that's where you're providing this detailed description of this program that's been in existence for at least two years so that the peer reviewers can take a look at this and understand how long it's been in play, what it encompasses, who it targets, what are the various components of it. Is it a multi-pronged approach? Is it a single method approach? That's all up to you to discuss and provide a description of in a very clear and concise way.

The second element under significance talks about the dissemination plan. Here you are to indicate a comprehensive dissemination plan that would allow you to get information to other institutions of higher education about your program, provide them with information on how it could be used on their campus, and develop materials that others could use if they wanted to create a similar program.

Some of the more common forms of dissemination that we also have included in this application package are articles for publications. That could include newsletters. That could include peer-reviewed journal articles. Dissemination could include providing consultations, either having folks come to your campus or you going to other campuses interested in learning more about your program. Hosting a conference specifically about your project. Creating websites about your project, and that's another form of dissemination. We leave that completely up to you and your discretion as to how you want to propose disseminating information about your program to others. But, it's up to you to fully flesh that out and to describe it in a way that makes it clear to the reviewers how this will be disseminated to others who may be interested in adopting it on their particular campus.

So again, you have two sub-elements that you need to address. One is certainly weighted much more than the other. That is worth 15 points, and that's the full and complete description of your program that's been in place for at least two years. The second element has to do more with the dissemination plan. How are you planning to notify others about your program if they are interested in adopting a similar effort at their institution?

The second selection criterion speaks to the project design. There are three sub-elements. They total 40 points. The first sub-element has to do with the current program. How does it reflect up to date knowledge from research and practice? This is the theoretical base that we saw in all three definitions of the levels of recognition. So, you're explaining how does this program that we've had in place reflect current research, current practice, what the literature is telling us about what works. That's what the reviewers will



be looking for in a clear way that you've explained to them about the particular program that you've written about in your proposal.

The second element has to do with the enhancement piece. You -- as part of this grant program, one of the things we've not lost is for all grantees that we fund to enhance their existing program and to further evaluate it. Well, in your proposal, you're providing that proposed enhancement piece as well. But, that proposed enhancement also needs to reflect up to date knowledge from research and practice.

Let me just give you an example, and this is completely a hypothetical. But let's say that you've implemented a social norms program on your campus that has been in place for at least two years and it has solely targeted members of the Greek community. Your fraternity members and your members of sororities. And let's say that you've discussed that in a comprehensive manner in your proposal, but -- and you have evidence to show that it's effective. But what you want to do is enhance the program and further evaluate it, which is a requirement. We leave that up to you to decide what enhancement means. But for the purposes of this example, the enhancement might mean let's now develop a social norms campaign because we know it works with our Greeks population. Let's develop a campaign that now targets our student athletes. So, the enhancement could be simply a new student population. That's fine.

Again, it's completely up to you to determine what's the enhancement. The onus and burden is on you to explain what's your proposed enhancement plan, how do you plan to further evaluate it, but more importantly for this element, how does that enhancement also reflect current knowledge from research and effective practice?

The third element under project design also speaks to the enhancement piece. And what the reviewers will be looking for is the goals and the objectives and the outcomes you've identified that will be achieved by the program enhancement. Are they clearly specified and are they measurable? We would hope and expect that the existing program has already determined and had clearly identified goals and objectives. Well, as you know, as part of this program you have to enhance and further evaluate that program. What the reviewers will look for are clear, specific and measurable goals and objectives and outcomes for that enhancement piece.

For any of you that may have had one of our grants, say under the competition to prevent high-risk drinking or violent behavior among college students, know that one of the sub-elements there under the criterion quality of the project design speaks to this very issue. What is it you hope to see as a result of this program at the end of a specific period of time? So, you're going to already have in your mind 18 months, because that's the project period for an exemplary or an effective program. What are the goals and objectives that you want to see at the end of 18 months as a result of the enhancement to your existing program?

The final selection criterion is project evaluation. It also is worth 40 points. And the three sub-elements are weighted at 25, 10 and 5 points, and I'll briefly touch on each of them.

The first sub-element has to do specifically with the evaluation data of the program that's been in place for at least two full years. Again, direct correlation to one of the sub-elements or elements, I should say, of the absolute priority. It is in your response to this criterion the reviewers are going to look for the specific evidence of the effectiveness of

your program. They're going to look for a complete and comprehensive explanation of the data that serve as the indication of your program's effectiveness.

