

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

OMB No. 1121-0329
Approval Expires 07/31/2016



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking](#) (SMART) is seeking applications for funding under the SMART Office FY 15 Campus-Focused Sexual Assault Perpetration Prevention and Education Program. This program furthers the Department's mission by supporting projects that will test pilot programs to enhance sex offender management practices.

SMART FY 15 Campus-Focused Sexual Assault Perpetration Prevention and Education Program

Eligibility

Eligible applicants include nonprofits with 501(c)(3) status, private or public and state controlled institutions of higher education, tribal institutions of higher education, for-profit organizations, or small businesses. For profit organizations must agree to forgo any profit or management fee.

The SMART Office welcomes applications that involve two or more entities; however, one eligible entity must be the applicant and the others must be proposed as subrecipients. The applicant must be the entity with primary responsibility for administering the funding and managing the entire program.

The SMART Office may elect to make awards for applications submitted under this solicitation in future fiscal years, dependent on the merit of the applications and on the availability of appropriations.

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

Deadline

Applicants must register with [Grants.gov](#) prior to submitting an application. All applications are due to be submitted and in receipt of a successful validation message in Grants.gov by 11:59 p.m. eastern time on May 28, 2015.

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

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

Contact Information

For technical assistance with submitting an application, contact the Grants.gov Customer Support Hotline at 800-518-4726 or 606-545-5035, or via e-mail to support@grants.gov. The 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 e-mail the SMART Office 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 Scott Matson, Senior Policy Advisor by telephone at (202) 305-4560, or by e-mail at Scott.Matson@usdoj.gov for program-specific questions; or Marlon Daley, Grant Management Specialist, by telephone at 202-514-5231, or by e-mail at Marlon.Daley@usdoj.gov for grant-related questions.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: SMART-2015-4157

Release date: April 15, 2015

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program- Specific Information	4
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables	6
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices	8
B. Federal Award Information	8
Type of Award	9
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	9
Budget Information	9
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement	9
Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals	10
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	10
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	10
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)	10
C. Eligibility Information	11
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement	11
Limit on Number of Application Submissions	11
D. Application and Submission Information	11
What an Application Should Include	11
How to Apply	22
E. Application Review Information	25
Selection Criteria	25
Review Process	25
F. Federal Award Administration Information	26
Federal Award Notices	26
Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements	26
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	28
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	28
H. Other Information	28
Provide Feedback to OJP	28
Application Checklist	29

SMART FY 15 Campus-Focused Sexual Assault Perpetration Prevention and Education Program (CFDA # 16.203)

A. Program Description

Overview

Many colleges and universities lack the training and resources to adequately address sexual assault prevention. Most prevention programming in colleges and universities is carried out in a limited capacity or through a basic one-time educational program for entering students. Research is beginning to demonstrate that situational prevention initiatives, programs, strategies, and policies aimed at preventing first time perpetration of sexual violence have been successful.¹ This solicitation seeks to reduce sexual violence perpetration on college and university campuses through the design and implementation of a comprehensive situational-based sexual assault prevention strategy, which may include educational, structural, environmental, and/or policy components.

Program - Specific Information

According to a 2007 study of campus sexual assault,² nearly one in five women has been sexually assaulted while in college. To a lesser extent, but often ignored, men are also vulnerable to sexual assault in college³. Most college victims are assaulted by someone they know, especially in incapacitated assaults.⁴ Reporting rates for campus sexual assault are very low; on average only 12% of student victims report the assault to law enforcement.⁵ The trauma caused by sexual assault can be life-long⁶ and not all campuses have the resources to effectively help the victim. Even fewer have the clinical background to understand how to deal with the student who is at risk for abusive behaviors, found responsible for an assault or convicted of an assault. Although many campuses have developed resources for the victims of sexual assault who come forward for help, most have not developed sufficient responses to the

¹ Taylor, B., Stein, N., Woods, D., & Mumford, E. (2011). Shifting boundaries: Final report on an experimental evaluation of a youth dating violence prevention program in New York City middle schools. Washington, D.C. US Department of Justice.

² Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2007). The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

³ White House Council on Women and Girls and the Office of the Vice President. (2014). Rape and Sexual Assault: A Renewed Call to Action. Retrieved on March 5, 2015 from:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/sexual_assault_report_1-21-14.pdf

⁴ White House Council on Women and Girls and the Office of the Vice President. (2014). Rape and Sexual Assault: A Renewed Call to Action. Retrieved on March 5, 2015 from:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/sexual_assault_report_1-21-14.pdf

⁵ Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2007). The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

⁶ White House Council on Women and Girls and the Office of the Vice President. (2014). Rape and Sexual Assault: A Renewed Call to Action. Retrieved on March 5, 2015 from:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/sexual_assault_report_1-21-14.pdf

alleged perpetrators, those convicted of or found responsible for sexual assault or for those at risk to cause harm.

