

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

Solicitation: Research on the Justice System Response to Sexual Violence in Corrections

Eligibility

(See "Eligibility," page 4)

Deadline

All applications are due June 18, 2008, 11:59 p.m. eastern time.

Contact Information

For assistance with the requirements of this solicitation, contact Andrew Goldberg, Social Science Analyst, at 202–307–1135 or andrew.goldberg@usdoj.gov.

This application must be submitted through Grants.gov. For technical assistance with submitting the application, call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 1–800–518–4726.

Grants.gov Funding Opportunity No. 2008–NIJ–1884

SL# 000843

CONTENTS

Overview	3
Deadline: Registration	3
Deadline: Application	4
Eligibility	4
Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations	4
American Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Tribes and/or Tribal Organizations	5
Background	5
Specific Information	7
Performance Measures	9
How to Apply	10
What an Application Must Include	11
Selection Criteria	13
Review Process	14
Additional Requirements	15

Research on the Justice System Response to Sexual Violence in Corrections CFDA No.16.560

Overview

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

NIJ seeks applications for research and evaluation to address knowledge gaps related to prison sexual violence. NIJ is particularly interested in research and evaluation on staff-on-inmate sexual misconduct. For purposes of this solicitation, correctional staff may include but are not limited to employees, contractors, volunteers, or any agency representatives.

The goal of this research and evaluation is to increase understanding and advance policy and practice aimed at reducing sexual violence in correctional facilities. Researchers are encouraged to form collaborations with practitioners so that research results inform responses to this issue.

Applicants may refer to the following key sources of information:

- The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–79).
- Sexual Victimization in State and Federal Prisons Reported by Inmates, 2007 (http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/svsfpri07.htm).
- Report to the Congress of the United States on the Activities of the Department of Justice in Relation to the Prison Rape Elimination Act (http://nicic.org/Downloads/PDF/Library/022893.pdf).

NIJ will consider proposals for research related to male and/or female prisons, jails, or juvenile facilities.

All proposals should be for research or evaluations with direct implications for criminal justice policy and practice in the United States.

Deadline: Registration

Registering with Grants.gov is a one-time process; however, if you are a first-time registrant, it could take up to several weeks to have your registration validated and confirmed and to receive your user password. Start the registration process early to prevent delays that may cause you to miss the application deadline. You must complete

these three steps before you are able to register: (1) Register with Central Contractor Registry (CCR), (2) Register yourself as an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR), and (3) Be authorized as an AOR by your organization. For more information, visit http://www.grants.gov. Note: Your CCR Registration must be renewed once a year. Failure to renew your CCR registration may prohibit submission of a grant application through Grants.gov.

Deadline: Application

The due date for applying for funding under this announcement is **June 18, 2008**, **11:59 p.m. eastern time.**

Eligibility

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

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

Faith-based organizations receiving DOJ assistance awards retain their independence and do not lose or have to modify their religious identity (e.g., removing religious symbols) to receive assistance awards. DOJ grant funds, however, may not be used to fund any inherently religious activity, such as prayer or worship. Inherently religious activity is permissible, although it cannot occur during an activity funded with DOJ grant funds; rather, such religious activity must be separate in time or place from the DOJ-funded program. Furthermore, participation in such activity by individuals receiving services must be voluntary. Programs funded by DOJ are not permitted to discriminate in the provision of services on the basis of a beneficiary's religion.

If your organization is a faith-based organization that makes hiring decisions on the basis of religious belief, it may be entitled, under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb, to receive Federal funds and yet maintain that hiring practice, even if the law creating the funding program contains a general ban on religious discrimination in employment. For the circumstances under which this may occur, and the certifications

that may be required, please see "Other Requirements for OJP Applications" at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other-requirements.htm.

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

American Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Tribes and/or Tribal Organizations: If a grant application is being submitted on behalf of a tribe or tribal organization, a letter or similar document authorizing the inclusion of the tribe or tribal organization named in the application must be included.