You'll note in this sub-element that it's an omnibus or a comprehensive element in that it talks about all of the various outcome data. And by that, I mean reductions in use, reductions in problems, reductions in risk factors, enhancement of protective factors, or some combination of them. It is an omnibus sub-element in that it could be any or all of those elements. You tie those directly back to those definitions we talked about earlier and, depending on the outcomes that you've had as evidence of the effectiveness of your program, that will help to determine which level of recognition that may -- you may be designated for based on how well the peer reviewers felt that you responded to the criterion and, ultimately, a recommendation that comes back to us from the site visit team if your campus is visited.

So, sub-element A, here is where you talk about the effectiveness of the program. Please do not be vague and non-specific here. You want to be very specific, very concise and very clear and identify, not only for us, but ultimately for the reviewers, what is the specific evidence that you have to show that your program's effective.

The second element under project evaluation talks about the methods of evaluation. So, going back to the question that Caller 6 had posed earlier, again, it's up to you to clearly identify the methods by which you used to evaluate and ultimately document the evidence of this particular program. Is it solely based on pre and post-tests? Did you employ some type of experimental design where there was a random assignment of treatment and control groups? Or was there a quasi-experimental design in play in which case you had comparison groups that were not randomly assigned? It is all on you. Again, the burden is always with the applicant to basically explain all of that in laymen's terms, in a concise and clear way so that the peer reviewers can make a determination. And ultimately, the site visitors, if you get to that point, can see how you arrived at your data.

The last element under project evaluation goes back to the enhancement piece. If you basically think about what it is you want to do over the course of the next 18 months -- we'll just continue along with this hypothetical example of an effective or an exemplary program. "At the end of 18 months, I hope to see these goals, objectives and outcomes, but how am I going to know whether or not I met them?" What methods of evaluation are you planning to put into play during the enhancement phase that will give you some performance feedback and allow you to periodically assess your progress toward meeting those intended outcomes?

So, that's the third and final sub-element that the peer reviewers are going to be looking for within this particular element. You'll see that it's only worth five points, but please do not look at that as an indication that we do not think it's worth much in comparison to the other two. The real thrust behind this grant program admittedly is for us to identify effective, exemplary and promising programs. And the way that we do that is through the evidence of the effectiveness and through the methods by which you determined that. But there is that component of the enhancement piece. We do want to see that you have a plan in play to periodically assess how well you're progressing toward those intended outcomes.

So with that, I will now open it up for any questions that you might have related to the three selection criteria.

Operator: Okay. Thank you. Once again, ladies and gentlemen, if you do have a question, please press the one key at this time. Okay. I show one question coming from Caller 7 from Sangre de Cristo.

Richard Lucey: Okay.

Caller 7: Hi, Rich.

Richard Lucey: Hello.

Caller 7: This is Caller 7 from Sangre de Cristo and Highlands University. One question that I do have, typically most grants, they limit the number of pages you can submit. Is there any type of limitation? I have not seen anything on this grant.

Richard Lucey: Yes. Actually, if you look in section four of the application package.

Caller 7: Okay.

Richard Lucey: And in one of the areas that we talk about -- it's actually on page -- it's on the first page of section four. We had -- just trying to see if we actually listed it here or if it was another part of the application narrative. I'm sorry; it's actually under the "Organizing the Application" section. It's still in that section four. But, if you look at item three, Project Narrative, we indicate that it should be no more than 25 double-spaced pages. So, you'll have your abstract, which is just the one page brief overview of what's in your proposal, but then the project narrative, your response to those three criterion and all of the respective sub-elements should be no more than 25 double-spaced typed pages.

Caller 7: Okay.

Richard Lucey: Do you see that in the--?

Caller 7: --Yes, sir, I do.

Richard Lucey: Okay.

Caller 7: Thank you.

Richard Lucey: Sure.

Operator: Okay. I show one more question at this time coming from Caller 8 from the University of Nebraska.

Richard Lucey: Okay.

Caller 8: Yeah. I just -- my question on the, you know, criteria for, you know, what counts as evidence is, if you did a campus-wide intervention, what would you have for any type of control or comparison group?

Richard Lucey: Caller 8, unfortunately, that's not really for me to say. Again, that's getting into campus-specific information and project designs and I'm not allowed to comment specifically on that. What we indicate or provide as guidance to the applicants -- and admittedly, it may basically bump people out of a specific level of recognition. But, depending on the project or the program you have in place, whether it's a full-blown comprehensive

program or whether it's a specific strategy that you're calling a program, that certainly -- you know, if it's a component of a comprehensive program, it's up to you to decide basically what's the evaluation method you've used to indicate that it's evidence of effectiveness.

