

**U.S. Department of Justice**  
Office of Justice Programs  
*Bureau of Justice Statistics*



---

The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Bureau of Justice Statistics](#) (BJS) along with the [Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention](#) (OJJDP) are seeking applications to conduct methodological work for a future survey on children's exposure to violence. This program furthers the Department's mission by identifying the prevalence, scope, and extent to which children in the nation are directly and indirectly exposed to different forms of violence.

## **Methodological Research to Support the National Survey of Children's Exposure to Violence**

**Applications Due: June 24, 2016**

### **Eligibility**

Eligible applicants are national, regional, state, or local public and private entities, including for-profit and nonprofit organizations, faith-based and community organizations, institutions of higher education, federally recognized Indian tribal governments as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, and units of local government that support initiatives to improve the functioning of the criminal justice system.

BJS and OJJDP welcome applications that involve two or more entities that will carry out the funded federal award activities; however, one eligible entity must be the applicant and the other(s) must be proposed as subrecipient(s). The applicant must be the entity with primary responsibility for administering the funding, managing the entire project, and appropriately managing and monitoring any subrecipients or, as applicable, for administering any procurement subcontract that would receive federal funds from the applicant under the award. Only one application per lead applicant will be considered; however, a subrecipient may be part of multiple proposals.

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

## Deadline

Applicants must register with [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) prior to submitting an application. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on June 24, 2016.

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

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

## Contact Information

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

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

For assistance with any other requirements of this solicitation, contact Jennifer Bronson, Statistician and Program Manager, by telephone at 202-616-8937 or by email at [askbjs@usdoj.gov](mailto:askbjs@usdoj.gov). Include “NatSCEV2016” in the subject line.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: BJS-2016-10080

Release date: May 9, 2016

## Contents

A. Program Description .....	4
Overview .....	4
Project-Specific Information .....	4
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables .....	6
B. Federal Award Information.....	14
Type of Award .....	14
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls .....	15
Budget Information .....	15
Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement .....	15
Pre-Agreement Cost (also known as Pre-award Cost) Approvals .....	15
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver.....	16
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs .....	16
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable).....	16
C. Eligibility Information.....	17
Limit on Number of Application Submissions .....	17
D. Application and Submission Information .....	17
What an Application Should Include .....	17
How to Apply .....	27
E. Application Review Information.....	30
Selection Criteria .....	30
F. Federal Award Administration Information .....	33
Federal Award Notices .....	33
Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements .....	33
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements.....	35
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s) .....	35
H. Other Information.....	35
Provide Feedback to OJP.....	35
Application Checklist.....	37

# Methodological Research to Support the National Survey of Children's Exposure to Violence

(CFDA #16.734 and #16.818<sup>1</sup>)

## A. Program Description

### Overview

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), working in partnership with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), seeks an applicant to conduct methodological work that will develop improved strategies to produce national estimates of children's exposure to violence. The work performed under this solicitation involves reviewing and assessing the recent administrations of OJJDP's National Survey of Children's Exposure to Violence (NatSCEV) and making recommendations on items that will be included in the survey instrument, frame development, sampling plan, modes of data collection, strategies for reducing nonresponse bias, reference periods for trend analysis, and viability of supporting various subgroup estimates. Work will include (1) reviewing previous approaches used to collect NatSCEV data, (2) review current literature on collecting information on sensitive topics and from hard-to-reach populations including young children, (3) analyzing data collected in previous NatSCEV administrations, (4) developing and testing appropriate measures of exposure to violence, (5) designing alternative data collection strategies and methodologies to increase the utility of the data, (6) conducting cognitive and pilot tests to evaluate the propose alternatives, and (7) providing detailed cost estimates for administering the proposed approaches.

Applications for funding should (1) provide a synopsis of the team's background that documents its methodological, statistical and survey expertise and its expertise with issues related to childhood victimization; (2) demonstrate that the team has the skills and infrastructure necessary to develop and test various designs for a national data collection effort on the topic of childhood victimization; and (3) describe the administrative capabilities necessary to undertake a project of this scope.

BJS is authorized to conduct this work pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 3732(c). OJJDP is authorized to conduct this work under Pub. L. No. 114-113; 129 Stat.2242, 2307.

### Project-Specific Information

The goal of the NatSCEV is to assess the incidence and prevalence of children's exposure to violence. Since its inception, OJJDP sponsored and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) supported the NatSCEV. The goal of this federal partnership was to develop a comprehensive surveillance system to measure and track youth victimization in the United States and to collect data on the safe, stable, and nurturing relationships that may serve as protective factors for vulnerable youth. The NatSCEV marks the first comprehensive attempt to measure children's exposure to violence in their daily lives across the settings of home, school,

---

<sup>1</sup> OJJDP is funding this project, however, BJS is managing it. CFDA #16.734 is the BJS number and CFDA #16.818 is the OJJDP number, the latter of which should be used in the grants management system (GMS).

and community. The NatSCEV has been administered via random-digit-dial (RDD) telephone surveys three times, with data collection in 2008 (NatSCEV I), 2011 (NatSCEV II), and 2014 (NatSCEV III). The NatSCEV is intended to produce national estimates on sensitive topics (direct victimization and indirect violence) directed at a hard-to-reach, vulnerable population (i.e., children ages 0 to 17). After three survey administrations, the current content, design, and data collection methodology must be assessed to determine how to maintain and improve the work. The current NatSCEV has encountered challenges in trying to balance methodological rigor with increasing costs of survey research and declining response rates. Like many other social science surveys, particularly those relying on telephone interviews, the NatSCEV has experienced a steady decline in response rates in each of its collections. Coupled with the issues surrounding a hard-to-reach population, the declining response rates have raised questions about the representativeness of NatSCEV data in the future using the current methodology.

The NatSCEV survey findings underpin the Department of Justice's (DOJ) [Defending Childhood](#) initiative. The findings have helped DOJ understand and begin to address the implications of children's exposure to violence, crime, and abuse (either direct or indirect). Findings from the NatSCEV indicate that children who are exposed to even one type of violence (directly or indirectly), both within the past year and over their lifetimes, are at far greater risk of experiencing other types of violence. Additionally, children who are exposed to multiple types of violence, crime, abuse, and neglect across various domains (e.g., the home, school, and community) are at even greater risk of adverse outcomes. Polyvictimization tends to persist over time. It is associated with a cluster of prior circumstances or pathways, including living in a violent family, living in a distressed and chaotic family, living in a violent neighborhood, and having preexisting psychological symptoms. Children who experience polyvictimization have a disproportionate share of the most serious kinds of victimizations, such as sexual victimization and parental maltreatment. They also have more life adversities and are more likely to manifest symptoms of psychological distress and other health problems in adolescence and adulthood.

To date, the NatSCEV has been designed to obtain incident and prevalence estimates of a wide range of children's experiences of violence, crime, abuse, and neglect. The NatSCEV III used a nationwide sample of about 4,000 children and youth ages 0 to 17 who were identified using one of four sources:

- (1) an address-based sample (ABS) of households from which cell phone and residential numbers could be obtained
- (2) a prescreened sample of households with children from recent national RDD surveys
- (3) a listed landline sample (in which commercial lists indicated there was a child in the household)
- (4) cell phone numbers drawn from a targeted RDD sample frame.

