



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention](#) (OJJDP) is seeking applications for its fiscal year (FY) 2016 Practitioner-Researcher Partnership in Cognitive Behavioral Mentoring Program. This project furthers the Department's mission by developing and researching mentoring practices that can be implemented with youth at high risk of delinquency and/or who have experienced victimization or trauma.

OJJDP FY 2016 Practitioner-Researcher Partnership in Cognitive Behavioral Mentoring Program

Applications Due: June 13, 2016

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are states (including territories), units of local government, federally recognized Indian tribal governments (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior), nonprofit and for-profit organizations (including tribal nonprofit or for-profit organizations), and institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education). Recipient organizations must agree to forgo any profit or management fee. Foreign governments, foreign organizations, and foreign institutions of higher education are not eligible to apply.

Applicants may apply under one of the following two categories:

- Category 1: Program Development and Implementation.
- Category 2: Evaluation.

To be considered eligible under this program, all applicants must document with a signed memorandum of understanding or letter of support that they have partnered with an organization that will submit an application under the alternate category. Category 1 practitioner applicants must document that the proposed implementation sites are administering an existing mentoring program and identify their corresponding evaluator/research partner applying under Category 2, and Category 2 evaluator/research applicants must identify their corresponding practitioner partner applying under Category 1.

OJJDP welcomes applications that involve two or more entities that will carry out the funded federal award activities under each category; however, one eligible entity under each category must be the applicant and the other(s) must be proposed as subrecipients. The applicant must be the entity with primary responsibility for conducting and leading the project. If successful, the applicant will monitor and manage any subrecipients or, as applicable, administer any procurement subcontracts that would receive federal program funds from the applicant under

the award. OJJDP will consider only one application per lead applicant; however, subrecipients may be part of multiple proposals. (Applicants should also review and consider the “Duplicate Applications” note under [How To Apply](#) in Section D. Application and Submission Information.) Subrecipients may be part of multiple proposals.

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

For additional eligibility information, see Section [C. Eligibility Information](#).

Deadline

Applicants must register with [Grants.gov](#) prior to submitting an application. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time (ET) on June 13, 2016.

All applicants are encouraged to read this [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#).

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

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 800-518-4726 or 606-545-5035, or via e-mail to support@grants.gov. Hotline hours of operation are 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays.

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must e-mail the OJJDP contact identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application. Additional information on reporting technical issues is found under “Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues” in the [How To Apply](#) section.

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact the Response Center by telephone at 800-851-3420, or TTY: 301-240-6310 (Hearing impaired only), by e-mail at grants@ncjrs.gov, or by [web chat](#). Response Center hours of operation are 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. ET, Monday through Friday, and 10 a.m. to 8 p.m. ET, on the solicitation close date. Answers to frequently asked questions that may assist applicants are posted at www.ojjdp.gov/grants/solicitations/FY2016/FAQ/PractResearcherMentoringFAQ.pdf.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: OJJDP-2016-9053

Release date: April 22, 2016

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	4
Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products	5
B. Federal Award Information.....	11
Type of Award	11
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	12
Budget Information	12
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement.....	13
Preagreement Cost Approvals.....	13
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver.....	13
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	14
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)	14
C. Eligibility Information.....	14
Limit on Number of Application Submissions	14
D. Application and Submission Information	14
What an Application Should Include	14
How To Apply	30
E. Application Review Information.....	33
Selection Criteria	33
Review Process.....	35
F. Federal Award Administration Information	36
Federal Award Notices	36
Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements	36
General Information About Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	38
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	38
H. Other Information.....	38
Provide Feedback to OJP	38
Application Checklist	40

OJJDP FY 2016 Practitioner-Researcher Partnership in Cognitive Behavioral Mentoring Program (CFDA #16.726)

A. Program Description

Overview

The Practitioner-Researcher Partnership in Cognitive Behavioral Mentoring Program will support the development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative mentoring approaches for youth at high risk for delinquency/juvenile and criminal justice involvement or victimization and trauma. These mentoring approaches must incorporate practices that are informed by research on cognitive behavioral interventions and techniques. The program will fund a partnership between a practitioner/service provider and an evaluator/researcher.

Practitioner/service provider applicants should develop and implement cognitive behavioral-informed practices within existing mentoring programs. These new or enhanced approaches should be piloted, manualized, and implemented with a diverse target population (defined as populations that differ demographically and/or in implementation setting). Researcher applicants should design a rigorous evaluation that examines the program design, implementation fidelity and process, and program impact. OJJDP expects the practitioner and researcher to work closely throughout the application and program development, implementation, and evaluation. OJJDP expects to make separate awards to support program development and service delivery (Category 1) and evaluation activities (Category 2).

Authorizing Legislation: This program is authorized pursuant to the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2016 Pub. L. No. 114-113, 129 Stat. 2242, 2309.

Program-Specific Information

Research has demonstrated that mentoring can be an effective prevention and intervention approach for youth with multiple risk factors for both victimization and delinquency; however, certain moderators or features of mentoring programs exist that tend to be associated with better effects.^{1,2} A meta-analysis of interventions for youth involved in the justice system indicated that approaches that incorporate a therapeutic-oriented approach or philosophy effectively reduce recidivism. These types of approaches include: (1) restorative (e.g., victim-offender mediation), (2) skill building (e.g., cognitive-behavioral techniques), (3) counseling, and (4) multiple coordinated services (e.g., case management and service

¹ DuBois, D.L., Portillo, N., Rhodes, J.E., Silverthorn, N., and Valentine, J.C. 2011. "How Effective Are Mentoring Programs for Youth? A Systematic Assessment of the Evidence." *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 12(2)57–91.

² Tolan, P., Henry, D., Schoeny, M., Bass, A., Lovegrove, P., and Nichols, E. 2013. "[Mentoring Interventions to Affect Juvenile Delinquency and Associated Problems: A Systematic Review](#)." *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 2013:10.

brokering).³ Research has further indicated that cognitive behavioral interventions for justice involved youth can have an overall positive impact on outcomes⁴ and positive effects for traumatized children and youth.⁵

This solicitation will support the development, implementation, and evaluation of mentoring approaches that integrate principles or practices informed by the research on cognitive behavioral interventions and techniques. For purposes of this solicitation, these types of approaches are based on cognitive behavioral therapy, a psychotherapeutic approach that focuses on both a person's thinking, moods, and feelings to be more adaptive and healthy and a person's actions to change unhealthy behavior patterns.⁶ OJJDP does not expect applicants under this solicitation to integrate formal therapy within mentoring, but instead integrate practices that are informed by the theoretical underpinnings of cognitive behavioral therapy and the empirical research about the application of these types of approaches with high-risk youth.

The proposed mentoring approach may include one or more mentoring model types (e.g., one-on-one, group, school, community, and peer) and the cognitive behavioral techniques may be integrated in various aspects of the programmatic approach (e.g., recruitment, training, support, activity methods).

Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products

The goal of this program is to develop, implement, and evaluate mentoring approaches that integrate principles or practices informed by the research on cognitive behavioral interventions and techniques. OJJDP expects that this will help juvenile justice practitioners and mentoring organizations identify effective mentoring approaches to improve the well-being of youth, reduce youth offending, and increase public safety.