Last year, the SMART Office released a solicitation targeting the perpetrators of sexual assault on college campuses.⁷ Through the initiative, the SMART Office is funding the development of a treatment curriculum for campus perpetrators of sexual assault to be implemented and tested at multiple colleges and universities. The SMART Office is furthering that effort by seeking to enhance campus safety through the development of primary prevention programs; that is, programs designed to stop sexual violence *before* it occurs.

To date, a number of sexual violence prevention strategies at the college level have focused on brief, one-time sessions, psycho-educational programs aimed at changing attitudes or increasing knowledge of sexual abuse. Unfortunately, rigorous evaluations have shown that these one-time short-term educational programs have limited, if any, effect.⁸ In recent years, primary prevention efforts have expanded to focus on reducing the rates of perpetration (rather than just examining victimization), as well as emphasizing community level interventions (rather than focusing exclusively on the individual). This expanded focus is meant to “decrease the number of actual and potential perpetrators in the population to achieve measurable reductions in the prevalence of sexual violence.”⁹

There are a number of multi-session education programs that are beginning to show effects on attitudes, knowledge and, most importantly, behavior. For instance, the Safe Dates program is effective in reducing the likelihood of future victimization and perpetration by targeting middle and high school students through a multi-session curriculum and associated activities.¹⁰ Additionally, bystander interventions programs at the college level and high school levels, such as Bringing in the Bystander,¹¹ Coaching Boys into Men,¹² and Green Dot¹³ are also considered promising practices. However, they are primarily education and curriculum-based approaches and may not address all of the community level interventions that are possible in a comprehensive prevention approach. This solicitation seeks to complement and build upon these successful sexual violence prevention efforts on college campuses through the development of comprehensive campus-based situational prevention programs.

⁷ <http://www.smart.gov/pdfs/SMARTFY14CampusSexualAssault.pdf>

⁸ DeGue, S., Valle, L. A., Holt, M. K., Massetti, B. M., Matjasko, J. L., & Tharp, A. T. (2014). A systematic review of primary prevention strategies for sexual violence perpetration. *Aggression and Violence Behavior* 19, 346-362.

⁹ DeGue, S., Valle, L. A., Holt, M. K., Massetti, B. M., Matjasko, J. L., & Tharp, A. T. (2014). A systematic review of primary prevention strategies for sexual violence perpetration. *Aggression and Violence Behavior* 19, 346-362.

¹⁰ Foshee, V. A., Bai, L. E., Emmett, S. T., Linder, G. F., Benefield, T., & Suchindran, C. (2004). Assessing the long-term effects of the safe dates program and a booster in preventing and reducing adolescent dating violence victimization and perpetration. *American Journal of Public Health*, 94, 619-624.

¹¹ Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 35, 463-481. DOI: 10.1002/jcop.20159.

¹² Miller, E., Tancredi, D. J., McCauley, H. L., Decker, M. R., Virata, M. C. D., Anderson, H. A., Stetkevich, N., Browne, E. W., Moideen, F., & Silverman, J. G. (2012). Coaching boys into men: A cluster-randomized controlled trial of a dating violence prevention program. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 51, 431-438.

¹³ Coker, A. L., Fisher, B. S., Bush, H. M., Swan, S. C., Williams, C. M., Clear, E. R., & DeGue, S. (2014). Evaluation of the Green Dot Bystander Intervention to reduce interpersonal violence among college students across three campuses. *Violence Against Women*. 1-21. DOI: 10.1177/1077801214545284.

Situational prevention is a criminological approach that examines the various situations (i.e., conditions, locations, circumstances, and policies) that either increase or decrease the risk for a crime to be committed within a given organization or community. This approach has particular relevance for use in organizations and institutions that work with children, adolescents, and young adults—where the actions, responses and policy enforcement of peers and adults have the most influence.¹⁴

One example of this strategy is *Shifting Boundaries*, a school-based dating violence prevention program implemented in New York City middle schools, utilizing two key components: a multi-session curriculum and a building-level intervention (focusing on policies and safety).¹⁵ In an evaluation of this program, researchers found that the building-level intervention alone and the combination of the curriculum and building-level intervention contributed to a 32-47% reduction in peer sexual violence victimization and perpetration in the six months following the intervention.¹⁶ This example points to the need to move away from single-dose education efforts toward perpetration prevention strategies that seek to modify community and contextual supports for sexual violence.