For a comprehensive campus-wide program, you know, it would be up to the campus, I guess, if it were looking at an experimental design or quasi-experimental design, to come up with a campus of another type, of a similar type of scope, if you will, that could serve as a control group. But, that's certainly up to the campus to decide. It's not something that we would dictate. But certainly, through the definition itself and what we have identified, it may result in that, you know, a campus may have to determine what are they going to use or indicate as the research method that was evidence of the program's effectiveness. I can't, because every campus is different, indicate which one we recommend or which one we say is preferable.

We'll leave it up to -- as long as the applicant has clearly addressed all of the elements of the priority and comprehensively addressed -- well, let me back up. As long as they clearly address all four elements of the priority in their application, we'll assign it to the peer review panel. We'll let them decide how well you responded to each of the selection criteria. And inclusive in that is the project evaluation piece. It's up to them to decide how well you explained the methods of evaluation and whether or not, you know, an experimental design was in place or experimental -- a quasi-experimental, or however you've laid it out, it's up to them to decide how well you responded to that particular sub-element.

Caller 8: Yeah. But am I to interpret that correctly that only experimental designs are acceptable, or quasi-experimental?

Richard Lucey: For an exemplary or an effective program, yes. If you look at the definitions, you will see that we have specifically said that highest research design is the operative word or phrase. And we've gone on to say that that means an experimental design that involves random assignment, control group, treatment group, but we have allowed for quasi-experimental designs in both exemplary and effective. It's certainly up to the applicant to decide or to explain how it's one or the other. It's in the limited research designs where we move down into promising. And that's where they have, at the least, a pre and post-test that's been in play.

Operator: Thank you. I'm showing one more question now coming from Caller 9 from Mexico Highlands.

Caller 9: Hello. My question is in relationship to the display of tables and graphs.

Richard Lucey: Okay.

Caller 9: Can those be -- do those -- are those required to be double-spaced as well--?

Richard Lucey: --No. And in fact, that was one of the things that I'm going to discuss shortly--.

Caller 9: --Okay--.

Richard Lucey: --In the grant proposal organization tips. But since you've asked it here, I'll mention it. We certainly will allow an applicant in a displaying of a graph or a chart or a table in their application package, their proposal to us, they can use single-spaced text in those

charts or those tables. But, we always put the caveat out there, and I explain this during the grants workshop sessions that I do, do not put large blocks of text or your direct responses to the criteria as single-spaced responses and just put a border around it and call it a table. We actually have had applicants do that in the past and they've tried to challenge us and say that that's a chart or a table, when it's clear that they're -- it was intended to be a response to a selection criteria. They were just trying to get more information in by circumventing the double-spaced rule. That's the only caveat we give to people. But, if you're simply putting together a chart that shows prevalence rates or outcome data, or those types of charts, graphs or tables, you certainly can single space those.

Cecilia Navarrete: Thank you very much.

Operator: There are no further questions.

Richard Lucey: Okay. I'm going to move into now some grant proposal tips for you. These tips are based on not only my own experiences as a successful and an unsuccessful applicant before I came to the Department eight and a half years ago, but also the experiences of my colleagues, as well as your colleagues from around the field that have developed proposals and submitted them to the Department. And after I go through these next set of tips, I'll open it up for any other questions that you might have.

The first tip that we have is obviously to allow yourself plenty of time to prepare. Now, the application just came out this past Friday. And in fact, the Notice of Proposed Priority has been out since the end of December of 2007. For those of you who are aware of that and have started to formulate in your mind what you might be thinking about in putting a proposal together, you're already giving yourself plenty of time to prepare. And you also are doing so just by virtue of being on the call this afternoon. So, that's a good thing.

We basically are giving folks 45 days from the time we released the application to the public to the date that they have to transmit their application to the Department. You know, I also know that 45 days seems like a short amount of time. And you know, it's all just a matter of time management. Certainly, we're required to give potential applicants 30 days. In some rare instances we will give applicants 60 days for a grant program. But the vast majority of our grant programs, at least in the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, are at the 45-day limit. And so, that's what you'll see with this particular grant program.

So, the first tip that we would certainly give you is to allow yourself plenty of time to prepare because trying to put the application together for the first time just a couple of weeks before the deadline is certainly not advisable.