The researchers used weights to account for differential probability of selection within and across the sampling frames and to adjust for nonresponse. A major part of the proposed effort will be to assess the utility of this design and the weighting adjustments and propose viable and sustainable alternative designs.

In the NatSCEV III, screening occurred once contact was made with the household by telephone. Only households with children age 17 or younger currently living in the household were eligible for inclusion in the study. If there were no children residing in the household, the interview was terminated and the contact was counted as a screen-out.

Respondents were offered modest incentives for completing the screening process and participating in a telephone interview conducted by an experienced survey research firm. Once an eligible household was identified, the interviewer asked to speak with the parent or guardian who was most familiar with the everyday activities of the child or children living in the household. The interviewer then enumerated all children in the household and collected their ages. A focal child was selected at random by the computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) program from all children living in the household. If the designated child was age 0 to 9, the entire interview was conducted with the parent or guardian. If the designated child was age 10 to 17, a short interview was first conducted with the parent or guardian. The child portion of the interview was conducted with the child only after receiving consent from the parent or guardian and assent from the selected youth respondent. Verbal informed consent was obtained from all youth and adults interviewed.

Interviews averaged 60 minutes in duration and were conducted in English or Spanish (non-English/Spanish speakers were excluded). The study made use of a “child in danger” protocol, and respondents who disclosed a current serious threat or ongoing abuse or neglect were recontacted by a clinical member of the research team trained in crisis counseling who stayed in contact with the respondent until the situation was addressed locally.

The NatSCEV III interview questionnaire covered children’s exposure to the following general areas: conventional crime (defined as recognized illegal behaviors, such as assault or robbery) child maltreatment and neglect, peer and sibling offending, sexual assault, witnessing and indirect exposure to violence, and online offending. The instrument also included some items that were not in earlier NatSCEV administrations. (See attachment 1 for the full instrument used in the NatSCEV III.) Follow-up questions collected additional information about incidents, including perpetrator characteristics, the use of a weapon, and whether injury resulted.

Response rates varied across the four sampling frames, ranging from a low of 9.7% in the cell RDD sample to a high of 52.7% in the ABS return sample. Because response rates were low on all frames, extensive nonresponse adjustments were used. (See attachment 2 for more information about response rates, nonresponse adjustments, and weighting.) Information about the methodology used in the previous NatSCEV administrations is available in the NatSCEV I and II methodology reports. (See attachment 3 for the NatSCEV I and attachment 4 for the NatSCEV II.)

### **Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables**

This solicitation seeks to fund the survey design and methodological work to develop a research design and survey instrument that produces accurate and reliable national estimates of and trends in children’s exposure to violence. This work will contribute to the field’s understanding of children’s exposure to violence, abuse, and neglect (both direct and indirect) by building on the NatSCEV’s previous efforts. BJS and OJJDP are seeking specific recommendations for—

- content of the survey instrument necessary to serve the field’s information needs
- development of a universe frame or frames
- a sampling plan
- the viability of supporting various subgroup estimates
- modes of data collection
- methods for improving response rates
- strategies for addressing nonresponse bias
- preferred reference periods for trend analysis.

More specifically, this research will—

- evaluate and assess the prior NatSCEV survey instruments, universe frames, sampling designs, sampling implementation, data collection modes, item response rates, and analytic approaches
- review current literature on collecting information on sensitive topics and from hard-to-reach populations, especially on young children
- form expert panels to inform the NatSCEV redesign, one with experts on child victimization and one with expertise on methodology
- based on these findings, propose survey instrument content for measuring children's exposure to violence
- propose alternative universe frames, sampling plans, and data collection procedures to assess children's exposure to violence while maintaining participant safety and comfort given the sensitive nature of the questions and constructs assessed
- propose alternatives to improve response rates, address nonresponse bias, and increase the precision of national estimates of children's exposure to violence
- evaluate the feasibility, utility, and costs associated with the proposed alternative methods relative to those used in prior survey waves through cognitive testing and pilot studies
- make final recommendations to improve upon or enhance the next NatSCEV data collection.

**Attend a kickoff meeting and develop a final time/task plan to BJS (Deliverable 1).** A kickoff meeting will be held at the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) in Washington, D.C., within the first month of the project period. During the meeting, representatives from BJS, OJJDP, and project staff will review all phases of the work and finalize a comprehensive time/task plan. Within 2 weeks of the kickoff meeting, the successful applicant will deliver a final time/task plan to BJS reflecting all decisions made at the kickoff meeting. The final time/task plan will build on the one presented in the application and will reflect (1) any changes to the project's goals, objectives, and deliverables that may have developed since the application was written, and (2) any revisions to the proposed work plan that may have occurred in the period between the application and the award.

**Assemble panels of experts (Deliverable 2).** In close collaboration with BJS and OJJDP, the successful applicant will form two panels of experts that are separate from the project team to inform the NatSCEV's redesign. The first panel (the NatSCEV content expert panel) will consist of 10 to 12 persons who are knowledgeable in the field of children's exposure to violence. This panel will help identify critical information needs and data gaps and will provide guidance on survey content and administration. The second panel (the NatSCEV methods expert panel) will consist of 10 to 12 persons knowledgeable about issues surrounding data collection with hard-to-reach populations and on sensitive topics, household surveys, sampling and nonresponse. This panel will provide input on the proposed frame development, sampling plan, data collection modes (including techniques to improve response rates), and plans for cognitive testing of the instrument(s) and pilot testing of the data collection approaches. These panels will support the project throughout the project review and development phases. Representatives from the CDC and the Administration for Children and Family (ACF) must be included on these panels.

The application should include costs to hold at least one in-person meeting of each expert panel. BJS realizes that the exact cost of convening such in-person meetings will depend in part on the meeting locations, the size of the panel, and where the panel members reside. When

budgeting for the expert panel meetings, applicants should specify their assumptions regarding the meeting locations, size of panel, and travel for panel members.

**Complete a comprehensive assessment of the current NatSCEV methodology and survey content to produce a report on the study's strengths and limitations (Deliverable 3).** The successful applicant will critically assess the current NatSCEV methodology, research design, and survey instrument to inform and support the applicant's proposed improvements to the informational utility of the survey and the precision of its incidence and prevalence estimates on children exposed to violence. The process for and findings of the review and assessment will be presented in a report titled *Strengths and Limitations of the NatSCEV and Proposed Alternatives for the NatSCEV IV* (Deliverable 3). This report will be the foundation of the methodological work this solicitation seeks to fund and will shape the agenda, content, and materials for the first meetings of the expert panels. While each panel's meetings will focus on the panel's designated areas of expertise, a single report addressing both content and method issues will add in the discussions of both panels.

The applicant must specify how they will conduct the review and assessment of prior NatSCEV data collections. The dataset and survey instrument for each NatSCEV will be available online through the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data no later than December 2016. This review should include the sampling frames, performance of the samples, data collection mode and process, incentive strategies, screening processes, survey questions, response rates, nonresponse bias adjustments, and the need for and quality of the estimates produced. The applicant can use a variety of methods to conduct this review and develop alternatives, including literature reviews, focus group meetings, teleconferences, and consultations with content experts and methodologists. The work should include reviews of other federal surveys that could be used as vehicles to conduct some or all of the NatSCEV data (particularly those that collect data from or about children)<sup>2</sup> and reviews of other surveys that seek to measure children's exposure to violence or trauma.<sup>3</sup> The report should also consider the possibility of conducting the NatSCEV through other than a household survey (e.g., a school-based survey). The proposed alternatives should be justified and defended by this review work.

