

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
*Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring,
Apprehending, Registering and Tracking*



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering and Tracking](#) (SMART Office) is seeking applications to validate an existing sex offense-specific risk assessment scale, or develop a new culturally specific scale, for American Indian/Alaska Native populations. This program furthers the Department's mission by supporting the SMART Office in assisting states, the District of Columbia, territories, and tribal jurisdictions with developing and/or enhancing a program designed to implement the requirements of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (SORNA) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, and to promote innovation and best practices in the field of sex offender management.

SMART FY 17 Developing or Validating a Risk Assessment Instrument for American Indian/Alaska Native Populations

Applications Due: June 21, 2017

Eligibility

Eligible applicants are institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education); non-profit and/or for profit organizations (including tribal nonprofit and for-profit organizations); national membership organizations, non-government organizations. For-profit organizations (as well as other recipients) must forgo any profit or management fee.

The SMART Office welcomes applications under which two or more entities would carry out the federal award; however, only one entity may be the applicant. Any others must be proposed as subrecipients ("subgrantees").¹ The applicant must be the entity that would have primary responsibility for carrying out the award, including administering the funding and managing the entire project. Under this solicitation, only one application by any particular applicant entity will be considered. An entity may, however, be proposed as a subrecipient ("subgrantee") in more than one application.

¹ For additional information on subawards, see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

The SMART Office may elect to fund applications submitted under this FY 2017 solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on, among other considerations, the merit of the applications and on the availability of appropriations.

Deadline

Applicants must register with [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) prior to submitting an application. All applications are due by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on June 21, 2017.

To be considered timely, an application must be submitted by the application deadline using Grants.gov, and the applicant must have received a validation message from Grants.gov that indicates successful and timely submission. OJP urges applicants to submit applications at least 72 hours prior to the application due date, in order to allow time for the applicant to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

OJP encourages all applicants to read this [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#).

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

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 800-518-4726 or 606-545-5035, or via email to support@grants.gov. The [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) Support Hotline operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on federal holidays.

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must email the SMART Office contact identified below **within 24 hours after the application deadline** in order to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. Additional information on reporting technical issues appears under “Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues” in the [How to Apply](#) section.

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact Marnie Dollinger, by telephone at (202) 305-2150, or by email at Marnie.Dollinger2@usdoj.gov or Amy Staubs at (202) 307-5762 or Amy.Staubs@usdoj.gov.

Grants.gov number assigned to this solicitation: SMART-2017-4962

Release date: May 22, 2017

Contents

A. Program Description.....	4
Overview	4
Project-Specific Information.....	4
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables	6
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices.....	7
B. Federal Award Information	8
Type of Award.....	8
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	8
Budget Information.....	9
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement	9
Pre-Agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs)	9
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver.....	10
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	10
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable).....	10
C. Eligibility Information	11
D. Application and Submission Information	11
What an Application Should Include.....	11
How to Apply	25
E. Application Review Information	28
Review Criteria.....	28
Review Process	30
F. Federal Award Administration Information.....	31
Federal Award Notices	31
Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements	32
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements.....	33
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	33
H. Other Information	33
Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a).....	33
Provide Feedback to OJP.....	34
Application Checklist.....	35

SMART FY 17 Developing or Validating a Risk Assessment Instrument for American Indian/Alaska Native Populations

CFDA # 16.203

A. Program Description

Overview

The SMART Office seeks applications for the development or validation of a sex offense-specific assessment scale that predicts risk to reoffend sexually in American Indian and Alaskan Native populations in the United States. This program furthers the SMART Office's Promoting Evidence Integration in Sex Offender Management work, including the [Native American Sex Offender Management](#) (NASOM) project and the [Sex Offender Management Assessment and Planning Initiative](#) (SOMAPI), projects designed to assess the state of research and practice in sex offender management and to inform the Office of Justice Programs' research and grant-making efforts in this area.

Statutory Authority: This program is authorized by Pub. Law 109-248.

Project-Specific Information

Risk assessment has evolved from a process that once was based primarily upon clinical judgment to more modern approaches that incorporate scientifically tested, actuarial measures. These modern approaches provide a more accurate picture of risk and needs as they rely on objective and empirically validated information rather than the subjective insight of an individual. As a result, criminal justice professionals have more scales to develop targeted supervision and treatment strategies for sex offenders. These approaches can benefit jurisdictions through better allocation of scarce resources and can increase public safety by targeting the highest risk individuals to receive increased and intensive treatment and supervision.

Over the past eight years, the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) has contributed to the knowledge base of risk and needs assessment. In 2008, OJP's SMART Office and National Institute of Justice (NIJ) funded an evaluation of two adult risk assessment scales, Sex Offender Treatment Intervention and Progress Scale (SOTIPS) and the Static-99R, to determine whether the combined use of these scales would result in more accurate risk predictions in the State of Vermont. Results showed that the combined use of these scales improved risk prediction accuracy more than either scale used alone. In 2012, SMART and NIJ funded a replication and evaluation of this model in two additional jurisdictions. In 2013, SMART and NIJ funded a project to improve knowledge of and the accuracy and efficacy of risk assessment scales in the field of juvenile justice, as there is currently a dearth of knowledge on static and dynamic risk assessments for juveniles who commit sex offenses. These projects are ongoing and results are not yet available for dissemination.

While sex offender risk assessment continues to be validated and revised based on current research and the expanding knowledge of sexual offending; the populations used to validate

risk assessment instruments remain primarily Caucasian. For evaluators involved in the assessment of AI/AN sex offenders, an important issue to consider is whether the available assessment scales (and their items) are equally predictive for both indigenous and non-indigenous sex offenders. Differences between these groups on key characteristics related to criminal behavior (e.g., deviant sexual interest, substance abuse) may not mean that available risk scales are invalid for AI/AN sex offenders but preliminary findings indicating differences should, however, motivate an examination of possible differences in the accuracy of these risk scales in predicting reoffending or the effect of interventions on treatment and management.² A few studies have evaluated the cross-cultural use of risk assessment instruments on populations of diversity including Aboriginal sex offenders in Canada and Australia³, however, the indigenous populations of the United States remain an understudied group in the sexual offending and risk assessment arenas.⁴

Assessments are administered throughout the criminal and juvenile justice process (i.e., courts, adjudication, disposition, corrections, supervision, and treatment). The point in the process at which an assessment is administered, as well as the purpose of the evaluation, may have significant impact on the evaluation. Within the context of treatment, assessment is typically used to set a baseline assignment of risk and to then periodically reevaluate risk during the course of treatment. In addition, the risk assessment process can be used to determine the type and intensity of treatment needed and to help define targets (i.e., dynamic factors or criminogenic needs) for treatment and case management.⁵ Because dynamic risk factors are potentially changeable, assessment instruments offer direction to providers about which problems to target in order to reduce risk to reoffend. Assessing dynamic risk at regular intervals during the course of services may be important in helping providers adjust the intensity and duration of interventions to match participants changing risk and needs,⁶ with the ultimate goal of reducing risk to reoffend sexually and treatment completion.