Background

The Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) was passed unanimously by the United States Congress and signed into law by the President of the United States in 2003. One of the purposes of PREA is to establish a zero-tolerance standard for the incidence of prison rape across both State and Federal correctional facilities. The Act requires the development and adoption of national standards for the detection, reduction, prevention, and punishment of prison rape. PREA also calls for data collection, annual studies of the incidence of prison rape, and grants for States to implement prevention and other programs. PREA also includes provisions for technical assistance to State and local corrections, and research with respect to prison rape.¹

Until the passage of PREA, it was difficult to assess the prevalence of rape in prisons and jails, and no national-level studies existed. Generally, studies were inmate self-report surveys from either single institutions or a select sample of facilities, or qualitative studies that collected inmate and staff perceptions of prison rape and sexual violence. One study noted: "The measurement problems for these surveys are formidable, given the stigmatization associated with sexual victimization as well as the fact that many of the previous attempts to measure victimization have resulted in large unit nonresponse." The most widely cited research related to the prevalence of rape in prison is in two studies conducted by Struckman-Johnson and colleagues. The first study investigated prison rape in four institutions in Nebraska, and the second studied seven Midwest prisons. Questions in the surveys did not capture data on rape but rather more generalized responses related to inmate-on-inmate or staff-on-inmate coercion and sexual contact.

Additional prevalence studies conducted prior to the passage of PREA provided a wide range of both lifetime and bounded prevalence rates. Results ranged from less than

-

¹ See Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003, Public Law 108–79, codified at 42 U.S.C. §§ 15601–15609.

² Gaes, G.G., and A.L. Goldberg, *Prison Rape: A Critical Review of the Literature*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, March 2004, NCJ 213365, available at http://www.nicic.org/Downloads/PDF/2004/019813.pdf.

³ Struckman-Johnson, C., D. Struckman-Johnson, L. Rucker, K. Bumby, and S. Donaldson, "Sexual Coercion Reported by Men and Women in Prison," *The Journal of Sex Research* 33(1) (1996): 67–76; Struckman-Johnson, C., and D. Struckman-Johnson, "Sexual Coercion Rates in Seven Midwestern Prison Facilities for Men," *The Prison Journal* 80(4) (2000): 379–390.

1 percent⁴ to nearly 30 percent.⁵ A meta-analysis of these studies estimated the lifetime prevalence of rape in prison to be 1.9 percent.⁶

Among the qualitative studies of inmate and staff perceptions of prison rape, inmates often reported: correctional officers disregard or discount inmates' concerns over sexual violence, officers were unable to protect them from retaliation, were insensitive to the problems faced by homosexual inmates, 9 or sometimes ignored or encouraged fighting when inmates defended themselves against rape. 10 Contrary to these results, officers reported they were more willing to protect homosexual inmates from rape¹¹ and believed they should try to prevent rape. 12

PREA provides for the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) to collect data that estimates the incidence of rape in prisons on a national level, including staff-on-inmate sexual assault. In 2007, according to the BJS facility-based sample study of inmate selfreported prevalence of rape, an estimated 38,600 inmates reported they had been sexually victimized by staff. These incidents include willing and unwilling activities and range from improper touching to oral, vaginal, or anal penetration. 13 A separate 2007 BJS report of administrative records consisting of official allegations of sexual victimization found approximately 3,500 allegations involving staff-on-inmate sexual misconduct and harassment. About 36 percent of the reported allegations in 2006 involved staff-on-inmate sexual misconduct, and 17 percent involved staff-on-inmate sexual harassment. Of these, 25 percent of the staff-on-inmate sexual misconduct cases were substantiated and 7 percent of staff-on-inmate sexual harassment cases were substantiated.14

In addition to these estimates, a recent ethnographic study of inmate perceptions about sexual violence in correctional facilities reported 66 percent of male and 71 percent of female inmates in maximum security facilities were aware of staff-on-inmate mutual sex relationships. Nearly 40 percent of male and 50 percent of female inmates also stated they knew of false rape allegations made by inmates against staff. 15