Consideration must be given to the sampling approach (es). For example, some strategies are likely to miss subgroups of children, such as children in juvenile residential placement facilities or those living in homeless shelters, motels/hotels, or temporary housing. The successful applicant should also consider the utility of and means to include other special populations. Past NatSCEV data collections yielded low response rates despite offering a small incentive. The proposed design should consider the need for, cost, and benefit of incentives. As nonresponse has been a major concern in past NatSCEV administrations, the applicant will recommend approaches to minimize and address nonresponse bias and the implications of these approaches on data quality. Additionally, the next national implementation of the NatSCEV should be conducted using a nationally-representative sample with no geographic exclusions. The proposed sample strategy should be able to achieve this goal.

NatSCEV III interviews averaged 60 minutes in duration, and the preference is to reduce respondent burden. Consequently, an applicant's overall goal should be to propose a revised

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, the Department of Education's *National Household Education Survey*, the National Institute of Drug Abuse's *Monitoring the Future*, and ACF's *National Survey on Child and Adolescent Well-Being*.

<sup>3</sup> For example, CDC's *Adverse Childhood Experiences* and Princeton University's *Fragile Families and Children Well Being Study*.

survey instrument that is reasonable in length, aligns with or maintains successful past NatSCEV measures to produce trends; produces reliable and valid past-year incidence and lifetime prevalence of exposure to multiple types of direct and indirect violence; meets data and information needs; informs understanding of children's exposure to violence; and includes appropriate predictor and contextual variables where possible. While this is ideal, decisions will need to be made that balance survey length with information utility, quality, and need. As such, the successful applicant is asked to propose a data collection approach that is an optimal compromise among the information needs of the field, the burden placed on respondents, and the ability to collect quality information.

Because children's exposure to violence takes many different forms, the successful applicant should know how to measure the multiple dimensions of violence, its complexities, and the implications for measurement and definition choices. The applicant should include a description of how they will evaluate the existing survey instrument and improve it to meet the measurement goals and information needs of DOJ and other government agencies, the juvenile justice system, the child welfare system, public health and public safety organizations, and the general public. Some of the desired measurement goals and key research questions that may be addressed in an optimal research design are—

1. What is the overall scope of children's exposure to violence, both past-year and lifetime, across all ages from birth through age 17, and how has this changed over time?
  - Develop national estimates of the incidence and prevalence of children's exposure to violence.<sup>4</sup>
  - Document changes in the incidence and prevalence of children's exposure to violence at a minimum of 5-year intervals.<sup>5</sup>
2. How does childhood exposure to violence vary by demographic subgroup and other child characteristics?
  - Document variation in incidence and prevalence exposure rates and changes in rates by subgroup (e.g., age, sex, and race or Hispanic origin) and other child characteristics (e.g., family structure, socioeconomic status, region, and location of residence).<sup>6</sup>
3. What are the types and nature of violent victimization incidents experienced and witnessed by children, and how do they intersect and overlap?
  - Document incident characteristics, including but not limited to the type (e.g., conventional crime, child maltreatment, peer and sibling offense, sexual assault, witnessing and indirect exposure to violence, or online offenses), severity (e.g., whether an injury resulted), and location (e.g., home, school, or community) of the

---

<sup>4</sup> Finkelhor, D., Turner, H., Shattuck, A., and Hamby, S. (2015). Prevalence of childhood exposure to violence, crime, and abuse: Results from the National Survey of Children's Exposure to Violence. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 169(8), 746-754; Finkelhor, D., Turner, H., Shattuck, A., Hamby, S., & Kracke, K. (2015). *Children's Exposure to Violence, Crime, and Abuse: An Update*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; Finkelhor, D., Turner, H., Ormrod, R., Hamby, S., & Kracke, K. (2009). *Children's Exposure to Violence: A Comprehensive National Survey*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

<sup>5</sup> Finkelhor, D., Shattuck, A., Turner, H., & Hamby, S. (2014). Trends in children's exposure to violence, 2003-2011. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 168(6), 540-546.

<sup>6</sup> Finkelhor et al. 2015. Op cit.

- exposure; the child's relationship to the perpetrator; and, in the case of witnessing, the child's relationship to the victim.<sup>7</sup>
- Document how specific types of violence exposure co-occur and how victimization and polyvictimization have changed over time.<sup>8</sup>
4. What other factors are critical to understanding the problem and context of childhood exposure to violence?
- Identify individual, family, and community-level predictors of violence exposure and how those predictors may have changed over time.<sup>9</sup>
  - Examine the association between the level and type of violence exposure and mental health, and how those associations may have changed over time.<sup>10</sup>
  - Examine the extent to which children disclose incidents of violence to various individuals and the nature and sources of assistance or treatment (if any) provided to the child and how disclosure and treatment may have changed over time.<sup>11</sup>

The report *Strengths and Limitations of the NatSCEV and Proposed Alternatives for the NatSCEV IV* (Deliverable 3) will include, but not be limited to, the following elements:

- an assessment of how prior NatSCEV sampling frames and sampling plans performed and an assessment of the prior data collection strategies and their limitations, challenges, and strengths
- an assessment of past patterns of nonresponse in NatSCEV administrations, how nonresponse bias was handled, and the effect of these adjustments on the quality of the estimates
- evaluation of the impact of incentives on past NatSCEV response rates and an assessment of the value of offering incentives
- after reviewing past work, an analysis of coverage bias associated with various proposed sampling frames (e.g., a school-based survey) and strategies, including identifying which subgroups (e.g., homeless children or children in temporary households) may be missed in a particular approach
- cost/benefit analysis of different sampling strategies using various sample frames or combinations
- cost analysis associated with alternative data collection designs with detailed cost estimates for administering varying data collection approaches
- evaluation of the NatSCEV III survey to see how items performed in their ability to produce critical information, including item response, nonresponse, and break-off analysis
- prioritization of critical NatSCEV information needs and how they map onto the existing NatSCEV survey items

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Finkelhor, D., Turner, H., Hamby, S., & Ormrod, R. (2011). *Polyvictimization: Children's Exposure to Multiple Types of Violence, Crime, and Abuse*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

<sup>9</sup> Cuevas, C., Finkelhor, D., Shattuck, A., Turner, H., & Hamby, S. (2013). *Children's Exposure to Violence and the Intersection Between Delinquency and Victimization*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

<sup>10</sup> Turner, H., Shattuck, A., Finkelhor, D., & Hamby, S. (in press). Effects of poly-victimization on adolescent social support, self-concept, and psychological distress. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*.

<sup>11</sup> Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R., Turner, H., & Hamby, S. (2012). *Child and Youth Victimization Known to Police, School, and Medical Authorities*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

- matrix of the value, cost, and burden of including questions and variables
- review and assessment of the potential of other national collections to support NatSCEV's information needs.

In the last section of the report, the successful applicant will defend and justify its recommendations (or possible alternatives) to include but not limited to the following elements of the NatSCEV-IV:

- universe frame and sampling design
- data collection mode and design
- a draft of the proposed NatSCEV survey instrument(s) or items to be included in other national data collection efforts reflecting the successful applicant's assessment of (1) the critical NatSCEV information domains and constructs needed to produce key statistics on the incidence and prevalence of children's exposure to violence, and (2) the demographic and socioeconomic variables needed to provide a context for children's exposure to violence
- plans for cognitive testing of survey instrument(s) and (if proposed) items designed to be included in other national data collection efforts
- plans for field testing various data collection modes.