The next tip that I would give you is to read the application package in its entirety. The application came out this past Friday. Hopefully, you've had a chance to download it. My advice to all of you on this call, as well as any other potential applicant that contacts us, is that you're going to read the application in its entirety at least a minimum of three times. The first time you should read the application solely for the sake of reading it and getting its full context and what the Department is doing and the direction in which they're heading. You shouldn't be trying to write the proposal just on your first read of the application.

The second time you read the application I would advise you to get your laptop or desktop or else a notepad nearby and start jotting notes to yourself about questions you either have for me or questions you have for others on your campus about particular things. These are just simple notes to yourself as you're reading through the application a second time of things you know you want to follow up on.

The third time you're reading through the application, now you're ready to start actually probably putting the pieces together. Whether you're assigning out sections of the application to others to write, or if you're going to be the sole author, starting to jot those things down to yourself that you know you need to or want to include in certain sections of the proposal.

So, a minimum of three times in reading the application in its entirety is certainly advisable.

Follow the formatting guidelines. That goes back to the question that we just had about the number of pages and how it should be formatted and how it should look. This is all included in section four of the application package. We do indicate that all of the applicants should adhere to a specific set of formatting guidelines. One-inch margins, 8.5 by 11 paper. Your font type is to be no smaller than 12-point type throughout your document. You can use boldface type, you can use underlining, you can use italics and all that other fun stuff to draw the eye to the type, but do not use colored text. It's not going to show up on the prints that we make here because we will not print out your proposals on the color printers. So, simply go with the black ink on the white paper is best.

The other thing that we -- tip that we give folks in terms of following the formatting guidelines has to do with structuring your narrative according to the criteria. I indicated that the three selection criteria are significance, project design and project evaluation. And there are various sub-elements to each of those selection criteria.

You really want to make it easy for the reviewer to evaluate your proposal. And as such, you want the reviewer essentially to be your friend. You want them on your side. Because, as I said, I know it's a lot of time and effort and energy that goes into putting this proposal together. You're -- we're trying to create a level playing field for everyone. That is one of the goals of our competition, is the same rule applies to everyone. But, you are in competition with each other. And one of the ways you'd try to gain a competitive advantage is to point out easily for the reviewers where your responses are to each of the criteria.

One of the pieces of advice that we have for our potential applicants is to use headings. So for example, you can have a major heading of Significance, since that's one of the selection criteria, and then use two smaller headings that deal with the two sub-elements under Significance. But, provide your direct response to each of those sub-elements clearly in the proposal so that the peer reviewers have -- do not have to go on a fishing expedition, if you will, or have to start hunting for where your response is. You want to make it crystal clear to them how you responded to sub-element A under Project Design, or sub-element C under Project Evaluation.

The other nice thing about this is, not only does it make it very clear to the reviewers where your responses are, but those headings, the inclusion of them in your proposal does not count against the page limitation that I just mentioned earlier. So, it really is to your

advantage to include that type of information so the reviewers can easily find your responses to those selection criteria.

The next piece of advice that we have for our potential applicants is to be clear, be concise, and be specific. A vague and non-specific application rarely, if ever, gets funded. The reviewers are going to be looking for clearly identified, clearly specified and clearly measurable goals, objectives and outcomes. They want to see clearly what your program consists of, what are its components, when was it first implemented so we can measure that two year piece. These are the types of things, again, that really go a long way to getting a decent score on an application is for you to be very clear and specific, and also to format it in a way that makes it easy for the reviewers to read your proposal.

The next thing that I want to mention has to do with your funding request. In addition to the project narrative that you put together, which is your response to the three selection criteria, you also will be required to submit a budget narrative. One of the required forms is Ed Form 524. It's the Budget Information form. This is simply a one-page form that you use to list by budget category the funding items or the budget requests that you have for this project.

In addition to that form, and to accompany it, is a budget narrative that fully justifies and explains all of the proposed costs. It will not be sufficient for you to simply provide the Ed Form 524 and then attach a one-page spreadsheet that simply shows the same figures that are on the 524. What we are going to want to see primarily is, not only how you calculated those costs, but also how they relate directly to the project narrative that you've included. How do these costs relate to your program or to your project if it's funded for 12 to 18 months?

One of the things that I tell folks, as an example, would be in the supplies category. Do not simply put \$10,000 for miscellaneous expenses. There's no surer way to get that cut out of your budget than to be as vague and non-specific as that. I bring it up as an example because we have had applicants, in this program and others, indicate such a line item.