In fact, situational prevention assumes that there are opportunities for prevention in addressing the community factors, both physical and policy driven, that may contribute to, or inhibit the possibility of, a crime being committed in a particular situation. Limited, but promising, research has shown that through the use of structural, environmental and/or policy strategies, situational prevention has the potential to create significant reductions in sexual violence perpetration.¹⁷

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

The SMART Office is seeking applications for the Campus-Focused Sexual Assault Perpetration Prevention and Education Program. The goal of the project is to promote evidence-based knowledge to prevent and reduce sexual assault on college and university campuses. SMART seeks to achieve this goal by developing and implementing situational-based sexual assault prevention programs on college and university campuses. The applicant, in the narrative, will provide the name(s) of the college or university campus(es) intended for implementation. Additionally, applicants must collect information about sexual assault statistics, including rates of victimization and perpetration, adjudication processes and available sanctions, as well as other programs aimed at preventing sexual assault on the campus(es).

An applicant will be selected for SMART Office funding based upon their responses to the Selection Criteria listed in the section, “What an Application Must Include” on page 11. The application should clearly describe and demonstrate how the project will:

¹⁴ Kaufman, K. (Eds.) (2010), *The Prevention of Sexual Violence: A Practitioner’s Sourcebook*. NEARI Press, Holyoke, MA.

¹⁵ The building-level intervention included student mapping of safe/unsafe “hot spots”, placing more security presences in those identified areas, and the use of posters to increase awareness and information about reporting.

¹⁶ Taylor, B., Stein, N., Woods, D., & Mumford, E. (2011). *Shifting boundaries: Final report on an experimental evaluation of a youth dating violence prevention program in New York City middle schools*. Washington, D.C. US Department of Justice.

¹⁷ DeGue, S, Simon, TR, Basile, KC, Yee, SL, Lang, K & Spivak, H. (2012). Moving Forward by Looking Back: Reflecting on a decade of CDC’s work in sexual violence prevention, 2000-2010. *Journal of Women’s Health*. DOI: 10.1089/jwh.2012.3973

- Develop and implement a situational prevention strategy that includes, but is not limited to, a focus on preventing the perpetration of sexual violence through targeted and universal efforts, strategies that address community level risk and protective factors,¹⁸ and one that is integrated into existing practices so that the environmental, policy or other changes are a part of a more comprehensive strategy.
- Incorporate prevention of perpetration strategies that are culturally relevant.
- Build knowledge and new evidence on perpetration prevention opportunities to further support the program and its replication on additional campuses.
- Protect victim safety through supportive services and advocacy and avoid any strategies that may traumatize or blame victims.
- Explore the use of the existing evidence-based educational curriculum, safety policies that promote environmental changes to enhance any potential situational prevention strategies in order to reduce the perpetration of sexual violence.
- Collect program development data.
- Work collaboratively with the SMART Office.
- Participate in any external research or evaluations at a later date (should funds become available).

In addition, applications must include a monitoring and evaluation plan for information collection and analysis. Applicants are encouraged to consider and include the following outcomes of interest in monitoring and evaluation plans:

- Changes in knowledge about campus policies and state or federal laws related to consent, sexual harassment, and sexually abusive behavior, resources for help both on and off campus, rape myths, and increase in student involved-prevention skills (e.g., bystander interventions);
- Changes in attitudes about the acceptability of violent, abusive, and harassing behaviors;
- Information about strategies used to reach underserved populations such as LGBT, students with disabilities and African American, Tribal, Hispanic, Asian Pacific Islanders or International students.
- Evidence of behavioral intentions to avoid committing a range of unwanted behavior, from sexual harassment to sexual violence in the future as well as intentions to intervene when in the position of a bystander;
- Information on dating violence, sexual violence and sexual harassment experienced as someone who is victimized or someone who may perpetrate these behaviors; and
- Information on prior attendance at an educational program about sexual assault, sexual harassment, or dating violence; healthy relationships training and students' prior history of dating and dating violence.