A complete draft of this report should be delivered to BJS within 8 months of the project start date. [BJS and OJJDP strongly encourage the successful applicant to provide early drafts of individual sections of the full report as they are developed so that they can provide comments while the draft report is in development.] BJS and OJJDP will review the full draft report and recommend revisions within 2 weeks of receipt. The successful applicant will respond to these recommendations and provide a final report by the end of Month 10 of the project period. This report will serve as the foundation for the first expert panel meetings.

**Develop a set of materials for the first set of expert panel meetings (e.g., necessary presentations and handouts) with approval by BJS and OJJDP (Deliverable 4).** At their first meetings of the expert panels, panelists will review and assess the project team's initial recommendations as presented in the report *Strengths and Limitations of the NatSCEV and Proposed Alternatives for the NatSCEV IV* and provide feedback in their separate areas of expertise (i.e., content and methods). With BJS and OJJDP approval, the successful applicant will prepare additional materials as needed to be distributed or presented to invitees of each panel. The meeting materials will be customized for the individual expert panels, delving more deeply into each panel's areas of interest.

**Convene the first set of expert panel meetings (Deliverable 5).** These meetings will be held by Month 11 of the project period and will reflect the review work and proposed alternatives outlined in Deliverable 3. BJS and OJJDP will have final approval of the agendas. After convening the meetings and synthesizing the feedback, the successful applicant will have sufficient information to revise the text in the report *Strengths and Limitations of the NatSCEV and Proposed Alternatives for the NatSCEV IV* (Deliverable 3). The revised report (**Deliverable 6**) will be prepared within 1 month of the expert panel meetings (i.e., Month 12). The report will be delivered to BJS and OJJDP for review and comment. Once completed, the revised report will be the basis for the cognitive and pilot testing.

**Submit the cognitive testing plan and conduct the cognitive testing (Deliverables 7 and 8).** The applicant should specify a plan for how they might conduct cognitive testing of the survey instrument. The successful applicant will be required to conduct cognitive testing of many of the survey items, particularly those that were not tested and those that underperformed in past collections. This is to ensure that respondents (both youth and adult caretaker respondents) understand the questions and the information that is being asked. Within 1 month of the delivery of the revised report *Strengths and Limitations of the NatSCEV and Proposed Alternatives for the NatSCEV IV* (i.e., the Month 13), the successful applicant will submit a *Plan for Cognitive Testing of the NatSCEV Survey Items* (Deliverable 7) to BJS and OJJDP for approval. This plan will include the specific items suggested for testing (if not all items are to be tested); justifications for why, how, and where cognitive testing will be performed; who the respondents will be; and a budget for implementing the testing and analyzing the results. It is expected that there would be more than one round of cognitive testing to insure the revisions resulting from earlier testing will also be tested. Upon approval from BJS and OJJDP, the successful applicant will conduct the cognitive testing as agreed by Month 15 (Deliverable 8).

**Prepare a draft of the proposed survey instrument, codebook, and crosswalk (Deliverables 9, 10, and 11).** Following successful completion of the cognitive testing, by Month 16 the successful applicant will produce a draft of the complete survey instrument (Deliverable 9), codebook (Deliverable 10), and a variable crosswalk that compares the concepts measured in this survey to the prior NatSCEV iterations (Deliverable 11). The survey should contain all of the questions and variables deemed necessary to produce the desired data. This instrument will be used in the pilot testing.

**Prepare and submit the pilot test plans (Deliverable 12).** The specific shape and scope of the pilot testing will depend to a large extent on the design chosen. Any pilot testing must include a test of the full proposed survey instrument and incentive procedure (if chosen). Working with BJS and OJJDP, the successful applicant will identify the appropriate scope and scale of the pilot testing necessary to assess the NatSCEV redesign. The proposal written in response to this solicitation should describe a detailed plan and initial budget to conduct the pilot testing, supported by the applicant's best assumptions at the time of application. The specifics of the pilot testing will later be refined as necessary to match the proposed research design with input from the expert panels, BJS, and OJJDP.

The cognitive and pilot testing conducted under this solicitation will fall under the purview of the BJS generic Office of Management and Budget (OMB) clearance package. However, a new OMB package may be required. In either case, the successful applicant will work with BJS and OJJDP to complete the necessary OMB package requirements and application process to secure the proper clearance.

The successful applicant will also be responsible for securing any necessary Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval from the appropriate review board entity to conduct the pilot study. Consideration should be given to IRB concerns that are likely to arise in a study of this nature, such as obtaining informed consent from a minor and establishing various protocols for addressing situations where a child is in imminent danger or becomes upset during the interview. Because IRB review can be lengthy, applicants should identify their assumption for the appropriate IRB, any key dates related to submissions (e.g., new proposals are due by noon on the second Friday of each month), expected review and turnaround times, and special requirements in their application.

The successful applicant will recommend one or more research designs for pilot testing and a means for conducting these pilot tests. This information will be submitted in a report titled *A Plan for Pilot Testing Alternative Methods for the NatSCEV* by Month 16 (Deliverable 12). The successful applicant's plan will clearly describe the details of the proposed alternative methods and thoroughly justify and support their recommendations by discussing the benefits and drawbacks of the proposed methods compared to others. This will include a cost estimate of implementing the recommended alternatives on a national scale. The plan will also discuss how the proposed strategies will improve on the response rates of prior collections and include a nonresponse bias plan. A budget and timeline for completing the pilot testing in an efficient manner will also be included. Upon approval from BJS and OJJDP, the applicant will then conduct the pilot test.

**Pilot testing the proposed NatSCEV design(s) and survey instrument and assess the results in a report (Deliverables 13 and 14).** Once BJS and OJJDP decide on the most robust and sustainable methodology for the NatSCEV and the accompanying survey, the successful applicant will implement the pilot testing as agreed (Deliverable 13). [The successful applicant should be prepared to conduct more than one pilot test if it is determined that more than one methodology should be tested.] Following the completion of the pilot testing, the successful applicant will—

- evaluate the strengths and challenges of the research designs and its individual components to meet its objectives
- conduct preliminary data analysis of key statistics
- conduct a nonresponse bias analysis (applicable only if the response rate is below 80%)
- conduct an item response analysis to identify questions that may be problematic or unnecessary.

This evaluation and its findings will be delivered in a report titled *Findings from the NatSCEV Redesign Pilot Testing* (Deliverable 14) by Month 20 of the project period. It will also include observations, notes, or lessons learned from the field or respondents.

**Organize a review process for the expert panels to provide final feedback (Deliverable 15).** Following the completion of the pilot testing, the successful applicant will organize a process to share what did and did not work in the pilot testing and solicit final feedback from the expert panel members on all aspects of the proposed plan for conducting NatSCEV IV. This review process may be in the form of in-person meetings, webinars, conference calls, or another method. The successful applicant should summarize for the experts the results of the pilot testing and its final recommendations for conducting NatSCEV IV. These recommendations should include for review and comment by the experts its recommendations for the survey design, sampling strategy, efforts to obtain a high response rate, a plan for nonresponse bias adjustments and a plan to produce national estimates of children exposed to violence from the sample data. Feedback from the expert panels should occur in Month 21 of the project period.