Assessment scales are an important scale for managing persons who have committed sexual offenses. Further, they may inform sentencing decisions, correctional programming, reentry, and post-incarceration supervision and treatment plans. However, there are no actuarial risk assessments available that have been normed or validated on AI/AN populations. These populations may have particular factors that could weight a risk assessment scale to either assess risk as too high or too low making its application invalid. In the assessment of dynamic risk, factors based on individual needs that can change, AI/AN populations may have specific needs not addressed by current dynamic risk factors.

² Hanson, R. K. (2012). "Risk Assessment for Aboriginal Sex Offenders." Research Summary, Public Safety Canada. Vol 17, No. 4.

³ Allan A & Dawson D 2002. [Developing a unique risk of violence tool for Australian Indigenous offenders](#) CRC 6/00-01 Canberra: Criminology Research Council

⁴ Bonta, J., LaPrairie, C., & Wallace-Capretta, S. (1997). Risk prediction and reoffending: Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal offenders. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 39, 127-144.

British Columbia Public Safety and Solicitor General. (2004). *Female and male community risk needs assessment: Data from Aboriginal offenders assessed in 1998*. British Columbia, Canada: Corrections Branch.

⁵ See: http://www.smart.gov/SOMAPI/sec2/ch4_risk.html

⁶ McGrath, R. J., Lasher, M. P., and Cumming, G. F. (2011). "A Model of Static and Dynamic Sex Offender Risk Assessment," <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/236217.pdf>.

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

With this solicitation, the SMART Office seeks applications for funding the basic scientific research in the development and validation of a dynamic risk assessment scale for American Indians/Alaskan Natives who commit sex offenses designed for use by professionals in measuring risk to reoffend sexually and identifying dynamic risk factors for treatment and reentry.

The project objectives include:

- Develop and validate an assessment scale that incorporates static and dynamic factors that assesses an AI/AN offender's risk to reoffend sexually.
- Produce a reliable and valid set of static and dynamic factors for sexually offending behavior in the AI/AN population, and provide empirical evidence concerning both the inter-rater reliability and predictive validity of assessment scales for sexually offending behavior within this population.
- Evaluate the implementation, impact and efficacy of incorporating the scale into treatment and reentry programs.
- Implement the scale in up to five sites and validate the scale in each.

Applicants may validate a risk assessment scale currently available in the field or develop a scale for the purposes of this solicitation. A justification for the scale selected should be made and included in the proposal.

The Goals, Objectives and Deliverables are directly related to the performance measures set out in the table in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#), under "Program Narrative."

Site Selection

The assessment scale should be validated in up to five sites that are geographically and demographically diverse. The sites should have a combined minimum of 300 - 500 AI/AN offenders that can be included in the project. The applicant should provide evidence of the sites' case flow and population of offenders who have committed sex offenses. The sites should have automated data and information systems in place capable of tracking AI/AN participants who commit sex offenses in the study. Evidence of these data systems and their capabilities should be described in the application. Applicants may include financial incentives in their proposed project budgets to encourage site participation. The sites selected to participate in the project will not receive additional funding from the SMART Office to implement the validated assessment scale or to develop a scale.

Applicants are encouraged to include a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Letter of Intent from each site detailing their commitment to participate in the project in their submitted application. This document should be provided to SMART before an award is made. A special condition will be attached to the award stipulating that the grantee may not obligate, expend, or drawdown any project funds until SMART has received an MOU or Letter of Intent from the participating sites.

The selected grantee will be responsible for the following activities:

- Work collaboratively with the selected sites to incorporate the scale selected or developed for this project into a sex offender management program and training professionals in its use.
- Work with the selected sites to track and document the implementation of the assessment scales.
- Evaluate the implementation, impact and efficacy of incorporating the scale into treatment and reentry programs.
- Verify the data infrastructure and data collection capabilities of the selected sites, and provide training on data-related issues, if applicable.
- Report and disseminate interim and final project results.

Project Deliverables and Other Project Activities

The following deliverables will be submitted to the SMART Office at the end of the project period:

- A final report and an executive summary that details (1) the development or modification and validation of the assessment scale, (2) the implementation, impact and efficacy of incorporating the scale into the treatment program, (3) significant findings, (4) any significant policy implications and lessons learned, and (5) a general description of the methods used and activities performed.
- A copy of the assessment scale developed for the purposes of the project or the existing scale implemented and validated for the project as well as all corresponding and relevant materials.

Applicants are encouraged to submit a copy of the assessment scale to be used for this project if it has been developed or is in use at the time of application.

Other expected deliverables for this project include:

- Monthly conference calls with the SMART program manager to review progress and address issues.
- Bi-monthly progress reports to keep SMART apprised of the current status of the project. Additional information about the content of the progress reports and their due dates will be provided once an award is made. A final progress report and a task activity summary will be submitted at the end of the performance period. The task activity summary shall address activities undertaken to achieve completion of this project.
- Data sets resulting from this research will be submitted as a product or deliverable for archiving, if applicable.

Evidence-Based Programs or Practices

OJP strongly emphasizes the use of data and evidence in policy making and program development in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services. OJP is committed to:

- Improving the quantity and quality of evidence OJP generates

- Integrating evidence into program, practice, and policy decisions within OJP and the field
- Improving the translation of evidence into practice

OJP considers programs and practices to be evidence-based when their effectiveness has been demonstrated by causal evidence, generally obtained through one or more outcome evaluations. Causal evidence documents a relationship between an activity or intervention (including technology) and its intended outcome, including measuring the direction and size of a change, and the extent to which a change may be attributed to the activity or intervention. Causal evidence depends on the use of scientific methods to rule out, to the extent possible, alternative explanations for the documented change. The strength of causal evidence, based on the factors described above, will influence the degree to which OJP considers a program or practice to be evidence-based. The OJP CrimeSolutions.gov website is one resource that applicants may use to find information about evidence-based programs in criminal justice, juvenile justice, and crime victim services.

B. Federal Award Information

The SMART Office expects to make one award of up to \$1 million for up to a 36-month period of performance, to begin on October 1, 2017.