I'll give you another example. Under travel, for example, you'll notice that we instruct our potential applicants that one of the things they have to budget for is attendance at our annual national meeting that's held each fall. What I would want to see in your budget request or your budget narrative is how you calculated the costs that will get your team, whether it's you and a project coordinator, or you and a team of folks from your campus, from your home base to our national meeting. And that includes airfare, lodging, per diem expenses, all of that. So, make sure you fully explain that in your budget narrative.

You want to make sure that your budget figures are consistent. Look at what you've included on the Ed Form 524 and make sure that those numbers match exactly what you have in your budget narrative.

The other thing you need to keep in mind as you're putting your proposals together is that your costs that you propose to us have to be reasonable, necessary and allowable under the program. So, I'll give you an example of an unallowable expense. And this will speak directly to folks who maybe have social norms programs. I won't debate the need, if you will, or the benefit for having social norms messages on a variety of objects such as stress balls, magnets, water bottles, key chains, mouse pads, those types of objects. But those are items for which we will not allow you to spend the federal tax dollars basically through this grant program.

We will allow you to use, if you have a social norms program for instance, we'll allow you to use your grant dollars mainly around print media issues, such as posters, brochures. Some folks have gone the route of billboards. Certainly MySpace and FaceBook are popular avenues of disseminating information. And that is an allowable expense if you want to promote the program through those venues. We have had grantees develop academic planners for their students. And they've included social norms messages on those. That's all well and good. But, keep in mind the trinket or tchotchke or what you would consider sometimes fluff type material like key chains and magnets and stress balls and water bottles and all of those things, we will not allow you to use the grant funds to produce those particular products.

So, keep that in mind as you're putting your proposals together. Certainly offline, if you have specific items that you want to run by me as possibly whether or not they're allowable, I can answer those on an individual basis with you. We do not have an all inclusive list of allowable and unallowable items just because it would be hard to develop such a list. But, I did want to use that one as an example of something that we would not allow.

The primary thing for you to keep in mind as you're putting your proposals together for your budgets is be able to explain in your budget narrative that it's a reasonable cost and why it's a necessary cost. We'll make that determination, and also take into account the allowability factor. But, be clear and be as specific in your budget proposal as you should be in your project narrative.

Another tip that we give all of our potential applicants is to proofread your proposal. You will have looked at this thing so many times over the course of the next several weeks that you will think that you will have seen things, or you will think that you will have read something or you will have included something in your proposal. But, just by the mere fact that you've become very close to it and be the principal author or primary author on it, you will miss things. It is just part of our natural inclination to just have our mind think we saw something and to gloss over something.

So, our advice is to really have a fresh pair of eyes look at your proposal and read it prior to submitting it. Whether you want to give it to your colleague in your office, to a work study student, bring it home and give it to your spouse or significant other. Truly, as a tip for this particular piece. And have that person look at it not only for spelling and potential grammar issues, but also for clarity's sake.

You really want to write the proposal for a layperson. You're writing this for someone who knows nothing about your program, even though the peer reviewers are trained in all the intricacies about this particular grant program, they're not allowed to fill in any holes for you or to give you any benefits of the doubt or anything like that. You need to be very clear in your proposal, but write it for someone as if someone knows nothing about your proposal.

The last couple of tips that I want to give you have to do with either electronic submission or paper submission. And it's -- these two pieces are very important depending on how you decide to submit your proposal. And that's why I save them for last because, oftentimes, people remember the last thing that you say.

I mentioned earlier at the top of our conference call that you are allowed to submit your proposal electronically if you wish. If you do, you must go through [grants.gov](http://grants.gov), which is



the federal government's portal now for all of its grants. You also, if you want, can submit it in paper format instead. And you can do that either by mail or deliver in person.

I'm going to talk first about signatures and how that plays out depending on how you submit your proposal. If you submit your proposal electronically through grants.gov, all of the forms will be electronically signed at the time of submission. And we accept that electronic signature. We may come back to you at a point in the future to ask for actual pen and ink signatures on the forms from your authorized rep. But at least in terms of the time of submission, we do allow the grants.gov system to serve as your electronic signatory.

If you're submitting your proposal in paper format, either by mail or by hand, you must -- that is your authorized representative -- must physically sign the proposals and all of the different forms.

An example that just came up this past couple of grant rounds. We had a person on a required form submit a form that simply used a cursive font type and called that a signature. It was initially ruled ineligible because it was not a signed required form as part of that particular grant program. The applicant appealed our decision and we took a second look and we did uphold our initial decision that that was not an original signature that was done by someone's own hand. It was simply a change in font type. So, please do not go that route if it's something you're considering. I would hope it is not. If you're going to submit in paper format, you actually have to have the forms signed.