**Submit a final technical report of recommendations for the NatSCEV IV redesign and survey (Deliverable 16).** Based on responses from the expert panels, BJS, and OJJDP, the final report will outline in detail the recommendations for how to conduct the NatSCEV IV. The final set of recommendations should be in the form of one research design and should not be presented as multiple designs from which to choose. The recommendations should be feasible, reasonable, and be built on lessons learned during the work funded through this solicitation. The report should include the final proposed survey instrument with an accompanying codebook, a sampling strategy, recommended efforts to obtain a high response rate, a plan for nonresponse

bias adjustments and a plan to produce national estimates of children exposed to violence from the sample data. The report should include a timeline to implement the recommended design on a national scale along with a budget. A draft of the report should be delivered to BJS by the end of Month 22, and BJS and OJJDP will review it. The draft report will then be revised and submitted to BJS by the end of Month 24.

## **B. Federal Award Information**

BJS estimates that it will make one award of up to \$1 million for a 2-year project period, with an anticipated start date of January 1, 2017. The award will be funded incrementally on an annual basis. Applicants must submit an annual budget for Year 1 and a provisional budget for Year 2 using the Budget Detail Worksheet. The budget for Year 1 may be up to but not exceed \$500,000, and the budget for Year 2 should be based on the remaining balance to equal \$1 million. (Note: only the Year 1 amount should be reflected in Grants.gov on the SF424 under “estimated funding.”)

BJS and OJJDP may, in certain cases, provide supplemental funding in future years to the award under this solicitation. Important considerations in decisions regarding supplemental funding include, among other factors, the availability of funding, strategic priorities, assessment of the quality of the management of the award (for example, timeliness and quality of progress reports), and assessment of the progress of the work funded under the award.

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<sup>12</sup>**

BJS expects that it will make any award from this solicitation in the form of a cooperative agreement, which is a particular type of grant used if BJS expects to have ongoing substantial involvement in award activities. Substantial involvement includes direct oversight and involvement with the grantee organization in implementation of the grant, but does not involve day-to-day project management. See [Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements](#), under [Section F. Federal Award Administration Information](#), for details regarding the federal involvement anticipated under an award from this solicitation.

As discussed [later in the solicitation](#), important rules (including limitations) apply to any conference/meeting/training costs under cooperative agreements.

**Please note:** Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be required to comply with Department of Justice regulations on confidentiality and human subjects’ protection. See “Evidence, Research, and Evaluation Guidance and Requirements” under “Solicitation Requirements” in [OJP's Funding Resource Center](#).

---

<sup>12</sup> See generally 31 U.S.C. §§ 6301-6305 (defines and describes various forms of federal assistance relationships, including grants and cooperative agreements (a type of grant)).

## **Financial Management and System of Internal Controls**

Award recipients and subrecipients (including any recipient or subrecipient funded in response to this solicitation that is a pass-through entity<sup>13</sup>) must, as described in the Part 200 Uniform Requirements set out at 2 C.F.R. 200.303:

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

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

## **Budget Information**

### **Cost Sharing or Matching 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 Cost (also known as Pre-award Cost) Approvals**

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

OJP does not typically approve pre-agreement costs; an applicant must request and obtain the prior written approval of OJP for all such costs. If approved, pre-agreement costs could be paid

---

<sup>13</sup> For purposes of this solicitation (or program announcement), “pass-through entity” includes any entity eligible to receive funding as a recipient or subrecipient under this solicitation (or program announcement) that, if funded, may make a subaward(s) to a subrecipient(s) to carry out part of the funded program.

from grant funds consistent with a grantee's approved budget, and under applicable cost standards. However, all such costs prior to award and prior to approval of the costs are incurred at the sole risk of an applicant. Generally, no applicant should incur project costs *before* submitting an application requesting federal funding for those costs. Should there be extenuating circumstances that appear to be appropriate for OJP's consideration as pre-agreement costs, the applicant should contact the point of contact listed on the title page of this announcement for details on the requirements for submitting a written request for approval. See the section on Costs Requiring Prior Approval in the [Financial Guide](#), for more information.

### **Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver**

With respect to any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation, recipients may not use federal funds to pay total cash compensation (salary plus cash bonuses) to any employee of the award recipient at a rate that exceeds 110% 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.<sup>14</sup> The 2016 salary table for SES employees is available at the Office of Personnel Management [website](#). Note: A recipient may compensate an employee at a greater rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with non-federal funds. (Any such additional compensation will not be considered matching funds where match requirements apply.) For employees who charge only a portion of their time to an award, the allowable amount to be charged is equal to the percentage of time worked times the maximum salary limitation.

The Director of BJS may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, the limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant requesting a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of the application. Unless the applicant submits a waiver request and justification with the application, the applicant should anticipate that OJP will request the applicant to adjust and resubmit the budget.

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

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

OJP strongly encourages applicants that propose to use award funds for any conference-, meeting-, or training-related activity to review carefully—before submitting an application—the OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at [www.ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm](http://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 and of some conference, meeting, and training costs for grant recipients; and (3) set cost limits, including a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

### **Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)**

If an applicant proposes a program or activity that would deliver services or benefits to individuals, the costs of taking reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to those services

---

<sup>14</sup> OJP does not apply this limitation on the use of award funds to the nonprofit organizations listed at Appendix VIII to 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

or benefits for individuals with limited English proficiency may be allowable. Reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to services or benefits may include interpretation or translation services where appropriate.

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

## **C. Eligibility Information**

For eligibility information, see title page.

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

### **Limit on Number of Application Submissions**

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

## **D. Application and Submission Information**

### **What an Application Should Include**

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

Moreover, applicants should anticipate that applications that are determined to be nonresponsive to the scope of the solicitation, or that do not include the application elements that BJS has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. Under this solicitation, BJS has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, Budget Narrative, and resumes/curriculum vitae of key personnel. For the purposes of this solicitation, "key personnel" means the principal investigator and any and all co-principal investigators. Applicants 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](#) 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," "Resumes") for all attachments. Also, OJP recommends that applicants include resumes 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).

**Intergovernmental Review:** This funding opportunity (program) **is not** subject to [Executive Order 12372](#). (In completing the SF-424, applicants are to make the appropriate selection in response to question 19 to indicate 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 (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](http://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/ProjectAbstractTemplate.pdf).

**Permission to Share Project Abstract with the Public:** It is unlikely that BJS 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 proposals.

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

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

## 3. Program Narrative

The program narrative section of the application should not exceed 30 double-spaced pages in 12-point font with 1-inch margins. If included in the main body of the program narrative, tables, charts, figures, and other illustrations count toward the 30-page limit for the narrative section. The project abstract, table of contents, appendices, and government forms do not count toward the 30-page limit.

If the program narrative fails to comply with these length-related restrictions, BJS may consider such noncompliance in peer review and in final award decisions.