The SMART Office may, in certain cases, provide additional funding in future years to awards made under this solicitation, through supplemental awards. In making decisions regarding supplemental awards, OJP will consider, among other factors, the availability of appropriations, OJP's strategic priorities, and OJP's assessment of both the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and the progress of the work funded under the award.

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

Type of Award

The SMART Office expects that any award under this solicitation will be made in the form of a cooperative agreement, which is a type of award that provides for OJP to have substantial involvement in carrying out award activities. See [Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements](#), under [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#), for a brief discussion of what may constitute substantial federal involvement.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

Award recipients and subrecipients (including recipients or subrecipients that are pass-through entities⁷) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements⁸ as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303:

⁷ For purposes of this solicitation, the phrase "pass-through entity" includes any recipient or subrecipient that provides a subaward ("subgrant") to a subrecipient ("subgrantee") to carry out part of the funded award or program.

⁸ The "Part 200 Uniform Requirements" means the DOJ regulation at 2 C.F.R Part 2800, which adopts (with certain modifications) the provisions of 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

(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.

To help ensure that applicants understand applicable administrative requirements and cost principles, OJP encourages prospective applicants to enroll, at no charge, in the DOJ Grants Financial Management Online Training, available [here](#).

Budget Information

Permissible uses of funds may include subawards to pilot sites to offset operational costs participating in training on use of and implementation of assessment scales.

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.

Pre-Agreement Costs (also known as Pre-award Costs)

Pre-agreement costs are costs incurred by the applicant prior to the start date of the period of performance of the federal award.

OJP does **not** typically approve pre-agreement costs; an applicant must request and obtain the prior written approval of OJP for all such costs. All such costs incurred prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of the applicant. (Generally, no applicant should incur project costs *before* submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs.) Should there be extenuating circumstances that make it appropriate for OJP to consider approving pre-agreement costs, the applicant may contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this solicitation for the requirements concerning written requests for approval. If approved in advance by OJP, award funds may be used for pre-agreement costs, consistent

with the recipient's approved budget and applicable cost principles. See the section on Costs Requiring Prior Approval in the [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#) for more information.

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, a recipient may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the recipient at a rate that exceeds 110% 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 2017 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 non-federal funds. (Non-federal funds used for any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds, where match requirements apply.) If only a portion of an employee's time is charged to an OJP award, the maximum allowable compensation is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

The Assistant Attorney General for OJP may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, this limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant that requests a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of its application. An applicant that does not submit a waiver request and justification with its application should anticipate that OJP will require the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

The justification should address -- in the context of the work the individual would do under the award -- the particular qualifications and expertise of the individual, the uniqueness of a service the individual will provide, the individual's specific knowledge of the proposed program or project, and a statement that explains whether and how the individual's salary under the award would be commensurate with the regular and customary rate for an individual with his/her qualifications and expertise, and for the work he/she would do under the award.

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

OJP strongly encourages every applicant that proposes to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity (or similar event) to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP and DOJ policy and guidance on approval, planning, and reporting of such events, available at

www.ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm. 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, as well as some conference-, meeting-, and training- costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, which include a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)

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

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

For additional information, see the "Civil Rights Compliance" section under "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards](#)" in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

C. Eligibility Information

For eligibility information, see the title page.

For information on cost sharing or match requirements, see [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

D. Application and Submission Information

What an Application Should Include

This section describes in detail what an application should include. An applicant should anticipate that if it fails to submit an application that contains all of the specified elements, it may negatively affect the review of its application; and, should a decision be made to make an award, it may result in the inclusion of award conditions that preclude the recipient from accessing or using award funds until the recipient satisfies the conditions and OJP makes the funds available.

Moreover, an applicant should anticipate that an application that OJP determines is nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that OJP determines does not include the application elements that the SMART Office has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review, nor receive further consideration. For this solicitation, the SMART Office has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, Budget Narrative, and requested funding amount does not exceed the maximum amount allowable. An applicant may combine the Budget Narrative and the Budget Detail Worksheet in one document. However, if an applicant submits only one budget document, it must contain **both** narrative and detail information. Please review the "Note on File Names and File Types" under [How to Apply](#) (below) 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 the OJP Grants Management System (GMS) take information from the applicant's profile to populate the fields on this form. When selecting "type of applicant," if the applicant is a for-profit entity, select "For-Profit Organization" or "Small Business" (as applicable).

To avoid processing delays, an applicant must include an accurate legal name on its SF-424. Current OJP award recipients, when completing the field for "Legal Name" should use the same legal name that appears on the prior year award document which is also the legal name stored in OJP's financial system. On the SF-424, enter the Legal Name in box 5 and

Employer Identification Number (EIN) in box 6 exactly as it appears on the prior year award document. An applicant with current, active awards must ensure that its GMS profile is current. If the profile is not current, the applicant should submit a Grant Adjustment Notice updating the information on its GMS profile prior to applying under this solicitation.

A new applicant entity should enter the Official Legal Name and address of the applicant entity in box 5 and the EIN in box 6 of the SF-424. Applicants must attach official legal documents to its application (e.g., articles of incorporation, 501(c)(3), etc.) to confirm the legal name, address, and EIN entered into the SF-424.

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

2. Project Abstract

Applications should include a high-quality project abstract that summarizes the proposed project in 400 words or less. 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 (such as Times New Roman) with 1-inch margins

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 available at ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf.

Permission to Share Project Abstract with the Public: It is unlikely that OJP 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 web page available to the public. The intent of this public posting would be to allow other possible funders to become aware of such applications.

In the project abstract template, each applicant is asked to indicate whether it gives OJP permission to share the applicant's project abstract (including contact information for individuals) with the public. Granting (or failing to grant) this permission will not affect OJP's funding decisions. Moreover, if the application is not funded, providing permission will not ensure that OJP will share the abstract information, nor will it assure 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

If the program narrative fails to comply with these length-related restrictions, the SMART Office may consider such noncompliance in peer review and in final award decisions. The program narrative must respond to the solicitation and the selection criteria. Submissions that do not adhere to the format will be deemed ineligible. The program narrative must be double-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with 1-inch margins, and must not exceed 20 pages. Please number pages "1 of 20," "2 of 20," etc.