Aside from ethnographic studies of officers' and inmates' perceptions of supervision and rape prevention or victimization studies to estimate the prevalence of rape in correctional

⁴Nacci, P.L., and T.R. Kane, "The Incidence of Sex and Sexual Aggression in Federal Prisons," Federal Probation 47(4) (1983): 31–36; Tewksbury, R., "Fear of Sexual Assault in Prison Inmates," *The Prison Journal* 69(1) (1989): 62–71; Maitland, A.S., and R.D. Sluder, "Victimization and Youthful Prison Inmates: An Empirical Analysis," *The Prison Journal*

⁵ Struckman-Johnson, C., & D. Struckman-Johnson, "Sexual Coercion Reported by Women in Three Mid-western Prisons," The Journal of Sex Research 39(3) (2002): 217-227.

⁶ Gaes and Goldberg, p. 3 (see note 2).

⁷ Fleisher, M., and J. Krienert, *The Culture of Prison Sexual Violence*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC, 2006, available at http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nii/grants/216515.pdf. ⁸ Davis, A.J., Report on Sexual Assaults in the Philadelphia Prison System and Sheriffs' Vans, Philadelphia: District Attorneys Office and Police Department, 1968.

⁹ Wooden, W., and J. Parker, *Men Behind Bars: Sexual Exploitation in Prison,* New York: Plenum Press, 1982.

Lockwood, D., Sexual Aggression in Prison, New York: Elsevier, 1980.

¹¹ Nacci and Kane, pp. 31–36 (see note 4); Eigenberg, H.M., "Male Rape: An Empirical Examination of Correctional Officers' Attitudes Toward Male Rape in Prison," The Prison Journal 68(2) (1989): 39-56. Eigenberg, pp. 39-56 (see note 11).

¹³ Beck, A., and P. Harrison, Sexual Victimization in State and Federal Prisons Reported by Inmates, 2007, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2007, available at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/svsfpri07.htm.

Beck, A., P. Harrison, and D. Adams, Sexual Violence Reported by Correctional Authorities, 2006, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2007, available at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/svrca06.htm.

Teleisher & Krienert, pp. 11–12 (see note 7).

facilities, there has been virtually no research to date that examines how corrections administrators are managing the issue. However, since the passage of PREA, significant funds have been awarded to corrections systems and facilities designed to aid them in preventing rape. This includes funds for developing policies and practices, training staff, educating inmates, developing treatment programs, and designing protocols for investigations of allegations.¹⁶

Specific Information—Research on the Justice System Response to Sexual Violence in Corrections

Topics for Research

Staff-on-inmate sexual misconduct. NIJ is particularly interested in proposals that focus on the following two topics:

Cross-gendered supervision. NIJ is soliciting research that seeks to understand the influence of institutional policies, practices, and work environment on the prevalence of staff-on-inmate sexual misconduct with a particular emphasis on cross-gendered supervision of inmates in correctional facilities. This includes both male staff interactions with female inmates and female staff interactions with male inmates. Potential areas for examination may include but are not limited to: evaluations of policies or evaluations of best practices regarding staff selection, assignments, and/or training; working conditions, organizational structure, and culture; and other relevant issues concerning cross-gendered supervision or interactions with inmates.

Strip and pat-down searches. Direct contact between staff and inmates during pat-down and strip searches is a serious challenge for corrections administrators who must maintain a safe and secure environment for both groups. Pat downs and strip searches often require corrections staff to touch inmates in an uncomfortable manner. This sometimes results in allegations of staff-on-inmate sexual misconduct. Potential areas for research may include but are not limited to: evaluations of best practices or protocols for searching inmates, management of allegations of sexual misconduct stemming from these searches, staff assignments and training, organizational culture, or other relevant research related to this issue.

In addition, NIJ would consider proposals addressing the following areas of research:

- Research on investigation and prosecution of sexual violence in corrections.
- Research and evaluation of policies or programs to prevent sexual violence in corrections facilities.
- Understanding the links between prison sexual violence or sexual victimization and violence or victimization before or after incarceration.
- Social network analyses of communication structures between corrections staff and inmates related to reporting incidents of sexual violence.