OJJDP expects to make separate awards to support program development and service delivery (Category 1) and evaluation activities (Category 2). Under each category in the solicitation, OJJDP welcomes joint applications from two or more eligible applicants; however, one applicant must be clearly indicated as the primary applicant (for correspondence, award, and management purposes) and the others indicated as subrecipients. (Lead applicants may also be implementation sites, under Category 1, but are not required to be.)

The **key objectives** under each category of this application are as follows:

Category 1: Program Development and Implementation. Under this category, OJJDP will fund the development and implementation of innovative mentoring approaches that incorporate practices informed by the research on cognitive behavioral interventions and techniques for high-risk youth. Proposed programmatic approaches under this category should include:

³ Lipsey, M.W., Howell, J.C., Kelly, M.R., Chapman, G., Carver, D. 2010. [Improving the Effectiveness of Juvenile Justice Programs: A New Perspective on Evidence-Based Practice](#). Washington, DC: Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, Georgetown University.

⁴ Latessa, E.J. 2006. "Effectiveness of Cognitive Behavioral Interventions for Youthful Offenders." In B. Glick *Cognitive Behavioral Interventions for At-Risk Youth* (pp. 14-1 – 14-18). Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute.

⁵ Office of Justice Programs. [Therapeutic Approaches for Sexually Abused Children and Adolescents](#). Retrieved November 24, 2015.

⁶ National Institute of Mental Health. [Psychotherapies](#). Retrieved November 24, 2015.

- **A research-informed cognitive behavioral mentoring program model.** The proposed program model should demonstrate the application of the latest research about risk factors for delinquency, mentoring, and cognitive behavioral interventions and techniques.

Applicants should also indicate the extent to which they will leverage or build off of other related, previous program initiatives; training; technical assistance; or investments. OJJDP will also work with successful applicants to coordinate with the OJJDP National Mentoring Resource Center and other training and technical assistance providers regarding training, materials, and other related activities.

- **A high-risk youth target population.** The target population of this solicitation is youth at high risk for delinquency and/or victimization or traumatization. For purposes of this solicitation, youth at high risk for delinquency are those whose individual, familial, and environmental risks and/or criminogenic needs make them more likely to engage in delinquent activities, offend, and/or reoffend. The target population can also include youth who have already experienced victimization or trauma or are at significant risk of experiencing it. Applicants should describe how they determine youth to be high risk, including how they will use a validated assessment instrument that qualified staff administer to assess risk factors.

OJJDP is also particularly interested in studying how mentoring can best support high-risk youth from one or more of the following populations:

- Youth in juvenile justice diversion programs, community-based alternatives, and/or on probation.
- Detained and incarcerated youth (or youth in aftercare/reentry).
- Youth with mental health disorders.
- Children/youth exposed to violence.
- Youth who have been sexually exploited.
- Tribal youth.
- Other routinely underserved, high-need populations.

Applicants under Category 1 should document in their application that they have worked with their identified Category 2 evaluation partner to determine the characteristics of the target population that would promote potential generalizability of the findings of the evaluation to other individuals. Category 1 applicants should also work with their identified Category 2 partner to conduct power projections or analogous statistical predictions to determine the specific number of youth to be served.

- **Implementation sites.** Category 1 applicants should describe the implementation sites' preexisting mentoring programs, including the number, location, and type(s) of organization(s).

- These implementation sites should be established youth mentoring programs. OJJDP defines an established youth mentoring program as one in which an organization or agency has facilitated a mentoring relationship between youth and one or more adults or trained peers and has done the following: (1) conducted mentor and youth recruitment, (2) completed screening and intake assessment, (3) matched mentees with mentors, (4) provided mentor training, (5) provided structure and supports for mentoring activities, and (6) provided monitoring and support for the mentoring match.
- Implementation sites under Category 1 can include either a collaboration of different mentoring organizations or separate implementation sites of the same organization. Each site must agree to implement the same mentoring program model and program design as part of this initiative.
- Category 1 applicants should also work with their Category 2 evaluation partner to identify sites that would promote potential generalizability of the program implementation to other locations.
- **A plan for manualization that promotes potential replication.** Applicants should address how they will manualize the proposed programmatic approach. This should include the development of written documentation of all protocols, materials, curricula, etc.

Applicants should work with their evaluation partners to address how the final manualization of the approach will promote potential replication and scaling of the program model by documenting:

- Core components.
- Potential adaptations.
- Continuous quality improvement plans.
- Key performance indicators/measures.

OJJDP intends to make all materials developed under this initiative publically available at the conclusion of the project. (See the [Publications](#) chapter of the [Financial Guide](#).) Applicants should address how they will prepare materials for web posting (see Section508.gov).

Category 2: Evaluation. Under this category, OJJDP will fund an evaluation of the partner program proposed under Category 1. The applicant should propose an evaluation, using the most rigorous approach feasible. Applicants should propose an evaluation of the quality of implementation, the implementation process, and outcomes. The applicant should provide a detailed explanation of the research design, including why it is a scientifically valid and feasible approach and how it includes the most reasonable and rigorous methods available for the program. The proposed research design should address:

- The research participants and sampling plan, including:

- How the method will increase the scientific yield of the evaluation while weighing it with practical challenges or costs with respect to program implementation.
- Whether the study will employ subject randomization or comparison condition methods (OJJDP encourages subject randomization when feasible and reasonable. If proposing random assignment, the applications should also address whether this will include randomly assigning program staff and the merits and feasibility of this approach.)
- A power analysis that supports the proposed number of implementation sites and youth to be served, as also indicated in the application of the programmatic partner.
- A detailed explanation of the human subjects considerations.
- Identification and examination of subgroups of the target population
- The examination of the **quality of the conceptual/program design, implementation, and program fidelity**, including how variations affect the impact on youth outcomes, including:
 - Manualization (as identified under Category 1).
 - Conceptual framework or theory of change.
 - Dosage.
 - Length of match.
 - Participant experience and perception.
 - Stakeholder (e.g. parents, mentors, youth, staff, etc.) experience and perception.
 - All other relevant programmatic activities and services.
 - The extent to which the new program services differ from the previous services provided.
 - Documentation of the costs of delivering the enhanced mentoring program services and their relation to the benefits of the youth outcomes.
- The **external validity** of the proposed program and research approach. OJJDP is interested in research that may be generalizable to additional populations and jurisdictions.
- The **outcomes** to be examined, including:
 - The impact of the program on the mentoring relationships.
 - The impact of the program on youth outcomes, including but not limited to:

- Delinquency/offending and justice system involvement (including both self-report and official records).
 - Risk factors for delinquency, such as academic achievement, predelinquent forms of misconduct, social competence, quality of the parent-child relationship, social support from nonparental adult role models, mental health, and involvement in supportive programs and services.
 - Positive outcomes for youth, including school achievement, healthy behaviors, and well-being indicators.
 - Potential negative or harmful effects of the program on youth.
- The **mediators and moderators** of the impact of the enhanced program delivery, including:
 - Youth and mentor characteristics or backgrounds.
 - The practice models.
 - Other organizational or programmatic characteristics.
- The **data sources, data collection tools, and data collection procedures**, including:
 - How the applicant will collect and triangulate data from multiple sources and modalities, whenever feasible. Applicants shall also address gathering data on relevant outcomes from multiple sources, such as youth, parents, teachers, mentors, and/or institutional records.
 - Include, at a minimum, psychometrically sound measurement tools that: (1) collect data from the youth, at least one other stakeholder, and the juvenile justice system (e.g., arrest records); (2) are both practical (cost-efficient) and not likely to be susceptible to bias; and (3) are time- and cost-efficient for the number of assessments and different types of outcomes.
- The **statistical and data analyses anticipated**, including:
 - Assessing the effects from differing perspectives, including “intent to treat” (i.e., the effect of offering the enhanced services to participants) and “treatment on the treated” (i.e., the effect of actually receiving the enhanced services).
 - Consideration of additional relevant concerns, such as the clustered nature of the data, handling of missing data, and balancing of risks for Type I and II error.
 - Consideration of how the potential for errors regarding findings of mediators and moderators of program effectiveness will be reduced through the consideration of relevant models of the effects of youth mentoring relationships and findings from prior research regarding mediators and/or moderators of the effects of mentoring relationships and programs.