The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative¹⁰:

a. Statement of the Problem

Applicants must describe the existing challenges and/or complexities in measuring treatment needs and in assessing risk for AI/AN individuals who commit sex offenses. Discussion should highlight the issues associated with assessing this population, including a synopsis of research literature, existing measurement scales, treatment efficacy, recidivism outcomes, and a description of the demographics, offender population, services available to AI/AN populations, and outcome data in the sites intended to be selected in validating the scale.

b. Project Design and Implementation

Applicants must detail how the project will operate during the funding period, align resources to effectively and efficiently implement the proposed project design, and describe the strategy that will be used to implement the proposed project, including project goals and objectives. This section should illustrate what phases and activities are proposed for the project, site selection and implementation of the scale, validation activities, and a description of how the strategy will support the overall goals and objectives. Applicants should include a project timeline, and identify staff responsible for each major task. The key staff performing these responsibilities and percentage of time that they dedicate to these activities should be clearly noted within the budget details worksheet.

c. Capabilities and Competencies

Applicants must document their experience and capabilities to implement the project and the competencies of the staff assigned to the project. This section should include: a description of the management structure and staffing of the project and include information that describes the roles and responsibilities of key organizational and functional components and personnel. This section must describe the experience and capability of the applicant and any contractors that will be used to implement the project and should highlight any previous experience implementing projects of similar design and magnitude. Discussion must demonstrate the applicant's competence and experience in the assessment of AI/AN individuals who commit sexual offenses, as well as experience in developing, implementing, and validating assessment scales. The management and organizational structure described should match the staff needs necessary to accomplish the tasks outlined in the project work plan. Position descriptions and resumes for key positions and personnel must be submitted as an attachment.

¹⁰ For information on subawards (including the details on proposed subawards that should be included in the application), see "Budget and Associated Documentation" under [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#).

- d. Identification of Implementation Partners and Pilot Sites
Applicants must identify any proposed partners and include in the application package MOUs for indicating a commitment to participate in the implementation of this project. If working directly with AI/AN organizations, the MOU must demonstrate an established approval or resolution granting permission to participate from the governing body.
- e. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures
Applicants should describe how performance will be documented, monitored, and evaluated, including how the impact of the strategy implemented and/or enhancement will be determined.

OJP will require each successful applicant to submit specific performance measures data as part of its reporting under the award (see [“General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements”](#) in [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#)). The performance measures correlate to the goals, objectives, and deliverables identified under "Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables" in [Section A. Program Description](#).

The application should describe the applicant's plan for collection of all of the performance measures data listed in the table below under “Data Recipient Provides,” should it receive funding.

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Description	Data Recipient Provides
Develop a validated scale to assess risk and progress.	Number of deliverables that meet expectations. Number of deliverables that are completed on time		Provide a copy of the risk assessment scale
Incorporate the scale into the risk assessment and cognitive-behavioral treatment of AI/AN offenders within a treatment program	Number of agencies/organizations participating in the project Number of AI/AN participants being assessed via the scale		A description of the treatment program, providers, to include the organization type and demographics of AI/AN participants

Conduct training to providers on its use.	Number of training materials developed		Description of training materials and any other materials used in training providers
	Number of hours of training delivered		Number of hours of training delivered to the providers
	Number of participants that complete the training		Number of program providers that complete the training
	Percent of providers trained who reported an increase in knowledge, skills, and/or abilities		Number of providers trained who reported an increase in knowledge, skills, and/or abilities Number of program providers trained
	Percent of providers that rated the training as satisfactory or better		Number of program providers that rated the training as satisfactory or better Number of program providers

			that completed the training
Implement and validate the scale in up to five sites	Number of AI/AN individuals who received an assessment at each site.		A description of the sites' offender population, demographics, and a report describing the validation process and supporting data.
Track offender risk outcomes	Number of risk factors that are predictive of risk to reoffend Number of risk factors that are predictive of successful treatment or reentry participation		Description of the risk factors that are predictive of risk to reoffend or successful participation in treatment or reentry
Provide effective management as measured by whether significant interim project milestones were achieved, final deadlines were met, and costs remained within approved limits	Number of deliverables that meet expectations. Number of deliverables that are completed on time		Bi-monthly status reports
	Number of meetings and/or conference calls with SMART program staff		Bi-weekly conference calls with the SMART program staff
	Provide final report with a comprehensive overview of the project		Comprehensive final report and executive summary of the project
	Provide data that is comprehensive and accurate		Data sets resulting from this research for

			archiving, if applicable.
Disseminate interim and final project results	Number of publications, events where project results are shared.		A description of venues where project results are shared and the type of audience reached.

Note on Project Evaluations

An applicant that proposes to use award funds through this solicitation to conduct project evaluations should be aware that certain project evaluations (such as systematic investigations designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge) may constitute “research” for purposes of applicable DOJ human subjects protection regulations. However, project evaluations that are intended only to generate internal improvements to a program or service, or are conducted only to meet OJP’s performance measure data reporting requirements, likely do not constitute “research.” Each applicant should provide sufficient information for OJP to determine whether the particular project it proposes would either intentionally or unintentionally collect and/or use information in such a way that it meets the DOJ definition of research that appears at 28 C.F.R. Part 46 (“Protection of Human Subjects”).

Research, for purposes of human subjects protection for OJP-funded programs, is defined as “a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.” 28 C.F.R. 46.102(d).

For additional information on determining whether a proposed activity would constitute research for purposes of human subjects protection, applicants should consult the decision tree in the “Research and the protection of human subjects” section of the [“Requirements related to Research”](#) web page of the [“Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017,”](#) available through the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#). Every prospective applicant whose application may propose a research or statistical component also should review the “Data Privacy and Confidentiality Requirements” section on that web page.

- f. Other Project Timelines and Resumes for Key Positions

4. Budget and Associated Documentation

a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf. An applicant that submits its budget in a different format should use the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet should break out costs by year.

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

b. Budget Narrative

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

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

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

c. Information on Proposed Subawards (if any), as well as on Proposed Procurement Contracts (if any)

Applicants for OJP awards typically may propose to make "subawards." Applicants also may propose to enter into procurement "contracts" under the award.

Whether -- for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements -- a particular agreement between a recipient and a third party will be considered a "subaward" or instead considered a procurement "contract" under the award is determined by federal rules and applicable OJP guidance. It is an important distinction, in part because the federal administrative rules and requirements that apply to "subawards" and to procurement "contracts" under awards differ markedly.

In general, the central question is the relationship between what the third-party will do under its agreement with the recipient and what the recipient has committed (to OJP) to do under its award to further a public purpose (e.g., services the recipient will provide, products it will develop or modify, research or evaluation it will conduct). If a third party will provide some of the services the recipient has committed (to OJP) to provide, will develop or modify all or part of a product the recipient has committed (to OJP) to develop or modify, or will conduct part of the research or evaluation the recipient has committed (to OJP) to conduct, OJP will consider the agreement with the third party a subaward for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements.