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

- a. Statement of the Problem
- b. Project Design and Implementation
- c. Capabilities and Competencies
- d. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures

To demonstrate program progress and success, as well as to assist the Department with fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), Public Law 103-62, and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010, Public Law 111–352, applicants that receive funding under this solicitation must provide data that measure the results of their work done under this solicitation. OJP will require any award recipient, post award, to provide the data requested in the “Data Grantee Provides” column so that OJP can calculate values for the “Performance Measures” column. Performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Performance Measures</b>	<b>Data Grantee Provides</b>
Evaluate and assess the prior NatSCEV samples, research designs, and instruments, and findings.	Number of deliverables completed on time  Number of deliverables that meeting expectations	Develop and provide a report titled <i>Strengths and Limitations of the NatSCEV and Proposed Alternatives for the NatSCEV IV</i> based on a comprehensive review of prior NatSCEV elements, the literature, and other comparable surveys
Undertake methodological research to determine an optimal research design.	Number of deliverables completed on time  Number of deliverables that meeting expectations	A list of proposed experts and panel members with justification for inclusion
	Materials developed for the expert panels.	Develop all materials necessary to guide the expert panel meetings and solicit feedback.
	Number of expert panel meetings held on scheduled dates.	Plan and hold two in-person expert panel meetings (one meeting of each panel).
Propose alternative methodologies for the next NatSCEV data collection.	Number of subject matter experts from the expert panel consulted	Number of subject matter experts from the expert panel consulted, along with their feedback incorporated into the revised <i>Strengths and Limitations</i> report
	Develop a plan to design a cognitive testing of NatSCEV survey items	Develop and provide a plan to cognitively test NatSCEV survey items.

	Provide the implementation plan to cognitively test the NatSCEV survey items	Implement the cognitive testing as agreed upon
	Achieve an 80% response rate	Number of individuals completing the NatSCEV cognitive tests  Number of individuals contacted
	Percent of items completed on the cognitive tests	Number of NatSCEV survey items completed  Number of NatSCEV survey items tested
	Number of recommendations based on the findings resulting from the cognitive testing	Provide the number of recommendations based on the findings resulting from the cognitive testing
	Number of deliverables completed on time	Provide a draft survey instrument, codebook, and crosswalk.
	Number of deliverables that meeting expectations	
Evaluate the cost, feasibility, and performance of the proposed alternatives.	Develop a plan for pilot testing alternative methods.	Prepare and submit the pilot testing plan
	Provide the implementation plan for the pilot testing.	Provide the implementation plan for pilot testing the alternative methods
	Achieve an 80% response rate	Number of individuals completing the NatSCEV pilot tests  Number of individuals contacted
	Percent of items completed on the pilot tests	Number of survey items completed  Number of survey items tested
	Number of recommendations based on the findings resulting from the pilot testing	Provide the number of recommendations based on the findings resulting from the pilot testing
	Number of deliverables completed on time	Provide a report titled <i>Findings from the NatSCEV Redesign Pilot Testing</i> .
	Number of deliverables that meet expectations	Provide OMB package to conduct the pilot testing, if applicable, per BJS guidance
	Provide review process for peer reviewers to assess research	Organize a review process for the expert panels to provide final feedback.

Provide final recommendations to improve upon or enhance NatSCEV to produce estimates of children exposed to violence.	Develop a final technical report for optimal NatSCEV methodology.	A technical report that synthesizes the methodological review work and makes final recommendations for the NatSCEV sample design, data collection, and survey instrument.
--	---	---

BJS and OJJDP do not require applicants to submit performance measures data with their application. Performance measures are included as an alert that BJS and OJJDP will require successful applicants to submit specific data as part of their reporting requirements. For the application, applicants should indicate an understanding of these requirements and discuss how they will gather the required data, should they receive funding.

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

- Bibliography or references.
- Any tools or instruments; questionnaires; tables, charts, or graphs; or maps pertaining to the proposed project that are supplemental to such items included in the main body of the narrative.
- Curriculum vitae or resumes of the principal investigator and any and all co-principal investigators. In addition, curriculum vitae, resumes, or biographical sketches of all other individuals (regardless of investigator status) who will be significantly involved in substantive aspects of the proposal (e.g., research methodologists serving as consultants to develop sampling strategies and experts with knowledge of children’s exposure to violence).
- List (to the extent known) of all proposed project staff members, including those affiliated with the applicant organization or any proposed subrecipient organization(s), any proposed consultant(s) and contractors (whether individuals or organizations), and any proposed members of an advisory board for the project (if applicable). The list should include, for each individual and organization: name, title (if applicable), employer or other organizational affiliation, and roles and responsibilities proposed for the project.
- A detailed proposed project timeline with expected milestones and level of staff effort for each phase of the work.
- A privacy certificate and human subjects protection certification of compliance must be completed for each project proposed in an application.
  - **Privacy Certification.** The Privacy Certificate is a funding recipient’s certification of compliance with federal regulations requiring confidentiality of information identifiable to a private person that is collected, analyzed, or otherwise used in connection with an OJP-funded research or statistical activity. The funding recipient’s Privacy Certificate includes a description of its policies and procedures to be followed to protect identifiable data. A model certificate is located at [www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/bjsmpc.pdf](http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/bjsmpc.pdf).

- **Human Subjects Protection Certification of Compliance.** BJS requires the funding recipient to submit proper documentation to be used to determine that the research project meets the federal requirements for human subjects protections set forth in 28 CFR Part 46. A model certificate, describing the necessary information to be provided by the funding recipient, is available at [www.bjs.gov/content/hscr.cfm](http://www.bjs.gov/content/hscr.cfm).
- List of any previous and current BJS awards to applicant organization and investigator(s), including the BJS-assigned award numbers and a brief description of any scholarly products that resulted in whole or in part from work funded under the BJS award(s).
- Letters of cooperation/support or administrative agreements from organizations collaborating in the project, such as universities, child welfare agencies, interest groups, or other relevant membership organizations.
- List of other agencies, organizations, or funding source to which this proposal has been submitted (if applicable).

#### 4. Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

##### a. Budget Detail Worksheet

A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at [www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf](http://www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf). Applicants that submit their budget in a different format should include the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet. BJS expects applicants to provide a thorough narrative to each section of the Budget Detail Worksheet. The Budget Detail Worksheet should be broken down by year.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the Financial Guide at <http://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/index.htm>.

##### b. Budget Narrative

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

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

The narrative should be mathematically sound and correspond with the information and figures provided in the Budget Detail Worksheet. The narrative should explain how the applicant estimated and calculated all costs, and how they are relevant to the completion of the proposed project. The narrative may include tables for clarification purposes but

need not be in a spreadsheet format. As with the Budget Detail Worksheet, the Budget Narrative should be broken down by year.

**IMPORTANT NOTE: BJS requires that the application include a separate Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative for each proposed subcontractor or subrecipient of funds associated with the proposed program.**

**c. Non-Competitive Procurement Contracts In Excess of Simplified Acquisition Threshold**

If an applicant proposes to make one or more non-competitive procurements of products or services, where the noncompetitive procurement will exceed the simplified acquisition threshold (also known as the small purchase threshold), which is currently set at \$150,000, the application should address the considerations outlined in the [Financial Guide](#).

**d. Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals**

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

**5. Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)**

Indirect costs are allowed only under the following circumstances:

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

Attach a copy of the federally approved indirect cost rate agreement to the application. Applicants that do not have an approved rate may request one through their cognizant federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or, if the applicant’s accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct cost categories. For the definition of Cognizant Federal Agency, see the “Glossary of Terms” in the [Financial Guide](#). For assistance with identifying your cognizant agency, please contact the Customer Service Center at 1-800-458-0786 or at [ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov](mailto:ask.ocfo@usdoj.gov). If DOJ is the cognizant federal agency, applicants may obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at <http://www.ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/IndirectCosts.pdf>.