- The monitoring and measuring of **threats to internal validity**, including contamination of participants and measurement attrition.
- How the applicant will provide the **programmatic sites with the training and support** to collect the data that the evaluation requires.
- Other **anticipated limitations and barriers** in the approach and project.

Deliverables. Proposals should describe all products that the grantee will produce from the project. Successful applicants will submit relevant reports and deliverables to OJJDP. These will be a part of their progress reporting or special reports and include the following:

- Both categories:
 - Practitioner friendly overview documents highlighting the project's goals and objectives, as OJJDP requires. (Refer to OJJDP News @ a Glance and JuvJust publications for examples of the type of documents requested, www.ojjdp.gov/enews/enews.html.)
 - Practitioner friendly interim reports highlighting the project's progress and interim findings, as OJJDP requires.
- Category 1 only:
 - A detailed implementation plan within 12 months of the award period start date. OJJDP will review and provide input. The plan should demonstrate how the enhanced services offered under this program differ from the current services offered. It should include a timeline for implementation and for planning purposes; year 1 should be designated as a planning year; years 2-3 as implementation years; year 4 as a data collection follow-up year; and year 5 for dissemination activities.
 - A detailed progress report to OJJDP every 6 months describing the status of the program implementation, implementation issues, progress toward the project goals, and any other relevant issues to the project's completion.
 - The manualization of the programmatic approach, including all new materials, protocols, procedures, etc., developed under this program.
- Category 2 only:
 - A detailed evaluation plan within 12 months of the award period start date. OJJDP will review and provide input. It should include a timeline for implementation and planning purposes. Year 1 should be designated as a planning year, years 2-3 as implementation years, year 4 as a data collection follow-up year, and year 5 for dissemination activities.
 - A detailed progress report to OJJDP every 6 months describing the status of the evaluation, methodological and implementation issues, progress toward the project goals, and any other relevant issues to the project's completion.

- Electronic copies of (1) a final, technical report and abstract highlighting key findings suitable for publication in a refereed journal and, as required by OJJDP, and (2) a final report, including an executive summary, documenting the project and its findings, suitable for a nontechnical audience, to be developed and disseminated at OJJDP's discretion.
- One or more scholarly products to result from each award under this solicitation, taking the form of one or more published, peer-reviewed, scientific journal articles, and/or (if appropriate) law review journal articles, book chapter(s), or book(s) in the academic press.

B. Federal Award Information

OJJDP expects to make as many as two awards under Category 1 and two awards under Category 2 (four awards total) for as much as \$250,000 per award (for a total of \$1 million) for a project period of 12 months, beginning on October 1, 2016.

Applicants under this program must be in practitioner-researcher partnerships and must clearly identify the appropriate partner in the abstract of their applications. OJJDP will fund practitioner applicants under Category 1: Program Development and Implementation and research applicants under Category 2: Evaluation in this solicitation.

OJJDP may provide supplemental funding in future years to awards made under this solicitation. OJJDP estimates that any such supplemental funding may be as much as \$250,000 per year over the 5-year project period (for a total of \$1.25 million per project). Important considerations in decisions regarding supplemental funding in years 2-5 include, among other factors, the availability of funding, strategic priorities, assessment of the quality of the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and assessment of the progress of the work funded under the award.

Applicants should submit a complete year 1 budget not to exceed \$250,000. For planning purposes, applicants should also include in their application materials draft budgets for as many as 4 additional years (for as much as \$250,000 per year).

For planning purposes, both categories of applicants should anticipate, at a minimum, the activities for each year will include: year 1 as a planning year; years 2-3 as implementation years; year 4 as a data collection follow-up year; and year 5 for dissemination activities.

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

Type of Award⁷

OJJDP expects to make all awards from this solicitation in the form of grants.

Note: Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to comply with Department of Justice regulations on confidentiality and human subjects' protection, as applicable. See "Evidence, Research, and Evaluation Guidance and Requirements" under "Solicitation Requirements" in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

⁷ See *generally* 31 U.S.C. §§ 6301-6305 (defines and describes various forms of federal assistance relationships, including grants and cooperative agreements (a type of grant)).

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including any recipient or subrecipient funded in response to this solicitation that is a pass-through entity⁸) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303:

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

In order to better understand administrative requirements and cost principles, applicants are encouraged to enroll, at no charge, in the Department of Justice [Grants Financial Magement Online Training](#).

Budget Information

OJJDP will not fund:

- Proposals primarily to purchase equipment, materials, or supplies. (A budget may include these items if they are necessary to conduct research, development, demonstration, evaluation, or analysis.)
- Proposals that are not responsive to this specific solicitation.
- Grantees may not use OJJDP funds for any biomedical or behavior control experimentation on individuals or any research involving such experimentation.

⁸ For purposes of this solicitation (or program announcement), “pass-through entity” includes any entity eligible to receive funding as a recipient or subrecipient under this solicitation (or program announcement) that, if funded, may make a subaward(s) to a subrecipient(s) to carry out part of the funded program.

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement

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

Preagreement Cost Approvals

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

OJP does not typically approve preagreement costs; an applicant must request and obtain the prior written approval of OJP for all such costs. If approved, preagreement costs could be paid from grant funds consistent with a grantee's approved budget, and under applicable cost standards. However, all such costs prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of an applicant. Generally, no applicant should incur project costs *before* submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs. Should there be extenuating circumstances that appear to be appropriate for OJP's consideration as preagreement costs, the applicant should contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this announcement for details on the requirements for submitting a written request for approval. See the section on Costs Requiring Prior Approval in the [Financial Guide](#), for more information.

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, recipients may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the award recipient at a rate that exceeds 110 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the Federal Government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.⁹ The 2016 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management [website](#). Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with nonfederal funds. (Any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds where match requirements apply.) For employees who charge only a portion of their time to an award, the allowable amount to be charged is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

The Assistant Attorney General for OJP may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, the limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant requesting a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of the application. Unless applicants submit a waiver request and justification with their applications, they should anticipate that OJP will request that they adjust and resubmit the budget.

The justification should include the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of the service the individual will provide, the individual's specific knowledge of the program or project being undertaken with award funds, and a statement explaining that the individual's salary is commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with his/her qualifications and expertise, and for the work to be done.