This will be true **even if** the recipient, for internal or other non-federal purposes, labels or treats its agreement as a procurement, a contract, or a procurement contract. Neither the title nor the structure of an agreement determines whether the agreement -- for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements -- is a "subaward" or is instead a procurement "contract" under an award.

Additional guidance on the circumstances under which (for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements) an agreement constitutes a subaward as opposed to a

procurement contract under an award, is available (along with other resources) on the [OJP Part 200 Uniform Requirements](#) web page.

1. Information on proposed subawards

A recipient of an OJP award may not make subawards ("subgrants") unless the recipient has specific federal authorization to do so. Unless an applicable statute or DOJ regulation specifically authorizes (or requires) subawards, a recipient must have authorization from OJP before it may make a subaward.

A particular subaward may be authorized by OJP because the recipient included a sufficiently-detailed description and justification of the proposed subaward in the application as approved by OJP. If, however, a particular subaward is not authorized by federal statute or regulation, and is not sufficiently described and justified in the application as approved by OJP, the recipient will be required, post-award, to request and obtain written authorization from OJP before it may make the subaward.

If an applicant proposes to make one or more subawards to carry out the federal award and program, the applicant should-- (1) identify (if known) the proposed subrecipient(s), (2) describe in detail what each subrecipient will do to carry out the federal award and federal program, and (3) provide a justification for the subaward(s), with details on pertinent matters such as special qualifications and areas of expertise. Pertinent information on subawards should appear not only in the Program Narrative, but also in the Budget Detail Worksheet and budget narrative.

2. Information on proposed procurement contracts (with specific justification for proposed noncompetitive contracts over \$150,000)

Unlike a recipient contemplating a subaward, a recipient of an OJP award generally does not need specific prior federal authorization to enter into an agreement that -- for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements -- is considered a procurement contract, **provided that** (1) the recipient uses its own documented procurement procedures and (2) those procedures conform to applicable federal law, including the Procurement Standards of the (DOJ) Part 200 Uniform Requirements (as set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.317 - 200.326). The Budget Detail Worksheet and budget narrative should identify proposed procurement contracts. (As discussed above, subawards must be identified and described separately from procurement contracts.)

The Procurement Standards in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, however, reflect a general expectation that agreements that (for purposes of federal grants administrative requirements) constitute procurement "contracts" under awards will be entered into on the basis of full and open competition. If a proposed procurement contract would exceed the simplified acquisition threshold -- currently, \$150,000 -- a recipient of an OJP award may not proceed without competition unless and until the recipient receives specific advance authorization from OJP to use a non-competitive approach for the procurement.

An applicant that (at the time of its application) intends -- without competition -- to enter into a procurement "contract" that would exceed \$150,000 should include a detailed justification that explains to OJP why, in the particular circumstances, it is appropriate to proceed without competition. Various considerations that may be pertinent to the justification are outlined in the [DOJ Grants Financial Guide](#).

d. Pre-Agreement Costs

For information on pre-agreement costs, see [Section B. Federal Award Information](#).

5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)

Indirect costs may be charged to an award only if:

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

An applicant with a current (that is, unexpired) federally-approved indirect cost rate is to attach a copy of the indirect cost rate agreement to the application. An applicant that does not have a current federally-approved rate may request one through its cognizant federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant entity, or, if the applicant’s accounting system permits, applicants may propose to allocate costs in the direct cost categories.

For assistance with identifying the appropriate cognizant federal agency for indirect costs, please contact the OCFO 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>.

Certain OJP recipients have the option of electing to use the “de minimis” indirect cost rate. An applicant that is eligible to use the “de minimis” rate that wishes to use the “de minimis” rate should attach written documentation to the application that advises OJP of both-- (1) the applicant’s eligibility to use the “de minimis” rate, and (2) its election to do so. If an eligible applicant elects the “de minimis” rate, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. The “de minimis” rate may no longer be used once an approved federally-negotiated indirect cost rate is in place. (No entity that ever has had a federally-approved negotiated indirect cost rate is eligible to use the “de minimis” rate.)

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

Every applicant (other than an individual applying in his/her personal capacity) is to download, complete, and submit the [OJP Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire](#), as part of its application.

Among other things, the form requires each applicant to disclose whether it currently is designated “high risk” by a federal grant-making agency outside of DOJ. For purposes of this disclosure, high risk includes any status under which a federal awarding agency provides additional oversight due to the applicant’s past performance, or other programmatic or financial concerns with the applicant. If an applicant is designated high risk by another federal awarding agency, the applicant must provide the following information:

- The federal awarding agency that currently designates the applicant high risk

- The date the applicant was designated high risk
- The high-risk point of contact at that federal awarding agency (name, phone number, and email address)
- The reasons for the high-risk status, as set out by the federal awarding agency

OJP seeks this information to help ensure appropriate federal oversight of OJP awards. An applicant that is considered “high-risk” by another federal awarding agency is not automatically disqualified from receiving an OJP award. OJP may, however, consider the information in award decisions, and may impose additional OJP oversight of any award under this solicitation (including through the conditions that accompany the award document).

7. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

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

8. Additional Attachments

- Project Timeline (include month and year for each listed goal or objective)
- Resumes and Position Descriptions of Key Personnel

a. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications

Each applicant is to disclose whether it has (or is proposed as a subrecipient under) any pending applications for federally-funded grants or cooperative agreements that (1) include requests for funding to support the same project being proposed in the application under this solicitation, and (2) would cover any identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted to OJP as part of the application under this solicitation. The applicant is to disclose applications made directly to federal awarding agencies, and also applications for subawards of federal funds (e.g., applications to State agencies that will subaward (“subgrant”) federal funds).

OJP seeks this information to help avoid 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.

Each applicant that has one or more pending applications as described above is to provide the following information about pending applications submitted within the last 12 months:

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

Federal or State Funding Agency	Solicitation Name/Project Name	Name/Phone/Email for Point of Contact at Federal or State Funding Agency
DOJ/Office of Community Oriented Policing Services	COPS Hiring Program	Jane Doe, 202/000-0000; jane.doe@usdoj.gov
Health and Human Services/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

Each applicant should include the table as a separate attachment to its application. The file should be named “Disclosure of Pending Applications.” The applicant Legal Name on the application must match the entity named on the disclosure of pending applications statement.