7

¹⁶ Zweig, J., R. Nasser, J. Blackmore, and M. Shaffer, *Addressing Sexual Violence in Prisons: A National Snapshot of Approaches and Highlights of Innovative Strategies*, Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 2006.

- Research and evaluation of technologies designed to prevent sexual violence in corrections.
- The relationship between prison rape, prison conditions, and monitoring and/or enforcement practices.
- Other appropriate topics that address prison rape as defined in PREA.

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

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

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

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

Please note: All applicants under this solicitation must comply with Department of Justice regulations on confidentiality and human subjects protection. See the Confidentiality and Human Subjects Protection Compliance section under "Additional Requirements" in this announcement.

What will not be funded:

- 1. Provision of training or direct service.
- Proposals primarily to purchase equipment, materials, or supplies. (Your budget may include these items if they are necessary to conduct applied research, development, demonstration, evaluation, or analysis, but NIJ does not fund proposals that are primarily to purchase equipment.)
- 3. Work that will be funded under another specific solicitation.
- Research that duplicates ongoing efforts at NIJ or other federally funded research, and research that does not inform U.S. criminal justice policy and practice.

5. Proposals that duplicate the tasks and duties assigned to the Bureau of Justice Statistics under PREA will not be considered under this solicitation. See: http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/abstract/dcprea03.htm

Cost of proposed work: NIJ anticipates that up to \$2.4 million may become available for multiple awards made through this solicitation. All NIJ awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and any modifications or additional requirements that may be imposed by law. If you propose a project that exceeds the amount of money that may be available for this solicitation, we recommend that you divide the project into phases, stages, or tasks so that NIJ can consider making an award for a specific portion of the work. NIJ cannot guarantee that subsequent phases, stages, or tasks will be funded. Such additional funding depends on NIJ's resources and your satisfactory completion of each phase, stage, or task. Note: Deliverables (e.g., a final report) will be required at the end of each phase, stage, or task.

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

Limitation on use of award funds for employee compensation; waiver: No portion of any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation may be used to pay any portion of the total cash compensation (salary plus bonuses) of any employee of the award recipient whose total cash compensation exceeds 110 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the Federal government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year. (The salary table for SES employees is available at http://www.opm.gov.)

This prohibition may be waived at the discretion of the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs. An applicant that wishes to request a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative for the application.

Performance Measures

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

Objective	Performance Measures	Data Grantee Provides
Develop and analyze information and data having clear implications for criminal justice policy and practice.	1. Relevance to the needs of the field as measured by whether the grantee's substantive scope did not deviate from the funded proposal or any subsequent agency modifications to the scope. 2. Quality of the research as assessed by peer reviewers. 3. Quality of management as measured by whether significant interim project milestones were achieved, final deadlines were met, and costs remained within approved limits.	1. A final report providing a comprehensive overview of the project and a detailed description of the project design, data, and methods; a full presentation of scientific findings; and a thorough discussion of the implications of the project findings for criminal justice practice and policy. 2. Quarterly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports, and a final progress report.

How to Apply

DOJ is participating in the e-Government initiative, one of 25 initiatives included in the President's Management Agenda. Part of this initiative—Grants.gov—is a "one-stop storefront" that provides a unified process for all customers of Federal grants to find funding opportunities and apply for funding.

Grants.gov Instructions: Complete instructions can be found at http://www.grants.gov/applicants/get_registered.jsp. If you experience difficulties at any point during this process, please call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 1–800–518–4726.

Note: Grants.gov does not support the Microsoft Vista Operating system. The PureEdge software used by Grants.gov for forms is not compatible with Vista. Also, Grants.gov cannot yet process Microsoft Word 2007 documents saved in the new default format with the extension ".docx." Please ensure the document is saved using "Word 97–2003 Document (*.doc)" format.