⁹ OJP does not apply this limitation on the use of award funds to the nonprofit organizations listed at Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

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

OJP strongly encourages applicants that propose to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP [policy and guidance](#) on conference approval, planning, and reporting. OJP policy and guidance (1) encourage minimization of conference, meeting, and training costs; (2) require prior written approval (which may affect project timelines) of most conference, meeting, and training costs for cooperative agreement recipients and of some conference, meeting, and training costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, including a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)

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

For additional information, see the "Civil Rights Compliance" section under "Solicitation Requirements" in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

C. Eligibility Information

For additional eligibility information, see the title page.

For additional information on cost sharing and match requirement, see Section [B. Federal Award Information](#).

Limit on Number of Application Submissions

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, OJJDP will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted. For more information on system-validated versions, see [How To Apply](#).

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

Applicants should anticipate that if they fail to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements, it may affect negatively the review of their application; and, should a decision be made to make an award, it may result in the inclusion of special conditions that preclude the recipient from accessing or using award funds pending satisfaction of the conditions.

Moreover, applicants should anticipate that applications determined to be nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that do not include the application elements that OJJDP has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. Under this solicitation, OJJDP has designated the following application elements as critical: a signed memorandum of understanding or letter of support that the applicant has partnered with an organization that will submit an application under the alternate category, Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, Budget Narrative, and *résumés/curriculum vitae* of key personnel. For purposes of this solicitation, "key personnel"

means the principal investigator or project director, and all coprincipal investigators. Review the “Note on File Names and File Types” under [How To Apply](#) to be sure applications are submitted in permitted formats.

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

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

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

Intergovernmental Review. This funding opportunity is subject to [Executive Order 12372](#). Applicants may find the names and addresses of their state’s Single Point of Contact (SPOC) at the following website: www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants_spoc/. Applicants whose state appears on the SPOC list must contact their state’s SPOC to find out about, and comply with, the state’s process under Executive Order 12372. In completing the SF-424, applicants whose state appears on the SPOC list are to make the appropriate selection in response to question 19 once the applicant has complied with their state’s E.O. 12372 process. (Applicants whose state does not appear on the SPOC list are to make the appropriate selection in response to question 19 to indicate that the “Program is subject to E.O. 12372 but has not been selected by the State for review.”)

2. Project Abstract

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

All applicants must document in their application abstract that they have a partnership with an organization that has agreed to submit an application under the alternate solicitation Category. (To be eligible, all applicants must clearly designate their partner organization in their application.)

Applications should include a high-quality project abstract that summarizes the proposed project in 250-400 words. Project abstracts should be—

- Written for a general public audience.
- Submitted as a separate attachment with “Project Abstract” as part of its file name.

- Single-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins.

The abstract should include a brief description of:

- The purpose of the project, the category the applicant is submitting under, the problem to be addressed, and the anticipated relevance to juvenile justice policy, practice, and theory.
- Potential strategies to complete the explicit goals and objectives of the project.
- Key partners.

As a separate attachment, the project abstract will **not** count against the page limit for the program narrative. All project abstracts should follow the [detailed template](#).

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

In the project abstract template, applicants are asked to indicate whether they give OJP permission to share their project abstract (including contact information) with the public. Granting (or failing to grant) this permission will not affect OJP's funding decisions, and, if the application is not funded, granting permission will not guarantee that abstract information will be shared, nor will it guarantee funding from any other source.

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

3. Program Narrative

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

The program narrative should address the following selection criteria: (1) statement of the problem (2) program design and implementation; (3) potential impact; and (4) capabilities/competencies. The applicant should clearly delineate the connections

between and among each of these sections. For example, the project design section should clearly explain how the program's structure and activities will respond to the problem statement identified in the previous section.

Program narrative guidelines:

- a. **Title page** (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit). The title page should include the title of the project, submission date, funding opportunity number, and the name and complete contact information (that is, address, telephone number, and e-mail address) for both the applicant organization and the principal investigator or project director and the corresponding partner organization submitting an application under the alternate solicitation category.
- b. **Table of contents and figures** (not counted against the 30-page program narrative limit).
- c. **Main body.** The main body of the program narrative should describe the proposed project in depth. The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative:
 - 1) **Statement of the problem and project objectives.** Applicants should briefly describe the nature and scope of the problem that the program will address (i.e., need for translational research products). The applicant should use data to provide evidence of the need, demonstrate the size and scope of the need, and document the effects of the need on the target population and the larger community.

The applicant should describe its understanding of the objectives outlined under Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables on pages 5-11.

- 2) **Project design and implementation.** Applicants should provide a detailed description of the strategy to implement the project, addressing the key objectives noted on pages 5-10.

For **Category 1 Applicants**, this includes detailed explanations of:

- A research-informed mentoring program model informed by cognitive behavioral interventions and techniques.
- A high-risk youth target population.
- Implementation sites with preexisting mentoring programs.
- A plan for manualization that promotes potential replication.

For **Category 2 Applicants**, this includes detailed explanations of:

- The research participants and sampling plan.

- The examination of the quality of the conceptual/program design, implementation, and program fidelity, including how variations affect the impact on youth outcomes.
- The external validity of the proposed program and research approach.
- The outcomes to be examined.
- The mediators and moderators of the impact of the enhanced program delivery.
- The data sources, data collection tools, and data collection procedures.
- The statistical and data analyses anticipated.
- The monitoring and measuring of threats to internal validity.
- How the applicant will provide the programmatic sites with the training and support to collect the data that the evaluation requires.
- Other anticipated limitations and barriers in the approach and project.

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

Applicants should submit the timeline as a separate attachment, as stipulated in Additional Attachments, page 27.

- 3) **Potential impact.** Applicants should describe the potential impact of the project and how it may inform or improve juvenile justice-related policy, practice, and theory in the United States. This includes a description of:
 - How the proposed approach will assist OJJDP, juvenile justice practitioners, and mentoring organizations in identifying effective mentoring approaches for reducing youth offending, improving the well-being of traumatized and victimized youth, and increasing public safety.
 - How applicants will complete the deliverables stated in the Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products section on page 5.
- 4) **Capabilities/competencies.** This section should describe the experience and capability of the applicant organization and any contractors or subgrantees that the applicant will use to implement and manage this effort and its associated federal funding, highlighting any previous experience implementing projects of similar scope, design, and magnitude.

Category 1 applicants should address:

- Experience and capacity to develop and implement new mentoring approaches that integrate approaches informed by research on cognitive behavioral interventions and techniques.
- Experience and capacity to participate in a rigorous evaluation.

Category 2 applicants should address:

- Experience and capacity to work with local programs on conducting an evaluation.
- Experience and capacity to conduct a rigorous evaluation.

For both Category 1 and 2 applicants, OJJDP encourages applicants to partner with subrecipient organizations or individuals that have complementary skills and experiences for completing a project of this scope and size.

Applicants should also highlight their experience/capability/capacity to manage subawards, including details on their system for fiscal accountability. Management and staffing patterns should be clearly connected to the project design described in the previous section.

Applicants should describe the roles and responsibilities of project staff and explain the program's organizational structure and operations. Applicants should include a copy of an organizational chart showing how the organization operates, including who manages the finances; how the organization manages subrecipients, if there are any; and the management of the project proposed for funding.