Any applicant that does not have any pending applications as described above is to submit, as a separate attachment, a statement to this effect: “[Applicant Name on SF-424] does not have (and is not proposed as a subrecipient under) any pending applications submitted within the last 12 months for federally-funded grants or cooperative agreements (or for subawards under federal grants or cooperative agreements) that request funding to support the same project being proposed in this application to OJP and that would cover any identical cost items outlined in the budget submitted as part of in this application.”

b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity

If an application proposes research (including research and development) and/or evaluation, the applicant must demonstrate research/evaluation independence and integrity, including appropriate safeguards, before it may receive award funds. The applicant must demonstrate independence and integrity regarding both this proposed research and/or evaluation, and any current or prior related projects.

Each application should include an attachment that addresses **both** i. and ii. below.

- i. For purposes of this solicitation, each applicant is to document research and evaluation independence and integrity by including one of the following two items:
 - a. A specific assurance that the applicant has reviewed its application to identify any actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any co-principal investigators, and any subrecipients), and that the applicant has identified no such conflicts of interest – whether personal or financial or organizational (including on the part of the applicant entity or on the part of staff,

investigators, or subrecipients) – that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, and reporting of the research.

OR

- b. A specific description of actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified – including through review of pertinent information on the principal investigator, any co-principal investigators, and any subrecipients – that could affect the independence or integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the research. These conflicts may be personal (e.g., on the part of investigators or other staff), financial, or organizational (related to the applicant or any subrecipient entity). Some examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations are those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse's work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former or current colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization would not be given an award to evaluate a project, if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that specific project or a location implementing the project (whether funded by OJP or other sources), because the organization in such an instance might appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability of an evaluation or research product is a problem and must be disclosed.
- ii. In addition, for purposes of this solicitation, each applicant is to address possible mitigation of research integrity concerns by including, at a minimum, one of the following two items:
 - a. If an applicant reasonably believes that no actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) exist, then the applicant should provide a brief narrative explanation of how and why it reached that conclusion. The applicant also is to include an explanation of the specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and prevent (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

OR

- b. If the applicant has identified actual or potential apparent conflicts of interest (personal, financial, or organizational) that could affect the independence and integrity of the research, including the design, conduct, or reporting of the research, the applicant must is to provide a specific and robust mitigation

plan to address each of those conflicts. At a minimum, the applicant is expected to explain the specific processes and procedures that the applicant has in place, or will put in place, to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) any such conflicts of interest pertinent to the funded project during the period of performance. Documentation that may be helpful in this regard may include organizational codes of ethics/conduct and policies regarding organizational, personal, and financial conflicts of interest. There is no guarantee that the plan, if any, will be accepted as proposed.

OJP will assess research and evaluation independence and integrity based on considerations such as the adequacy of the applicant's efforts to identify factors that could affect the objectivity or integrity of the proposed staff and/or the applicant entity (and any subrecipients) in carrying out the research, development, or evaluation activity; and the adequacy of the applicant's existing or proposed remedies to control any such factors.

c. Disclosure of Process Related to Executive Compensation

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

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

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

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

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

advance and relied upon by the body that reviews and approves compensation arrangements for covered persons; and (4) the written or electronic records that the applicant organization maintains as concurrent documentation of the decisions with respect to compensation of covered persons made by the body that reviews and approves such compensation arrangements, including records of deliberations and of the basis for decisions.

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

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

How to Apply

Applicants must register in, and submit applications through Grants.gov, a primary source to find federal funding opportunities and apply for funding. Find complete instructions on how to register and submit an application at 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**, which operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, except on 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 of registration and a user password. OJP encourages applicants to **register several weeks before** the application submission deadline. In addition, OJP urges applicants to submit applications at least 72 hours prior to the application due date, in order to allow time for the applicant to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification.

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

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

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

Note on File Names and File Types: Grants.gov only permits the use of certain specific characters in the file names of attachments. Valid file names may include only the characters

shown in the table below. Grants.gov rejects any application that includes an attachment(s) with a file name that contains any characters not shown in the table below. Grants.gov forwards successfully-submitted applications to the OJP Grants Management System (GMS).

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

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:

Every applicant entity must comply with all applicable System for Award Management (SAM) and unique entity identifier (currently, a Data Universal Numbering System [DUNS] number) requirements. If an applicant entity has not fully complied with applicable SAM and unique identifier requirements by the time OJP makes award decisions, OJP may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive an award and may use that determination as a basis for making the award to a different applicant.

An individual who wishes to apply in his/her personal capacity should search Grants.gov for funding opportunities for which individuals are eligible to apply. Use the Funding Opportunity Number (FON) to register. (An applicant applying as an individual must comply with all applicable Grants.gov individual registration requirements.)

Complete the registration form at <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRegister> to create a username and password for Grants.gov. (An applicant applying as an individual should complete all steps except 1, 2 and 4.)

- 1. Acquire a unique entity identifier (currently, a DUNS number).** In general, the Office of Management and Budget requires every applicant for a federal award (other than an individual) to include a "unique entity identifier" in each application, including an application for a supplemental award. Currently, a DUNS number is the required unique entity identifier.

A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit identification number provided by the commercial company Dun and Bradstreet. This unique entity identifier is used for tracking purposes, and to validate address and point of contact information for applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. It will be used throughout the life cycle of an OJP award. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, one-time activity. Call Dun and Bradstreet at 866–705–5711 to obtain a DUNS number or apply online at www.dnb.com. A DUNS number is usually received within 1-2 business days.

- 2. Acquire registration with SAM.** SAM is the repository for certain standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. All applicants for OJP awards (other than individuals) must maintain current registrations in the SAM database. An applicant must be registered in SAM to successfully register in Grants.gov. Each applicant must **update or renew its SAM registration at least annually** to maintain an active status. SAM registration and renewal can take as long as 10 business days to complete.

An application cannot be successfully submitted in Grants.gov until Grants.gov receives the SAM registration information. Once the SAM registration/renewal is complete, **the information transfer from SAM to Grants.gov can take as long as 48 hours.** OJP recommends that the applicant register or renew registration with SAM as early as possible. Information about SAM registration procedures can be accessed at www.sam.gov.
- 3. Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. An applicant entity's "unique entity identifier" (DUNS number) must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process for organizations and other entities, go to <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/OrcRegister>. Individuals registering with Grants.gov should go to <http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/individual-registration.html>.
- 4. Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.
- 5. Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance ("CFDA") number for this solicitation is 16.203, titled "Promoting Evidence Integration in Sex Offender Management," and the funding opportunity number is SMART-2017-4962.
- 6. Submit a valid application consistent with this solicitation by following the directions in Grants.gov.** Within 24–48 hours after submitting the electronic application, the applicant should receive two notifications from Grants.gov. The first will confirm the receipt of the application. The second will state whether the application has been validated and successfully submitted, or whether it has been rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received, and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting an application well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges each applicant to submit its application **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date, to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. Applications must be successfully submitted through Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on June 21, 2017.