The other thing that I want to mention has to do with the deadline. And this is critical information. The deadline, as I mentioned, is May 19th of 2008. If you submit your proposal electronically via grants.gov, your proposal has to be fully submitted. That does not mean in the middle of. That does not mean finishing up. That means fully uploaded and fully submitted by 4:30:00 P.M. Eastern Time on May 19th. The reason that I've added on the 00s to the 4:30 P.M. Eastern Time is that we have determined that 4:30 P.M. means on the dot. It does not mean one second late. If that happens, then your application will indeed be considered late and it will be ruled ineligible. So, based on experiences that we've had over the last year or so around confusion over that particular piece, for this year we have included the seconds as part of the deadline time by which the application has to be fully submitted via grants.gov.

If you submit your application in paper format by hand, whether you personally deliver your proposal or you hire a courier in the metro Washington DC area to do that for you, the application control center for the Department of Education will accept a hand-delivered proposal up until 4:30 P.M. Eastern Time on May 19th.

If you're going to submit your proposal in paper format by mail, whether that's through the U.S. Postal Service or through a commercial carrier like FedEx, DHL, UPS, whatever your commercial carrier of choice is, we will accept a postmark date. So in other words, if you happen to be located in an area where you have a post office that's open later hours -- I know that we have the luxury here in Washington DC of having a post office or two that's open until midnight. You basically have -- if you have that luxury of getting your proposal to them prior to midnight, but as long as it's postmarked by May 19th of 2008, it will be accepted.

If you're going to use an overnight carrier, like FedEx or UPS or any of those others, the shipping label needs to show a date that's no later than May 19th, 2008. If you're going to go that route, certainly hold on to your shipping label and track your package. On the

off chance -- and I do mean that it's an off chance -- it is the exception rather than the rule -- that your proposal gets lost in transit, you want to be able to prove to the Department of Ed, if asked, that you shipped out your proposal on or before the deadline. And having that tracking information certainly will go a long way toward providing that proof.

So again, there are a couple of intricacies with electronic applications and paper applications in terms of signatures. Electronic signature's okay in grants.gov. Actual signatures are required in paper format. And then, in terms of the deadline, applications must be fully submitted no later than 4:30 P.M., that's 4:30:00 P.M. Eastern Time on May 19th. The same is true for a hand-delivered application in paper format directly to the Department of Ed's application control center. If you're going to do paper format by mail or a commercial carrier, we will accept a postmarked date.

If you have any questions about any of the requirements or any pieces of the grant program, the advice is to contact the competition manager. And as I indicated, in this particular case that would be me. You have my email address. You have my phone number. I pride myself on being able to respond back to people in a timely manner because I know that time is of the essence for you as you're putting your proposals together.

Do not rely necessarily on the expertise of your colleagues or information they give you. If you're questioning something about the proposal, the example I always use in the grants workshop that I do is from several years ago when I had a potential applicant call me and wanted to discuss the proposal that she was putting together for her particular -- the grant program that I was running. And she wanted to ask me some questions about the proposal and I had to stop her short because my first question to her was why she was still working on it when it was due two weeks earlier. And she had been given some misinformation in a coalition meeting from someone -- one of her colleagues at another organization had told her that the Department of Ed had extended the program's deadline date by two weeks.

And I always say in the grants workshop that I don't try to second guess that person's motives, but it was a hard lesson for that person to learn, that -- to not rely on that kind of information without following up and getting the information directly from the Department of Ed, and specifically the person who's in charge of the competition.

So, our last piece is going to be an overview of the peer review process. But before I get to that, let me just open it up to any questions that you might have regarding the tips I just discussed, or any of the nuances within those tips.

Operator: Okay. Once again, ladies and gentlemen, if you do have a question please press the one key at this time. And I show a couple questions, the first coming from Caller 10 from Finger Lakes Community College.

Richard Lucey: Hi, Caller 10.

Caller 10: Hi, Rich. Yes, I'm calling to ask if the budget narrative is counted as part of the 25-page limit.

Richard Lucey: No, it is not.

Caller 10: And can texts or curriculum materials be purchased for review as part of the budget?

Richard Lucey: Give me a specific example or a hypothetical and I probably can answer that better for you.

Caller 10: A hypothetical would be a curriculum material that claims to have a social norm component [unintelligible] in its base model program that could potentially be applied to a community college with grant funds, can that material be purchased for review?