- d. Performance measures.** To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as, to assist the Department with fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111-352, applicants that receive funding under this solicitation must provide data that measure the results of their work done under this solicitation. OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to provide the data requested in the "Data Grantee Provides" column so that OJP can calculate values for the "Performance Measures" column. (Submission of performance measures data is not required for the application.) Performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Definition	Data Grantee Provides
<p>Category 1: development and implementation of a cognitive behavioral mentoring program.</p>	<p>Percentage of youth with whom an evidence-based program or practice was used.</p>	<p>The number and percentage of youth with whom an evidence-based practice was used. Evidence-based practice models include program models that have been shown, through rigorous evaluation and replication, to be effective at preventing or reducing juvenile delinquency or related risk factors, such as substance abuse. Model programs can come from many valid sources (e.g., Blueprints, CrimeSolutions.gov, OJJDP's Model Programs Guide, SAMHSA's Model Programs, state model program resources, etc.).</p>	<p>The number of youth served using an evidence-based model or program.</p> <p>The number of youth served during the reporting period.(by gender, race, and ethnicity).</p>
	<p>Percent increase in number of program mentors recruited.</p>	<p>The number of new mentors recruited during the reporting period. "Recruited" mentors are those who have completed requirements to be ready for training.</p>	<p>The increase in number of program mentors recruited (ready for training) during the reporting period.</p> <p>Number of program mentors at the beginning of the reporting period.</p>
	<p>Percentage of program mentors who complete training.</p>	<p>The number and percentage of program mentors successfully completing training during the reporting period.</p>	<p>Number of program mentors successfully completing training during the reporting period.</p> <p>Total number of program mentors who began training during the reporting period.</p>
	<p>Percentage of trained program mentors with increased knowledge of the program area.</p>	<p>The number of trained program mentors demonstrating increased knowledge of the program during the reporting period.</p>	<p>Number of trained program mentors demonstrating increased knowledge of the program during the reporting period.</p> <p>Number of trained program mentors.</p>
	<p>Number of mentors retained.</p>	<p>The number of program mentors retained by the program within the reporting period.</p>	<p>Number of mentors who have left the program during the reporting period.</p> <p>The total number of mentors in the program during the reporting period.</p>

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Definition	Data Grantee Provides
	Percent increase in youth enrolled in the program.	Increase in the number of youth enrolled (being mentored) since the beginning of the grant program.	<p>Number of youth enrolled at the beginning of the reporting period.</p> <p>Number of new youth added during the reporting period.</p>
	Percentage of mentoring programs with active partners.	The percentage of mentoring programs with active partners representing the following types of groups: non-profit service organizations and/or faith based organizations; private industry; secondary education provider; and post-secondary education provider or vocational training provider; other active partners.	<p>Number of mentoring programs with active partners.</p> <p>Number of mentoring programs.</p>
	Number and percentage of program youth completing program requirements.	<p>The number and percentage of program youth who have successfully fulfilled all program obligations and requirements. This does not include youth who are still in ongoing programs. Program obligations will vary by program, but should be a predefined list of requirements or obligations that clients must meet before program completion.</p> <p>The total number of youth includes those youth who have exited successfully and unsuccessfully.</p>	<p>Number of program youth who exited the program having completed program requirements.</p> <p>Total number of youth who exited the program during the reporting period.</p>
	Percentage of youth exhibiting desired change in the targeted behavior.	The number and percentage of youth who have exhibited a desired change in the targeted behavior during the reporting period or 6-12 months post program completion. The behavior targeted will depend on specific program goals and activities and may include antisocial behavior, family relationships, social competence, etc.).	<p>Number of youth served during the reporting period with the noted behavioral change.</p> <p>Total number of youth receiving services for target behavior during the reporting period.</p>

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Definition	Data Grantee Provides
	Number and percentage of program youth who offend or re-offend.	The number and percentage of participating program youth who were arrested or seen at a juvenile court for a delinquent offense during the reporting period or 6-12 months post program completion. Appropriate for any youth-serving program. Official records (police, juvenile court) are the preferred data source.	Number of program youth tracked during the reporting period. Number of program youth who had an arrest or delinquent offense during the reporting period.
	Number and percentage of program youth who are victimized or revictimized.	The measure determines the number of program youth who are harmed or adversely affected by someone else's criminal actions. Victimization can be physical or psychological; it also includes harm or adverse effects to youth's property. The re-victimization measure counts the number of youth who experienced subsequent victimization. The number of youth tracked should reflect the number of program youth that are followed or monitored for victimization. Ideally this number should be all youth served by the program during the reporting period.	Number of program youth tracked during the reporting period for victimization. Of the number of youth tracked, the number of program youth who were victimized or re-victimized.
Category 2: completion of a rigorous evaluation.	Number of new policies, procedures, strategies, or interventions evaluated.	The number of policies, procedures, strategies, or interventions evaluated by type.	Number of new policies, procedures, strategies, or interventions evaluated.
	Number of gaps identified as a result of research.	The number of gaps identified as a result of research which would further information about evidence-based practices.	Number of gaps identified.
	Number of documents published.	Documents published may include peer-reviewed, scientific journal articles, and/or (if appropriate) law review journal articles, book chapter(s) or book(s) in the academic press).	Number of documents published.

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

- Letters of support/memoranda of understanding. As described under Eligibility, page 1, applicants should submit signed and dated letters of support or memorandum of understanding to demonstrate they have a practitioner-researcher partnership with an applicant in the alternate solicitation category and any other partners designated in the proposal that include the following:
 - Expression of support for the program and a statement of willingness to participate and collaborate with it.
 - Description of the partner’s current role and responsibilities in the planning process and expected responsibilities when the program is operational.
 - Estimate of the percent of time that the partner will devote to the planning and operation of the project.
 - Letters of support may be addressed to OJJDP Administrator Robert L. Listenbee. During the review process, OJJDP will consider only letters of support that are submitted by the due date and with the full application.
- Bibliography/references.
- Any tools/instruments, questionnaires, tables/charts/graphs, or maps pertaining to the proposed project that are supplemental to such items included in the main body of the narrative.
- *Curriculum vitae* or résumés of the principal investigator and any and all co-principal investigators and project director. In addition, *curriculum vitae*, résumés, or biographical sketches of all other individuals (regardless of investigator status) who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposal (including, for example, individuals, such as statisticians serving as consultants to conduct proposed data analysis).
- List (to the extent known) of all proposed project staff members, including those affiliated with the applicant organization or any proposed subrecipient organization(s), any proposed consultant(s) and contractors (whether individuals or organizations), and any proposed members of an advisory board for the project (if applicable). The list should include for each individual and organization: name, title (if applicable), employer or other organizational affiliation, and roles and responsibilities proposed for the project. Applicants should use the [“Proposed Project Staff, Affiliation, and Roles”](#) form to provide this listing.
- Proposed project timeline and expected milestones.
- List of any previous and current OJJDP awards to applicant organization and investigator(s), including the OJJDP-assigned award numbers and a brief description of any scholarly products that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the OJJDP award(s). (See “Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products” under “Program-Specific Information,” above, for definition of “scholarly products.”)

- Data archiving plan. Applicants should anticipate that OJJDP will require (through special award conditions) that they submit data sets resulting in whole or in part from projects funded under this solicitation for archiving with the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data.