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

Note: Application Versions

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, OJP will review only the most recent system-validated version submitted.

Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues

An applicant that experiences unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond its control that prevent it from submitting its application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov [Customer Support Hotline](#) or the [SAM Help Desk](#) (Federal Service Desk) to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. The applicant must email the SMART Office contact identified in the Contact Information section on the title page **within 24 hours after the application deadline** to request approval to submit its application after the deadline. The applicant's email must describe the technical difficulties, and must include a timeline of the applicant's submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant's DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s).

Note: OJP does not automatically approve requests to submit a late application. After OJP reviews the applicant's request, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to verify the reported technical issues, OJP will inform the applicant whether the request to submit a late application has been approved or denied. If OJP determines that the untimely application submission was due to the applicant's failure to follow all required procedures, OJP will deny the applicant's request to submit its application.

The following conditions generally are insufficient to justify late submissions:

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

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP [Funding Resource Center](#) web page.

E. Application Review Information

Review Criteria

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

1. Statement of the Problem/Description of the Issue (20%)
 - Describe the existing challenges and/or complexities in measuring and assessing risk in AI/AN individuals who commit sex offenses.
 - The application demonstrates substantial knowledge of issues associated with working with this population, including a synopsis of research literature, existing measurement

scales, treatment efficacy, recidivism outcomes, and a description of the demographics, offender population, services available to AI/AN populations.

2. Project Design and Implementation (40%)

- Clearly articulate the goals established for this project and connect them to the
- overarching goals of the solicitation
- Describe in detail how the proposed project addresses the Mandatory Project

Components

- Describe specifically which areas the proposed project will address (refer to the “Allowable Uses for Award Funds” section on pages
- Use data to support the project design.
- Describe the roles and responsibilities of any subawardees, subcontractors, or consultants and how the role of each proposed partner is integrated into the overall strategy and the preparation of a final report that thoroughly assesses the results of the project
- Indicate the sample size used to validate the scale if this proposal is funded. This number will serve as the target for measuring performance of the project.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (25%)

- Describe the management structure and staffing of the project, identifying the agency responsible for the project and the grant coordinator.
- Demonstrate the capability of the implementing agency and collaborative partners to implement the project effectively, including gathering and analyzing data, engaging and collaborating with partners, developing and implementing a plan and troubleshooting implementation problems, and working with partners to evaluate a project.
- Describe and provide evidence of the types and quality of data sources available to the agency to conduct appropriate analysis.

4. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures (5%)

- Describe the process for assessing the project’s effectiveness through the collection and reporting of the required performance metrics data (see “Performance Measures,” including who will be responsible and how data will be collected.
- List any additional performance metrics that will be used to assess the project’s effectiveness and the process for collecting the information, including who will be responsible and how data will be collected.

5. Budget (5%): complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narratives should demonstrate generally how applicants will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.¹¹

- Include an appropriate percentage of the total grant award for research, data collection, performance measurement, and performance assessment. There is no minimum or maximum requirement regarding what constitutes an appropriate percent; however, the budget designated should be adequate to fund the activities outlined in the application.

¹¹ Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that, in its nature or amount, does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the costs.

The Budget Narrative should explain how the amount dedicated to these activities is adequate to support the proposed activities.

- Applicants must budget funding to travel to DOJ-sponsored grant meetings. Applicants should estimate the costs of travel and accommodations for teams of three to attend annual three-day meetings in Washington, D.C., to include representatives from collaborators and pilot sites.
6. Other: Project Timeline and Resumes/Position Descriptions for Key Personnel (5%)

Review Process

OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for making awards. The SMART Office reviews the application to make sure that the information presented is reasonable, understandable, measurable, and achievable, as well as consistent with the solicitation.

Peer reviewers will review the applications submitted under this solicitation that meet basic minimum requirements. For purposes of assessing whether an application meets basic minimum requirements and should proceed to further consideration, OJP screens applications for compliance with those requirements. Although specific requirements may vary, the following are common requirements applicable to all solicitations for funding under OJP programs:

- The application must be submitted by an eligible type of applicant
- The application must request funding within programmatic funding constraints (if applicable)
- The application must be responsive to the scope of the solicitation
- The application must include all items designated as “critical elements”
- The applicant must not be identified in SAM as excluded from receiving federal awards

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

Peer review panels will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. The SMART Office may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications on technical merit using the solicitation’s review criteria. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is not a current DOJ employee. An internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. Peer reviewers’ ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although reviewer views are considered carefully. Other important considerations for OJP include underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, and available funding, as well as the extent to which the budget detail worksheet and budget narrative accurately explain project costs that are reasonable, necessary, and otherwise allowable under federal law and applicable federal cost principles.

Pursuant to the Part 200 Uniform Requirements, before award decisions are made, OJP also reviews information related to the degree of risk posed by applicants. Among other things to help assess whether an applicant that has one or more prior federal awards has a satisfactory record with respect to performance, integrity, and business ethics, OJP checks whether the applicant is listed in SAM as excluded from receiving a federal award. If OJP anticipates that an

award will exceed \$150,000 in federal funds, OJP also must review and consider any information about the applicant that appears in the non-public segment of the integrity and performance system accessible through SAM (currently, the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System; "FAPIS").

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

The evaluation of risks goes beyond information in SAM, however. OJP itself has in place a framework for evaluating risks posed by applicants for competitive awards. OJP takes into account information pertinent to matters such as --

1. Applicant financial stability and fiscal integrity
2. Quality of the management systems of the applicant, and the applicant's ability to meet prescribed management standards, including those outlined in the DOJ Grants Financial Guide
3. Applicant's history of performance under OJP and other DOJ awards (including compliance with reporting requirements and award conditions), as well as awards from other federal agencies
4. Reports and findings from audits of the applicant, including audits under the Part 200 Uniform Requirements
5. Applicant's ability to comply with statutory and regulatory requirements, and to effectively implement other award requirements.

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, all final award decisions will be made by the Assistant Attorney General, who may take into account not only peer review ratings and the SMART Office recommendations, but also other factors as indicated in this section.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

Award notifications will be made by September 30, 2017. OJP sends award notifications by email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions on how to access and view the award documents, and steps to take in GMS to start the award acceptance process. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on the award date.

For each successful applicant, an individual with the necessary authority to bind the applicant will be required to log in; execute a set of legal certifications and a set of legal assurances; designate a financial point of contact; thoroughly review the award, including all award conditions; and sign and accept the award. The award acceptance process requires physical signature of the award document by the authorized representative and the scanning of the fully-executed award document to OJP.