Richard Lucey: So, let's say for an example as part of your budget, or as part of your project narrative, as I indicated earlier, you have to have a proposed enhancement piece--.

Caller 10: --Correct--.

Richard Lucey: --To your project. And if maybe as part of your enhancement you want to purchase materials to look at maybe their applicability to your type of institution, that would be allowable.

Caller 10: Thank you.

Richard Lucey: Um-hum

Operator: Thank you. Our next question comes from Caller 11 from University of Houston.

Richard Lucey: Hi, Caller 11.

Gaylyn Maurer: Hi, again. I just had a question about the page limit as well. We've been looking at the theoretical basis. And clearly, our reference list is growing and growing and growing. And I'm wondering if we can put items like that in the appendix?

Richard Lucey: Sure. I always tell potential applicants that if you're going to have, for example a citations page or an endnotes page or a references page, whatever you want to call it, you can go one of two routes. You can go with, you know, your traditional footnotes and have them included directly within your proposal, or you could have endnotes and include the endnotes as part of an appendix. That certainly would be acceptable as well.

Caller 11: And would that apply for a timeline as well?

Richard Lucey: Sure. The thing you need to be careful about, though, is not putting too much stuff in the appendices. The tangential information is certainly okay for an appendix. The guidance that we give to applicants is to not include something in the appendix if it directly relates to a response to the selection criteria. So for example, I would not say in the project evaluation section that talks about your methods of evaluation, I would not do a one paragraph thing that says, "We have evaluated this program through a quasi-experimental design. And for a full explanation of it, see Appendix G."

Caller 11: Oh, sure.

Richard Lucey: I would never -- but some applicants have in the past. And there -- our peer reviewers are under no requirement to look at what's in your appendices. So, you're really at a disadvantage for something like that. But, if you have like a management or a timeline chart or a deliverables chart or those kinds of things and you want to make reference to them in your project narrative and then direct folks for further information to look in the appendix for more information, that's okay. It's just to walk that line between what's

substantive and should be directly in the project narrative versus something that's cursory or tangential that really is -- can just go in the appendix.

Caller 11: Great. Thank you.

Richard Lucey: Sure.

Operator: Thank you. Our final question at this time comes from Caller 12 from University of Minnesota.

Richard Lucey: Hi, Caller 12.

Caller 12: Hi, Rich. I just wanted to make sure of the dates for the application. And also, for the last two years now we had a grant that ended in 2005, so are we still eligible to apply for this grant?

Richard Lucey: Sure. Of course, again, the burden is on you as the applicant to describe a current program that's in place, that's been in place for at least two full years. It doesn't matter whether or not it was a Department of Ed funded program. But, you have to have -- what you're basically saying to the Department is we have a current program that's been in place for at least two full years that we want to have considered by the Department as being an exemplary, effective or promising program.

Caller 12: Okay, thanks. That's good.

Richard Lucey: Okay?

Caller 12: Yep.

Operator: Thank you. I show no following questions.

Richard Lucey: Okay. The final piece that I have, then, is a brief overview of the peer review process, just to take a little bit of the mystery away about that particular process, and explain to you what happens when your application ultimately is submitted to the Department.

So first of all, why peer review? It directly states in the Department of Ed regulations that we will use a peer review process to award our grants. That's done for a couple of reasons. One, we want to maybe first and foremost not show any type of favoritism or a subjective slant or partiality toward any of the applications that come in to us. We do not, as federal employees here at the Department of Ed, want to be accused of favoritism or having selected only programs that we know about, or for people that we may have a close association with. So, that's one of the reasons to make sure that these are reviewed by your colleagues, your peers in this field of alcohol and other drug abuse prevention. Maybe specifically I should say among college students.

But secondly, it speaks to that piece, is the subject matter expertise. I would -- it's preferable to go out, because there are many more subject matter experts around the country on this particular topic than there are within the Department of Ed. That is not -- that's just I think simple math will tell you that, that the whole country is certainly larger than the Department of Ed is in terms of its employees versus its citizens. There are far many more colleagues that you have that have expertise on this particular topic. And so, we will hire them, if you will, and train them on how to be a peer reviewer and what they need to look for as they are assessing your applications.

So, before I talk about the review process, let me just talk to you about the recruitment process for peer review. You may have seen through announcements of our higher education center's website and electronic mailing lists that we are currently recruiting for peer reviewers for this particular program. We are looking for people who have direct experience and background in alcohol and other drug abuse prevention programs among college students.