Applicants should include a brief statement (less than one page) labeled “Data Archiving Plan” that documents how they will comply with OJJDP data archiving requirements. Grantees must work with OJJDP and/or its designee (e.g., National Archive of Criminal Justice Data) to develop a plan to archive the research data for public use, with a specific schedule, tasks, and milestones. The plan will be due to OJJDP as part of the Data Preparation and Archiving for information about what is included in a data archiving plan within 12 months of the project period start date. See the NACJD Guide to Social Science.

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

4. Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

OJJDP will fund awards awards for as much as \$250,000 for a project period of 12 months, beginning on October 1, 2016.

OJJDP may provide supplemental funding in future years to awards made under this solicitation. OJJDP estimates that any such supplemental funding may be as much as \$250,000 per year over the 5-year project period (for a total of \$1.25 million per project). Important considerations in decisions regarding supplemental funding in years 2-5 include, among other factors, the availability of funding, strategic priorities, assessment of the quality of the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and assessment of the progress of the work funded under the award.

Applicants should submit a complete year 1 budget not to exceed \$250,000. For planning purposes, applicants should also include in their application materials draft budgets for as many as 4 additional years (for as much as \$250,000 per year).

For planning purposes, both categories of applicants should anticipate, at a minimum, the activities for each year will include: year 1 as a planning year; years 2-3 as implementation years; year 4 as a data collection follow-up year; and year 5 for dissemination activities.

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

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

- Budget Detail Worksheet.** A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf. Applicants that submit their budget in a different format should include the budget categories listed in

the sample budget worksheet. (Work associated with satisfying data archiving requirements should be reflected.) OJJDP expects applicants to provide a thorough narrative to each section of the Budget Detail Worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet should be broken down by year.

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

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

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

- c. Noncompetitive procurement contracts in excess of simplified acquisition threshold.** If an applicant proposes to make one or more noncompetitive procurements of products or services, where the noncompetitive procurement will exceed the simplified acquisition threshold (also known as the small purchase threshold), which is currently set at \$150,000, the application should address the considerations outlined in the [Financial Guide](#).
- d. Preagreement cost approvals.** For information on preagreement costs approvals, see Section [B. Federal Award Information](#).

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs are allowed only under the following circumstances:

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

Attach a copy of the federally approved indirect cost rate agreement to the application. Applicants that do not have an approved rate may request one through their cognizant federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or, if the applicant's accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct cost categories. For the definition of Cognizant Federal Agency, see the "Glossary of Terms" in the [Financial Guide](#). For assistance with identifying your cognizant agency, contact the Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov. If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain

information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at <http://www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf>.

In order to use the *de minimis* indirect rate, attach written documentation to the application that advises OJP of both the applicant's eligibility (to use the *de minimis* rate) and its election. If the applicant elects the *de minimis* method, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. In addition, if this method is chosen, then it must be used consistently for all federal awards until such time as you choose to negotiate a federally approved indirect cost rate.¹⁰

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

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

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

7. Applicant Disclosure of High-Risk Status

Applicants are to disclose whether they are currently designated high risk by another federal grant making agency. This includes any status requiring additional oversight by the federal agency due to past programmatic or financial concerns. If an applicant is designated high risk by another federal grant making agency, you must email the following information to OJPCComplianceReporting@usdoj.gov at the time of application submission:

- The federal agency that currently designated the applicant as high risk.
- Date the applicant was designated high risk.
- The high-risk point of contact name, phone number, and email address, from that federal agency.

¹⁰ See 2 C.F.R. § 200.414(f).

- Reasons for the high-risk status.

OJP seeks this information to ensure appropriate federal oversight of any grant award. Disclosing this high-risk information does not disqualify any organization from receiving an OJP award. However, additional grant oversight may be included, if necessary, in award documentation.

8. Additional Attachments

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

- a. Applicant disclosure of pending applications.**¹¹ Applicants are to disclose whether they have pending applications for federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget narrative and worksheet in the application under this solicitation. The disclosure should include both direct applications for federal funding (e.g., applications to federal agencies) and indirect applications for such funding (e.g., applications to state agencies that will subaward federal funds).

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

Applicants that have pending applications as described above are to provide the following information about pending applications submitted within the last 12 months:

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

¹¹ Typically, the applicant is not the principal investigator; rather, the applicant, most frequently, is the institution, organization, or company in which the principal investigator is employed.

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

Applicants should include the table as a separate attachment to their application. The file should be named “Disclosure of Pending Applications.”

Applicants that do not have pending applications as described above are to include a statement to this effect in the separate attachment page (e.g., “[Applicant Name on SF-424] does not have pending applications submitted within the last 12 months for federally funded grants or subgrants (including cooperative agreements) that include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed under this solicitation and will cover the identical cost items outlined in the budget narrative and worksheet in the application under this solicitation.”).

b. Research and evaluation independence and integrity. If a proposal involves research and/or evaluation, regardless of the proposal’s other merits, in order to receive funds, the applicant must demonstrate research/evaluation independence, including appropriate safeguards to ensure research/evaluation objectivity and integrity, both in this proposal and as it may relate to the applicant’s other current or prior related projects. This documentation may be included as an attachment to the application which addresses BOTH i. and ii. below.

i. For purposes of this solicitation, applicants must document research and evaluation independence and integrity by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:

a. A specific assurance that the applicant has reviewed its proposal to identify any research integrity issues (including all principal investigators and subrecipients) and it has concluded that the design, conduct, or reporting of research and evaluation funded by OJJDP grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts will not be biased by any personal or financial conflict of interest on the part of part of its staff, consultants, and/or subrecipients responsible for the research and evaluation or on the part of the applicant organization;

OR

b. A specific listing of actual or perceived conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified in relation to this proposal. These conflicts could be either personal (related to specific staff, consultants, and/or subrecipients) or organizational (related to the applicant or any subgrantee organization). Examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations may include, but are not limited to, those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse’s work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former or current

colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization could not be given a grant to evaluate a project if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that specific project or a location implementing the project (whether funded by OJP or other sources), as the organization in such an instance would appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability of an evaluation or research product is a problem and must be disclosed.

- ii. In addition, for purposes of this solicitation applicants must address the issue of possible mitigation of research integrity concerns by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:
 - a. If an applicant reasonably believes that no potential personal or organizational conflicts of interest exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. Applicants MUST also include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant will put in place to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or subrecipients for this particular project, should that be necessary during the grant period. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard could include organizational codes of ethics/conduct or policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest.

OR

- b. If the applicant has identified specific personal or organizational conflicts of interest in its proposal during this review, the applicant must propose a specific and robust mitigation plan to address conflicts noted above. At a minimum, the plan must include specific processes and procedures that the applicant will put in place to eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or subrecipients for this particular project, should that be necessary during the grant period. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard could include organizational codes of ethics/conduct or policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

Considerations in assessing research and evaluation independence and integrity will include, but are not be limited to, the adequacy of the applicant's efforts to identify factors that could affect the objectivity or integrity of the proposed staff and/or the organization in carrying out the research, development, or evaluation activity; and the adequacy of the applicant's existing or proposed remedies to control any such factors.

9. Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire

In accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.205, federal agencies must have in place a framework to evaluate the risks posed by applicants before they receive a federal award. To facilitate part of this risk evaluation, all applicants (other than an individual) are to download, complete, and submit this [form](#).

10. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

All applicants must complete this information. Applicants that expend any funds for lobbying activities are to provide the detailed information requested on the form [Disclosure of Lobbying Activities \(SF-LLL\)](#). Applicants that do not expend any funds for lobbying activities are to enter “N/A” in the text boxes for item 10 (“a. Name and Address of Lobbying Registrant” and “b. Individuals Performing Services”).

How To Apply

Applicants must register in, and submit applications through Grants.gov, a primary source to find federal funding opportunities and apply for funding. Find complete instructions on how to register and submit an application at www.Grants.gov. Applicants that experience technical difficulties during this process should call the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at **800-518-4726** or **606-545-5035**, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except federal holidays. Registering with Grants.gov is a one-time process; however, **processing delays may occur, and it can take several weeks** for first-time registrants to receive confirmation and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications 72 hours prior to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

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

Note on Attachments. Grants.gov has two categories of files for attachments: mandatory and optional. OJP receives all files attached in both categories. Please ensure all required documents are attached in the mandatory category.

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

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

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

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

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

OJP may not make a federal award to an applicant organization until the organization has complied with all applicable DUNS and SAM requirements. If an applicant has not fully complied with the requirements by the time the federal awarding agency is ready to make a federal award, the federal awarding agency may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive a federal award and use that determination as a basis for making a federal award to another applicant.

- 1. Acquire a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number.** In general, the Office of Management and Budget requires that all applicants (other than individuals) for federal funds include a DUNS number in their applications for a new award or a supplement to an existing award. A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit sequence recognized as the universal standard for identifying and differentiating entities receiving federal funds. The identifier is used for tracking purposes and to validate address and point of contact information for federal assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. The DUNS number will be used throughout the grant life cycle. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, one-time activity. Call Dun and Bradstreet at 866–705–5711 to obtain a DUNS number or apply online at www.dnb.com. A DUNS number is usually received within 1-2 business days.
- 2. Acquire registration with the System for Award Management (SAM).** SAM is the repository for standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. OJP requires all applicants (other than individuals) for federal financial assistance to maintain current registrations in the SAM database. Applicants must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Applicants must **update or renew their SAM registration annually** to maintain an active status. SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete.

Applications cannot be successfully submitted in Grants.gov until Grants.gov receives the SAM registration information. The information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take up to 48 hours. OJP recommends that the applicant register or renew registration with SAM as early as possible.

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

3. **Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. The applicant organization's DUNS number must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process, go to www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html.
4. **Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.
5. **Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number for this solicitation is 16.726, titled "Juvenile Mentoring Program" and the funding opportunity number is OJJDP-2016-9053.
6. **Select the correct Competition ID.** Some OJP solicitations posted to Grants.gov contain multiple purpose areas, denoted by the individual Competition ID. If applying to a solicitation with multiple Competition IDs, select the appropriate Competition ID for the intended purpose area of the application

Category 1: Program Development and Implementation. Competition ID OJJDP-2016-9166.

Category 2: Evaluation. Competition ID OJJDP-2016-9167.

7. **Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application and the second will state whether the application has been successfully validated, or rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges applicants to submit applications **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. Applicants must submit their applications and have received a validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. ET on June 13, 2016.

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

Note: Duplicate Applications. If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, OJJDP will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted. See Note on File Names and File Types under [How To Apply](#).

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

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

Note: OJJDP does not automatically approve requests. After the program office reviews the submission, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to validate the reported technical issues, OJP will inform the applicant whether the request to submit a late application has been approved or denied. If OJP determines that the applicant failed to follow all required procedures, which resulted in an untimely application submission, OJP will deny the applicant's request to submit their application.

The following conditions are generally insufficient to justify late submissions:

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

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

E. Application Review Information

Selection Criteria

Applications that meet basic minimum requirements will be evaluated by peer reviewers using the following review criteria.

Statement of the Problem and Objectives (understanding of the problem, the objectives, and their importance) – 10 percent

1. Demonstrated understanding of the problem and project objectives.
2. Demonstrated awareness of the state of current research.

Project Design and Implementation (Quality and technical merit) – 40 percent

1. Soundness of program/research methods and analytic and technical approach to addressing the stated aim(s) of the proposed project.
2. Feasibility of the proposed project.
3. Awareness of potential pitfalls of proposed project design and feasibility of proposed actions to minimize and/or mitigate them.
4. Likelihood of proposed approach to address the key objectives outlined under the Program Specific Information, Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables.

Potential Impact – 20 percent

Potential for a significant scientific or technical advance(s) that will improve criminal/juvenile justice in the United States, such as—

1. Potential for significantly improved understanding of the stated criminal/juvenile justice problem.
2. Potential for innovative solution to address (all or a significant part of) the stated criminal/juvenile justice problem.
3. Potential for external validity, replicability, and scalability.

Capabilities/Competencies (Capabilities, demonstrated productivity, and experience of the applicant organization and proposed project staff) – 30 percent

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

Budget

Peer reviewers will consider and may comment on the following additional items in the context of scientific and technical merit.

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

Review Process

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

Peer reviewers will review the applications submitted under this solicitation that meet basic minimum requirements. For purposes of assessing whether applicants have met basic minimum requirements, OJP screens applications for compliance with specified program requirements to help determine which applications should proceed to further consideration for award. Although program requirements may vary, the following are common requirements applicable to all solicitations for funding under OJP grant programs:

- Applications must be submitted by an eligible type of applicant.
- Applications must request funding within programmatic funding constraints (if applicable).
- Applications must be responsive to the scope of the solicitation.
- Applications must include all items designated as critical elements.
- Applicants will be checked against the System for Award Management (SAM).

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

OJJDP may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications meeting basic minimum requirements on technical merit using the solicitation’s selection criteria. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is not a current DOJ employee. An internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. A peer review panel will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements.

Applicants under this program must have entered into a practitioner-researcher partnership consisting of a practitioner/service provider (applying under Category 1) and an evaluator/research institution (applying under Category 2). The corresponding/partnering Category 1 and 2 applications will be assigned to the same peer reviewers for review. The peer reviewers will assess each individual application based on the selection criteria noted above and assign numeric values for the criteria (peer review scores); at the conclusion of the assessment, the Category 1 and Category 2 scores will be averaged into a composite “partnership” score. Final selection will consider the composite score as well as other factors noted below.

OJP reviews applications for potential discretionary awards to evaluate the risks posed by applicants before they receive an award. This review may include but is not limited to the following:

1. Financial stability and fiscal integrity.

2. Quality of management systems and ability to meet the management standards prescribed in the [Financial Guide](#).
3. History of performance.
4. Reports and findings from audits.
5. The applicant's ability to effectively implement statutory, regulatory, or other requirements imposed on award recipients.
6. Proposed costs to determine if the Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative accurately explain project costs, and whether those costs are reasonable, necessary, and allowable under applicable federal cost principles and agency regulations.

For Category 1 applicants, the Assistant Attorney General will make all final award decisions. For Category 2 applicants, the OJJDP Administrator will make all final award decisions. Peer reviewers' ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although their views are considered carefully. In addition to peer review ratings, considerations for award recommendations and decisions may include, but are not limited to, planned scholarly products, proposed budgets, past performance (including scholarly products) under prior OJJDP and OJP awards, research independence and integrity, strategic priorities, past performance under prior OJJDP and OJP awards, and available funding when making awards.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

OJP sends award notification by email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions on how to access and view the award documents, and how to accept the award in GMS. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9 p.m. ET on the award date (by September 30, 2016). Recipients will be required to login; accept any outstanding assurances and certifications on the award; designate a financial point of contact; and review, sign, and accept the award. The award acceptance process involves physical signature of the award document by the authorized representative and the scanning of the fully-executed award document to OJP.

Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements

If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the agency-approved project proposal and budget, the recipient must comply with award terms and conditions, and other legal requirements, that are included in the award, incorporated into the award by reference, or are otherwise applicable to the award. OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review the information pertaining to these requirements **prior** to submitting an application. To assist applicants and recipients in accessing and reviewing this information, OJP has placed it on its [Solicitation Requirements](#) page of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

Please note in particular the following two forms, which applicants must submit in GMS prior to the receipt of any award funds, as each details legal requirements with which applicants must provide specific assurances and certifications of compliance. Applicants may view these forms in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#) and are strongly encouraged to review and consider them carefully prior to making an application for OJP grant funds.

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

Upon grant approval, OJP electronically transmits (via GMS) the award document to the prospective award recipient. In addition to other award information, the award document contains award terms and conditions that specify national policy requirements¹² with which recipients of federal funding must comply; uniform administrative requirements, cost principles, and audit requirements; and program-specific terms and conditions required based on applicable program (statutory) authority or requirements set forth in OJP solicitations and program announcements. For example, certain efforts may call for special requirements, terms, or conditions relating to intellectual property, data/information-sharing or -access, or information security; or audit requirements, expenditures and milestones, or publications and/or press releases.

OJP also may place additional terms and conditions on an award based on its risk assessment of the applicant, or for other reasons it determines necessary to fulfill the goals and objectives of the program.

Prospective applicants may access and review the text of mandatory conditions OJP includes in all OJP awards, as well as the text of certain other conditions, such as administrative conditions, via OJP's [Mandatory Award Terms and Conditions](#) page of the [Funding Resource Center](#).

Human Subjects and Privacy Certificate

DOJ regulations (28 C.F.R. Part 46) protect the human subjects of federally funded research. Part 46 requires that an Institutional Review Board, in accordance with the regulations, review and approve most research involving human subjects that any federal department or agency conducts or supports before an award recipient may expend federal funds for that research. As a rule, persons who participate in federally funded research must provide their informed consent and must be permitted to terminate their participation at any time. Funding recipients, before they will be allowed to spend OJP funds on any research activity involving human subjects, must submit appropriate documentation to OJP showing compliance with 28 C.F.R. Part 46 requirements, as requested by OJP.

DOJ regulations (28 C.F.R. Part 22) require recipients of OJP funding to submit a Privacy Certificate as a condition of approval of any grant application or contract proposal that contains a research or statistical component under which "information identifiable to a private person" will be collected, analyzed, used, or disclosed. The funding recipient's

¹² See generally 2 C.F.R. 200.300 (provides a general description of national policy requirements typically applicable to recipients of Federal awards, including the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA)).

Privacy Certificate includes a description of its policies and procedures to be followed to protect the confidentiality of identifiable data (28 C.F.R. § 22.23). The Department's regulations provide, among other matters, that: "Research or statistical information identifiable to a private person may be used only for research or statistical purposes (28 C.F.R. § 22.21)." Moreover, any private person from whom information identifiable to a private person is collected or obtained (either orally or by means of written questionnaire or other document) must be advised that the information will only be used or disclosed for research or statistical purposes and that compliance with the request for information is voluntary and may be terminated at any time (28 C.F.R. § 22.27).

Applicants selected for an award will be required to submit all appropriate IRB and privacy documents prior to spending OJP funds for research-related activities.

General Information About Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

Recipients must submit quarterly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports, final financial and progress reports, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements. Applicants should anticipate that progress reports will be required to follow the non-budgetary components of the Research Performance Progress Report (RPPR) template/format. General information on RPPRs may be found at www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/rppr/. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent.

Special Reporting requirements may be required by OJP depending on the statutory, legislative or administrative requirements of the recipient or the program.

As indicated earlier in this solicitation, OJJDP expects scholarly products to result from any award under this solicitation. Please review the [Goals, Objectives, Deliverables, and Expected Scholarly Products](#) segment of the "Program-Specific Information" section of this solicitation, as well as the "Performance Measures" section.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For additional Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s), see the title page.

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

H. Other Information

Provide Feedback to OJP

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

IMPORTANT: This e-mail is for feedback and suggestions only. Replies are not sent from this mailbox. If you have specific questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation, you must directly contact the appropriate number or e-mail listed on the front of this solicitation document. These contacts are provided to help ensure that you can directly reach an individual who can address your specific questions in a timely manner.

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, please e-mail your résumé to ojppeerreview@lmsolas.com. The OJP Solicitation Feedback email account will not forward your résumé. Note: Neither you nor anyone else from your organization can be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization have submitted an application.

Application Checklist

OJJDP FY 2016 Practitioner-Researcher Partnership in Cognitive Behavioral Mentoring Program

This application checklist has been created to assist in developing an application.

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

_____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 31)

_____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 31)

To Register with Grants.gov:

_____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 32)

_____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 32)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

_____ Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 32)

_____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package

_____ Sign up for Grants.gov [email](#) notifications (optional) (see page 30)

_____ Select the correct Competition ID (see page 32)

_____ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)

_____ Read [OJP policy and guidance](#) on conference approval, planning, and reporting

After application submission, receive Grants.gov email notifications that:

_____ (1) application has been received

_____ (2) application has either been validated or rejected (see page 32)

If no Grants.gov receipt, and validation or error notifications are received:

_____ Contact the Response Center at grants@ncjrs.gov regarding technical difficulties.

_____ Please refer to the section: Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues
(see page 33)

General Requirements:

_____ Review the [Solicitation Requirements](#) in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

Scope Requirement:

_____ The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit within the category you are applying under.

_____ **Category 1:** The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit of \$1.25 million.

_____ **Category 2:** The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit of \$1.25 million.

Eligibility Requirement:

_____ State, territory, unit of local government, federally recognized Indian tribal government, nonprofit or for-profit organization, tribal nonprofit or for-profit organization, institution of higher education, tribal institution of higher education, or a qualified individual.

_____ Foreign governments, foreign organizations, and foreign institutions of higher education are not eligible to apply.

_____ Applicant must document in their application that they have a partnered with an organization that will submit an application under the alternate category.

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 15)
- _____ Project Abstract (see page 15)
- _____ Program Narrative (see page 16)
- _____ Appendices (see page 22)
- _____ Budget Detail Worksheet and Narrative (see page 24)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 25)
- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 26)
- _____ Applicant Disclosure of High-Risk Status (see page 26)
- _____ Additional Attachments (see page 27)
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity
 - _____ Logic model
 - _____ Timeline or milestone chart
 - _____ Résumés of all key personnel
 - _____ Job descriptions outlining roles and responsibilities for all key positions
 - _____ Letters of support/memoranda of understanding from partner organizations
 - _____ Evidence of nonprofit status, e.g., a copy of the tax exemption letter from the Internal Revenue Service, if applicable.
 - _____ Evidence of for-profit status, e.g., a copy of the articles of incorporation, if applicable.
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 30)
- _____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 30)
- _____ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable) (see page 13)