Administrative, National Policy, and Other Legal Requirements

If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the OJP-approved application, the recipient must comply with all award conditions, as well as all applicable requirements of federal statutes, regulations, and executive orders (including applicable requirements referred to in the assurances and certifications executed in connection with award acceptance). OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review information on post-award legal requirements and common OJP award conditions **prior** to submitting an application.

Applicants should consult the “[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards](#),” available in the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#). In addition, applicants should examine the following two legal documents, as each successful applicant must execute both documents before it may receive any award funds.

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

Applicants may view these documents in the Apply section of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

The web pages accessible through the “[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards](#)” are intended to give applicants for OJP awards a general overview of important statutes, regulations, and award conditions that apply to many (or in some cases, all) OJP grants and cooperative agreements awarded in FY 2017. Individual OJP awards typically also will include additional award conditions. Those additional conditions may relate to the particular statute or program, or solicitation under which the award is made; to the substance of the funded application; to the recipient's performance under other federal awards; to the recipient's legal status (e.g., as a for-profit entity); or to other pertinent considerations.

As stated above, the SMART Office expects that any award under this solicitation to be a cooperative agreement. A cooperative agreement will include a condition in the award document that sets out the “substantial federal involvement” in carrying out the award and program. Generally speaking, under cooperative agreements with OJP, responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the funded project rests with the recipient. OJP, however, may have substantial involvement in matters such as coordination efforts and site selection, as well as review and approval of work plans, research designs, data collection instruments, and major project-generated materials. In addition, OJP often indicates in the award condition that it may redirect the project if necessary.

In addition to a condition that sets out the “substantial federal involvement” in the award, cooperative agreements awarded by OJP include a condition that requires specific reporting in connection with conferences, meetings, retreats, seminars, symposia, training activities, or similar events funded under the award.

General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements

In addition to the deliverables described in [Section A. Program Description](#), any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to submit the following reports and data.

Required reports. Recipients typically must submit quarterly financial reports, semi-annual progress reports, final financial and progress reports, and, if applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements or specific award conditions. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent. (In appropriate cases, OJP may require additional reports.)

Awards that exceed \$500,000 will include an additional condition that, under specific circumstances, will require the recipient to report (to FAPIIS) information on civil, criminal, and administrative proceedings connected with (or connected to the performance of) either the OJP award or any other grant, cooperative agreement, or procurement contract from the federal government. Additional information on this reporting requirement appears in the text of the award condition posted on the OJP web site at <http://ojp.gov/funding/FAPIIS.htm>.

Data on performance measures. In addition to required reports, an award recipient also must provide data that measure the results of the work done under the award. To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as to assist DOJ in fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111-352, OJP will require any recipient, post award, to provide the data listed as "Data Recipient Provides" in the performance measures table in [Section D. Application and Submission Information](#), under "Program Narrative," so that OJP can calculate values for this solicitation's performance measures.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)

For OJP contact(s), see the title page.

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

H. Other Information

Freedom of Information Act and Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552 and 5 U.S.C. 552a)

All applications submitted to OJP (including all attachments to applications) are subject to the federal Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and to the Privacy Act. By law, DOJ may withhold information that is responsive to a request pursuant to FOIA if DOJ determines that the responsive information either is protected under the Privacy Act or falls within the scope of one of nine statutory exemptions under FOIA. DOJ cannot agree in advance of a request pursuant to FOIA not to release some or all portions of an application.

In its review of records that are responsive to a FOIA request, OJP will withhold information in those records that plainly falls within the scope of the Privacy Act or one of the statutory exemptions under FOIA. (Some examples include certain types of information in budgets, and names and contact information for project staff other than certain key personnel.) In appropriate

circumstances, OJP will request the views of the applicant/recipient that submitted a responsive document.

For example, if OJP receives a request pursuant to FOIA for an application submitted by a nonprofit or for-profit organization or an institution of higher education, or for an application that involves research, OJP typically will contact the applicant/recipient that submitted the application and ask it to identify -- quite precisely -- any particular information in the application that applicant/recipient believes falls under a FOIA exemption, the specific exemption it believes applies, and why. After considering the submission by the applicant/recipient, OJP makes an independent assessment regarding withholding information. OJP generally follows a similar process for requests pursuant to FOIA for applications that may contain law-enforcement sensitive information.

Provide Feedback to OJP

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

IMPORTANT: This email is for feedback and suggestions only. OJP does **not** reply from this mailbox to messages it receives in this mailbox. Any prospective applicant that has specific questions on any program or technical aspect of the solicitation **must** use the appropriate telephone number or email listed on the front of this document to obtain information. These contacts are provided to help ensure that prospective applicants can directly reach an individual who can address specific questions in a timely manner.

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, please email your résumé to ojppeerreview@lmsolas.com. (Do not send your résumé to the OJP Solicitation Feedback email account.) **Note:** Neither you nor anyone else from your organization or entity can be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization/entity has submitted an application.

Application Checklist

SMART FY2017 Developing or Validating a Risk Assessment Instrument for American Indian/Alaska Native Populations

This application checklist has been created as an aid in developing an application.

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

- Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 26)
- Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 27)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 25)
- Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 27)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 27)
- Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 27)
- Sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) (optional) (see page 25)
- Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)
- Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at [ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm](#) (see page 10)

After Application Submission, Receive Grants.gov Email Notifications That:

- (1) application has been received,
- (2) application has either been successfully validated or rejected with errors (see page 27)

If No Grants.gov Receipt, and Validation or Error Notifications are Received:

- contact the SMART Office regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 28)

Overview of Post-Award Legal Requirements:

- Review the "[Overview of Legal Requirements Generally Applicable to OJP Grants and Cooperative Agreements - FY 2017 Awards](#)" in the OJP Funding Resource Center.

Scope Requirement:

- The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of \$1 million.

Eligibility Requirement:

Applicant is one of the following:

- institution of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education);
- non-profit or for profit organizations (including tribal nonprofit and for-profit organizations);
- national membership organization,
- non-government organization.

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 12)
- _____ Project Abstract (see page 12)
- _____ Program Narrative (see page 13)
- _____ Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 17)
- _____ Budget Narrative (see page 18)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 20)
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (see page 20)
- _____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 21)
- _____ Additional Attachments
 - _____ Project Timeline (see page 17)
 - _____ Resumes or Position Descriptions for Key Personnel (*see page 17*)
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 21)
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 21)
 - _____ Disclosure of Process related to Executive Compensation (see page 24)
- _____ Request and Justification for Employee Compensation; Waiver (if applicable) (see page 10)