Once we train those individuals through a conference call that I and a colleague here will conduct, we will talk to them about a lot of what we've talked about on the phone today, the selection criteria, the absolute priority, what things they should be looking for. All of those different nuances of the grant program.

Once we know how many applications we have, we will actually confirm the peer reviewers and assign them to panels. Each peer review panel is made up of three non-federal individuals who will be assigned up to six applications to review over a two-week period.

So, that's just the basic makeup of the panel. And now I'll just talk about the process for you. Once your application comes into the Department and the application deadline date passes, our application control center will contact us and/or our contractor and provide them with copies of all of your applications that you submitted. Staff here in the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools -- and it will primarily be me and, if necessary, depending on volume, the others that I train here in the office, we will screen your application. The screening is intended to simply check to see that the application is submitted by an eligible entity and meets the priority of the competition. We are not reading the applications word for word. We are not assessing them. We are not scoring them. It is not our job to do that. But before we can assign them to a peer review panel, we have to ensure that they do meet the qualifications of the program.

So, for this particular program, I'll look to see that an institution of higher education submitted the proposal and I'm going to look for those four elements of the priority. If any of those four are missing, it will be deemed an ineligible application and the applicant will be notified to that effect.

If they do meet all four elements of the priority, we will randomly assign that proposal to one of the panels to review. After all of the applications have been screened, we will move into the peer review period. As I mentioned, it's a two-week period. The panel will basically do first an independent review of your application. That means they do not discuss the application with anyone else on the panel. They simply read the application. They write up their comments, meaning the strengths and weaknesses they've identified, and score it. They do that for every application.

The second part of the peer review is the panel discussion. Those discussions are facilitated either by Department of Ed staff or others that we hire and train to that effect. And we discuss the applications and primarily look at any scoring discrepancies that may exist. Our goal is to get the panel in agreement, both scoring-wise and comment-wise with an application.

After that independent review is done and the panel discussion is done, we at the Department will identify those campuses for which we want a site visit conducted. We will send out a team of two -- again, non-federal -- individuals trained in a site visit protocol to go out to the campus for a one-day visit to clarify and verify. That's verify

information that was in the application and clarify any issues that may have come up among the panel discussion.

The site visit team conducts the visit, writes a report of 5 to 10 pages along with a recommendation for either exemplary status, effective status, promising status, or none of the above. After all of the site visit teams come back I will do a budget review. I will look at all of the budgets. I will knock out anything that's unallowable. If you're designated or recommended as a promising program, I will strip out anything that has to do with dissemination. As I said earlier we do not want the promising programs doing dissemination efforts. We want them to focus solely on the enhancement and further evaluation piece of their projects. And we will then move on to the final stage, which is getting the slate of candidates or the slate of applicants approved, not only within the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, but by the Secretary's office within the Department of Education. And once we have that approval, we're ready to obligate the awards and make those determinations public.

After the applications are awarded, or the grants are awarded, all applicants, whether or not you receive funding or designation from us, you will receive a copy of your scores and comments from the peer reviewers who evaluated your proposals. If your campus received a site visit, you also will receive a copy of the site visit report that was submitted by the team that conducted the site visit.

So, that's a brief overview of the peer review process and I'll open it up for our last set of questions if there are any related to that.

Operator: Once again, for the final time, if you have any questions please press the one key at this time. Okay, once again, if you do have a question or comment, please press the one key. And I show no questions.

Richard Lucey: Okay. Thank you, Operator.

Well, folks, as promised, this was going to take the full two hours and we've come in right on time, which makes me happy and I'm sure you as well. I've given you my contact information at the start of the call. You have not only my email address, but also my phone number.

If you have any campus-specific questions or further information that you want about anything we discussed today, feel free to call me or send an email message to me. I always set the parameters for folks when they call that I am not allowed to discuss your specific project design or your specific evaluation design. It's not for my place to do that. I simply can try to explain and clarify the different definitions and the requirements and the absolute priority for you. And it'll be up to the peer reviewers, and ultimately the site visitors, to assess and score your proposal.

So, I thank you for your time this afternoon. If you do plan to submit a proposal, I wish you luck. And if you're interested in being considered as a peer reviewer, go ahead and send an email message to me to that effect and I can send you information on that process.

And with that, I'll turn it back over to John to close the call.

Operator: Ladies and gentlemen, this does conclude your conference for today. Everyone have a great evening. You may now disconnect. Good day.