In order to use the “de minimis” indirect rate, attach written documentation to the application that advises OJP of both the applicant’s eligibility (to use the “de minimis” rate) and its election. If the applicant elects the “de minimis” method, costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct costs, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. In addition, if this method is chosen then it must be used consistently for all federal awards until such time as you choose to negotiate a federally approved indirect cost rate.<sup>15</sup>

**6. Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status**

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

- The federal agency that currently designated the applicant as high risk

---

<sup>15</sup> See 2 C.F.R. § 200.414(f).

- Date the applicant was designated high risk
- The high risk point of contact name, phone number, and email address, from that federal agency
- Reasons for the high risk status

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

**7. Additional Attachments**

**a. Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **b. Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity**

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

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

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

OR

b. A specific listing of actual or perceived conflicts of interest that the applicant has identified in relation to this proposal. These conflicts could be either personal (related to specific staff, consultants, and/or sub-recipients) or organizational (related to the applicant or any subgrantee organization). Examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations may include, but are not limited to, those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse’s work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former or current colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization could not be given a grant to evaluate a project if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that specific project or a location implementing the project (whether funded by OJP or other sources), as the organization in such an instance would appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a reasonable person understanding all of the facts would be able to have confidence that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability of an evaluation or research product is a problem and must be disclosed.

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

OR

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

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

#### **8. Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire**

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

#### **9. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities**

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

## How to Apply

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

BJS and OJJDP strongly encourage 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 insure all required documents are attached in the mandatory category.

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

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 (.)	<b>When using the ampersand (&amp;) in XML, applicants must use the “&amp;amp;” format.</b>		

Grants.gov is designed to forward successfully submitted applications to the OJP Grants Management System (GMS).

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

All applicants are required to complete the following steps:

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

Individual applicants should search Grants.gov for a funding opportunity for which individuals are eligible to apply. Use the Funding Opportunity Number (FON) to register. Complete the registration form at <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRegister> to create a username and password. Individual applicants should complete all steps except 1, 2, and 4.

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

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

Information about SAM registration procedures can be accessed at [www.sam.gov](http://www.sam.gov).

- 3. Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. The applicant organization's DUNS number must be used to complete this step. For more information about the registration process for organizations, go to [www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html](http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html). Individuals registering with Grants.gov should go to <https://apply07.grants.gov/apply/IndCPRegister>.
- 4. Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. The E-Biz POC will need the Marketing Partner Identification

Number (MPIN) password obtained when registering with SAM to complete this step. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.

5. **Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number for this solicitation is CFDA 16.734, titled “Special Data Collections and Statistical Studies,” and the funding opportunity number is BJS-2016-10080.
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 and the second will state whether the application has been successfully validated, or rejected due to errors, with an explanation. It is possible to first receive a message indicating that the application is received and then receive a rejection notice a few minutes or hours later. Submitting well ahead of the deadline provides time to correct the problem(s) that caused the rejection. **Important:** OJP urges applicants to submit applications **at least 72 hours prior** to the application due date to allow time to receive validation messages or rejection notifications from Grants.gov, and to correct in a timely fashion any problems that may have caused a rejection notification. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on June 24, 2016.

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

#### **Note: Duplicate Applications**

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

#### **Experiencing Unforeseen Grants.gov Technical Issues**

Applicants that experience unforeseen Grants.gov technical issues beyond their control that prevent them from submitting their application by the deadline must contact the Grants.gov [Customer Support Hotline](#) or the [SAM Help Desk](#) (Federal Service Desk) to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. The applicant must email the BJS contact identified in the Contact Information section on page 2 **within 24 hours after the application deadline** and request approval to submit their application. The email must describe the technical difficulties, and include a timeline of the applicant’s submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant’s DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s). **Note: BJS does not automatically approve requests.** After the program office reviews the submission, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desk to validate the reported technical issues, OJP will inform the applicant whether the request to submit a late application has been approved or denied. If OJP determines that the applicant failed to follow all required procedures, which resulted in an untimely application submission, OJP will deny the applicant’s request to submit their application.

The following conditions are generally insufficient to justify late submissions:

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

**Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP funding web page at <http://ojp.gov/funding/index.htm>.**

## **E. Application Review Information**

### **Selection Criteria**

This section includes information on the criteria used (and assignment of percentage weight) to evaluate the applications for this solicitation.

#### **1. Statement of the Problem (15%)**

Applications will be assessed according to the following criteria:

- Demonstrated knowledge about children exposed to violence, the complexities of defining and measuring children's exposure to different types of violence in different domains, the importance of collecting such data, and how this information can be used.
- Understanding of how the project goals and objectives will assist DOJ in addressing stakeholders' statistical information needs related to children's exposure to violence.
- Understanding of other federal data sources related to children's exposure to violence that can enhance, complement, or inform the NatSCEV.

#### **2. Project Design and Implementation (40%)**

This work has multiple phases and applications will be assessed according to the strength of descriptions about and plans to develop Deliverables 1 to 16. In addition, the application should include—

- The criteria the applicant will use to identify the expert panels.
- The applicant's understanding of the expert panels' roles and how they will be used.
- A detailed plan for how the applicant will conduct the NatSCEV review process.
- The applicant's preliminary ideas on a sampling plan.
- The applicant's preliminary ideas on how to improve response rates and address nonresponse bias.
- The applicant's preliminary ideas on how to conduct cognitive and pilot testing.
- The applicant's preliminary ideas on the type of data to be collected through the survey instrument.
- A reasonable time frame and staff commitment for producing each deliverable, and projected interim and final delivery dates.
- A detailed time/task plan showing the time periods for all subtasks, dates for major milestones and deliverables, and levels of effort of key staff on all subtasks and deliverables.

### **3. Capabilities and Competencies (30%)**

Applications will be assessed on—

- Qualifications and experience of all proposed project staff, including the principal investigator, any co-principal investigators, and all other individuals (and organizations) identified in the application who will be significantly involved in substantive and methodological aspects of the project.
- Demonstrated ability to design and carry out a methodological assessment and evaluation plan.
- Clear description of the project's management and organization that supports successful completion of the project's milestones within expressed time frames.
- Demonstrated ability to address nonresponse and improve survey response rates.
- Demonstrated competencies in identifying key resources to develop the topics of importance to understanding and preventing children's exposure to violence and relevant methodologies. This includes identifying organizations, persons, and relevant literature sources.
- Knowledge of the multiple dimensions of children's exposure to violence, including indirect and direct forms and contextual variables.
- Demonstrated ability to develop and implement nationally representative surveys capable of collecting data from young respondents.
- Comprehensive understanding of NatSCEV information needs and how estimates of children's exposure to violence are used.
- Demonstrated ability to design and test survey instruments.
- Demonstrated ability to develop a sampling plan to generate statistically sound national estimates with an acceptable degree of precision.
- Demonstrated capacity to implement a pilot test.
- Demonstrated capacity to cover the substantive, methodological, analytic, and technical issues described in the project.

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

Applications will be assessed for the efficiency of the review and recommendation activities required to demonstrate the project's performance in a low-cost manner and as part of the project organization.

### **5. Budget: complete, cost effective, allowable, reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities (10%)**

Budget narratives should generally demonstrate 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.<sup>16</sup>

Applications will be assessed on—

- Appropriateness of the budget relative to the level of effort of each deliverable.
- The extent to which staff resources allocated in the budget are appropriate for the project tasks (i.e., appropriateness of budgeted items for achieving project goals).

---

<sup>16</sup> 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.