Please also note: OJP's Grants Management System (GMS) does not accept executable file types as application attachments. OJP's Grants Management System (GMS) downloads applications from Grants.gov and is the system in which OJP reviews applications and manages awarded grants. These disallowed file types include, but are not limited to, the following extensions: ".com", ".bat", ".exe", ".vbs", ".cfg", ".dat", ".db", ".dbf", ".dll", ".ini", ".log", ".ora", ".sys", and ".zip".

CFDA Number: The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for this solicitation is 16.560, titled "Research on the Justice System Response to Sexual

Violence in Corrections," and the Grants.gov funding opportunity number is **2008–NIJ–1884.**

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

What an Application Must Include

Standard Form 424

Program Narrative

The Program Narrative includes:

- a. Abstract (not to exceed 600 words).
- b. Table of contents.
- c. Main body, which includes:
 - Purpose, goals, and objectives.
 - Review of relevant literature.
 - Research design and methods.
 - Implications for criminal justice policy and practice.
 - · Management plan and organization.
 - Dissemination strategy.
- d. Appendixes (not counted against program narrative page limit) include:
 - Bibliography/references (if applicable).
 - Data archiving strategy (see below).
 - List of key personnel (required).
 - Résumés of key personnel (required).
 - List of previous and current NIJ awards (required).
 - Letters of cooperation/support or administrative agreements from organizations collaborating in the project (if applicable).
 - Chart for timeline, research calendar, or milestones (required).
 - Other materials required by the solicitation.

Budget Detail Worksheet

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

Budget Narrative

Negotiated Indirect Rate Agreement (if applicable)

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

http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/pdfs/indirect_costs.pdf.

Other Program Attachments

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

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

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

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

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

Cofunding: A grant made by NIJ under this solicitation may account for up to 100 percent of the total cost of the project. You must indicate whether you believe it is feasible for you to contribute cash, facilities, or services as non-Federal support for the project. Your proposal should identify generally any such contributions that you expect to make and your proposed budget should indicate in detail which items, if any, will be supported with non-Federal contributions.

Selection Criteria

Successful applicants must demonstrate the following:

Understanding of the problem and its importance.

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

Quality and technical merit.

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

Impact of the proposed project.

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

Capabilities, demonstrated productivity, and experience of applicants.

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

Budget.

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

Dissemination strategy.

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

Relevance of the project for policy and practice.

Higher quality proposals clearly explain the practical implications of the project. They connect technical expertise with criminal justice policy and practice in the United

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

Review Process

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

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

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

Reasons for rejection: NIJ may reject applications that are incomplete, do not respond to the scope of the solicitation, do not comply with format requirements, or are submitted after the deadline.

When awards will be made: All applicants, whether they are accepted or rejected, will be notified. The review and approval process takes about 6 months. You should not propose to begin work until at least 6 months after the proposal deadline on the cover of this solicitation. Also, you should not expect to receive notification of a decision for at least 6 months after that date. Lists of awards are updated regularly on NIJ's Web site at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/funding/welcome.htm.

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

Additional Requirements

- Civil Rights Compliance
- Confidentiality and Human Subjects Protection Compliance
- Anti-Lobbying Act
- Financial and Government Audit Requirements
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Compliance
- DOJ Information Technology Standards
- Single Point of Contact Review
- Nonsupplanting of State or Local Funds
- Criminal Penalty for False Statements
- Compliance with Office of Justice Programs Financial Guide
- Suspension or Termination of Funding
- Funding to Faith-Based and Community Organizations
- Nonprofit Organizations
- Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)
- Rights in Intellectual Property
- Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA)

We strongly encourage you to review the information pertaining to these additional requirements prior to submitting your application. Additional information for each can be found at http://www.oip.usdoj.gov/funding/other-requirements.htm.

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

Final substantive report: The final report should be a comprehensive overview of the project and should include a detailed description of the project design, data, and

methods; a full presentation of scientific findings; and a thorough discussion of the implications of the project findings for criminal justice practice and policy. It must contain an abstract of no more than 600 words and an executive summary of no more than 2,500 to 4,000 words.

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

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

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