## Review Process

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

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

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

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

BJS may use internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination, to assess applications meeting basic minimum requirements on technical merit using the solicitation’s selection criteria. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the subject matter of a given solicitation who is not a current DOJ employee. An internal reviewer is a current DOJ employee who is well-versed or has expertise in the subject matter of this solicitation. A peer review panel will evaluate, score, and rate applications that meet basic minimum requirements. Peer reviewers’ ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although their views are considered carefully. In addition to peer review ratings, considerations for award recommendations and decisions may include, but are not limited to, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance under prior BJS and OJP awards, and available funding.

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

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

All final award decisions will be made by the director of the BJS with concurrence from the OJJDP Administrator. Peer reviewers' ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only, although their views are considered carefully. In addition to peer review ratings, considerations for award recommendations and decisions may include, but are not limited to, proposed budgets, past performance (including scholarly products) under prior BJS and OJP awards, research independence and integrity, strategic priorities, and available funding when making awards.

## F. Federal Award Administration Information

### Federal Award Notices

OJP sends award notification by email through GMS to the individuals listed in the application as the point of contact and the authorizing official (E-Biz POC and AOR). The email notification includes detailed instructions on how to access and view the award documents, and how to accept the award in GMS. GMS automatically issues the notifications at 9:00 p.m. eastern time on the award date (by September 30, 2016). Recipients will be required to log in; accept any outstanding assurances and certifications on the award; designate a financial point of contact; and review, sign, and accept the award. The award acceptance process involves physical signature of the award document by the authorized representative and the scanning of the fully-executed award document to OJP.

### Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements

If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the agency-approved project proposal and budget, the recipient must comply with award terms and conditions, and other legal requirements, including but not limited to OMB, DOJ, or other federal regulations which will be included in the award, incorporated into the award by reference, or are otherwise applicable to the award. OJP strongly encourages prospective applicants to review the information pertaining to these requirements **prior** to submitting an application. To assist applicants and recipients in accessing and reviewing this information, OJP has placed pertinent information on its [Solicitation Requirements](#) page of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

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

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

Upon grant approval, OJP electronically transmits (via GMS) the award document to the prospective award recipient. In addition to other award information, the award document contains award terms and conditions that specify national policy requirements<sup>17</sup> with which recipients of federal funding must comply; uniform administrative requirements, cost principles,

---

<sup>17</sup> See *generally* 2 C.F.R. 200.300 (provides a general description of national policy requirements typically applicable to recipients of Federal awards, including the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (FFATA)).

and audit requirements; and program-specific terms and conditions required based on applicable program (statutory) authority or requirements set forth in OJP solicitations and program announcements, and other requirements which may be attached to appropriated funding. For example, certain efforts may call for special requirements, terms, or conditions relating to intellectual property, data/information-sharing or -access, or information security; or audit requirements, expenditures and milestones, or publications and/or press releases. OJP also may place additional terms and conditions on an award based on its risk assessment of the applicant, or for other reasons it determines necessary to fulfill the goals and objectives of the program.

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

As stated above, BJS and OJJDP anticipate that they will make any award from this solicitation in the form of a cooperative agreement. Cooperative agreement awards include standard “federal involvement” conditions that describe the general allocation of responsibility for execution of the funded program. Generally stated, under cooperative agreement awards, responsibility for the day-to-day conduct of the funded project rests with the recipient in implementing the funded and approved proposal and budget, and the award terms and conditions. Responsibility for oversight and redirection of the project, if necessary, rests with BJS.

In addition to any “federal involvement” condition(s), OJP cooperative agreement awards include a special condition specifying certain reporting requirements required in connection with conferences, meetings, retreats, seminars, symposia, training activities, or similar events funded under the award, consistent with OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting.

BJS awards under this kind of solicitation will include a number of special conditions including the following four, among others:

- First, the project will be funded as a cooperative agreement. The basis for using a cooperative agreement is BJS and OJJDP’s substantial involvement in providing information, guidance, and direction relative to special data collections and the development of statistical studies. BJS will exercise general approval over the entire project subject to the recipient’s rights to disclose and publish certain information after review and comment by BJS, as set forth in a memorandum.
- Second, the award recipient will agree that no funds provided may be used to author or prepare reports, journal articles, speeches or studies, or other publications without the prior written approval of BJS and OJJDP, regardless of whether the data used in the publications or other releases are publicly available.
- Third, BJS will retain all rights to exclusive use of any data collected using the pilot instrument (if applicable). These data will not be released to the public because OMB generic clearance does not allow for data dissemination. The award recipient will not be able to release or disclose any data collected through this cooperative agreement without prior written BJS approval. This includes, but is not limited to, presentations at professional conferences and meetings, press releases, and/or grant applications. BJS-protected data include all data that BJS collects but has not yet released publicly. It does

not include aggregate results derived from the data by the recipient provided that such results do not contain any confidential, proprietary, or personally identifiable information.

- Fourth, the award recipient will retain a nonexclusive use of any methodological findings derived by the recipient or BJS from the project subject to the following condition: Only with the prior review and written comment by BJS, which includes mutual agreement on the representation of BJS's methodologies, may the recipient publicly disclose its or BJS's methodologies derived from the project prior to the publication of the final report. Such review and comment period shall not exceed 45 days after receipt of the proposed publication. Any such disclosures of recipient's or BJS's methodologies must be public in nature and contribute meaningfully to the development and/or advancement of social science research. Public disclosure may include, but is not limited to, presentations at professional conferences and meetings, articles appearing in widely distributed publications, Internet postings, or similar outlets that constitute a broad public release of the methodological information.

### **General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements**

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

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

## **G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)**

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

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

## **H. Other Information**

### **Provide Feedback to OJP**

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

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

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, please email your resume to [ojppeerreview@lmsolas.com](mailto:ojppeerreview@lmsolas.com). The OJP Solicitation Feedback email account will not

forward your resume. **Note:** Neither you nor anyone else from your organization can be a peer reviewer in a competition in which you or your organization have submitted an application.

## Application Checklist

# Methodological Research to Support the National Survey of Children's Exposure to Violence

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

### What an Applicant Should Do:

#### *Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:*

- Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 28)
- Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 28)

#### *To Register with Grants.gov:*

- Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 28)
- Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 28)

#### *To Find Funding Opportunity:*

- Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 29)
- Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 29)
- Sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) (optional) (see page 27)
- 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](http://ojp.gov/financialguide/DOJ/PostawardRequirements/chapter3.10a.htm) (see page 16)

#### *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 29)

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

- contact BJS regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 29)

### General Requirements:

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

### Scope Requirement:

- The federal amount requested is within the allowable limit(s) of the budget.

**Eligibility Requirement:** Eligible applicants are national, regional, state, or local public and private entities, including for-profit and nonprofit organizations, faith-based and community organizations, institutions of higher education, federally recognized Indian tribal governments as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, and units of local government that support initiatives to improve the functioning of the criminal justice system.

### What an Application Should Include:

- Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 17)
- Project Abstract (see page 18)
- Program Narrative (see page 18)
- Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 22)

_____	Budget Narrative	(see page 22)
_____	Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable)	(see page 23)
_____	Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status	(see page 23)
_____	Additional Attachments	
_____	Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications	(see page 24)
_____	Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity	(see page 25)
_____	Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire	(see page 26)
_____	<a href="#">Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL)</a>	(see page 26)
_____	Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable)	(see page 16)