¹⁸ Casey, EA & Lindhorst, TP. (2009). Toward a Multi-Level, Ecological Approach to the Primary Prevention of Sexual Assault: Prevention in Peer and Community Contexts. *Trauma Violence Abuse*. DOI: 10.1177/1524838009334129, Jewkes R, Sen P, Garcia-Moreno C. Sexual violence. In: Krug E, Dahlberg LL, Mercy JA, et al., editors. *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva (Switzerland): World Health Organization; 2002. p. 213-239, Loh C, Gidycz CA, Lobo TR, Luthra R. A prospective analysis of sexual assault perpetration: Risk factors related to perpetrator characteristics. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2005; 20(10):1325-1348, Tharp, A.T., Degue, S., Valle, L.A., Brookmeyer, K.A., Massetti, G.M., and Matjaso, J.L. (2012). A systematic qualitative review of risk and protective factors for sexual violence perpetration. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse* 14(2) 133-167.

A comprehensive report will be the final deliverable for this project. The report should contain, but not be limited to the following:

- The final situational prevention strategies and/or curriculum developed targeting perpetration behaviors.
- A detailed description of the theoretical and evidence-base for the perpetration prevention strategy.
- Documentation of the process for implementing the initiative.
- Descriptive information on the number of individuals reached and/or served.
- Campus profiles (including demographics, campus climate survey information, adjudication information, and other adjunct sexual violence and harassment prevention programming).
- An ongoing monitoring and evaluation plan.
- Any outcome information available from the above-mentioned outcomes of interest.

Evidence-Based Programs or Practices

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

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

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

B. Federal Award Information

The SMART Office estimates that it will make an award of up to \$1,000,000 for a 36-month project period, beginning on October 1, 2015.

The SMART Office may, in certain cases, provide supplemental funding in future years to awards 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 Award¹⁹

The SMART Office anticipates 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 the SMART Office 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.

Financial Management and System of Internal Controls

If selected for funding, the award recipient must:

(a) Establish and maintain effective internal control over the Federal award that provides reasonable assurance that the non-Federal entity 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 non-Federal entity's compliance with statute, 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 non-Federal entity considers sensitive consistent with applicable Federal, state and local laws regarding privacy and obligations of confidentiality.

In order to better understand administrative requirements and cost principles, award 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 Match Requirement

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

¹⁹ 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)).

Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals

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 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.²⁰ The 2015 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.)

The Assistant Attorney General for OJP may exercise discretion to waive, on an individual basis, the limitation on compensation rates allowable under an award. An applicant requesting a waiver should include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of the application. Unless 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 <http://www.ojp.gov/financialguide/PostawardRequirements/chapter15page1.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 such costs for cooperative agreement recipients and of some such 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

²⁰ This limitation on use of award funds does not apply to the non-profit organizations specifically named 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 additional eligibility information, see Title page.

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement

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

Limit on Number of Application Submissions

If an applicant submits multiple versions of the same application, the SMART Office 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 the SMART Office has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. Under this solicitation, the SMART Office has designated the following application elements as critical: Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet, and Budget Narrative. 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 OJP's Grants Management System (GMS) take information from the applicant's profile to populate the

fields on this form. When selecting "type of applicant," if the applicant is a for-profit entity, select "For-Profit Organization" or "Small Business" (as applicable).

Intergovernmental Review: This funding opportunity (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.

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

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

Note: OJP may choose not to list a project that otherwise would have been included in a listing of promising but 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 following sections should be included as part of the program narrative:

a. Statement of the Problem

Applicants should describe in detail the challenges a college or university campus faces in preventing sexual violence and how these challenges will be addressed by the grant project. The narrative should include a description of the targeted populations, including demographics, a description of the communities (including underserved populations, such as LGBT, students with disabilities and African American, Tribal, Hispanic, Asian Pacific Islanders or International students) affected by the targeted population, and detail the

college's current response to sexual violence as well as any efforts to prevent first time perpetration of sexual violence with special focus on community factors, both physical and policy driven, that may contribute to, or inhibit the possibility of, a crime being committed in a particular situation. This section should also describe the role of local police in responding to allegations of sexual violence on college campuses as well as an overview of the jurisdiction's guidelines, standards, protocols, memoranda of understanding (MOU), etc.

Additionally, this section should describe the institution's current educational programming or campaigns, response protocols used when allegations have been made, resources for victims or perpetrators available to campus students and/or personnel, any existing prevention programs and how the current efforts will be integrated with and enhanced by this project. Any information about the current state of the campus (e.g., campus climate survey), the effectiveness of these current prevention efforts, the theoretical models behind current approaches, strategies to reach underserved populations (such as LGBT, students with disabilities and African American, Tribal, Hispanic, Asian Pacific Islanders or International students), the utilization of current resources, and any other relevant information should be included.

b. Project Design and Implementation

Project Goals and Objectives: Applicants should describe the goals of the proposed project and identify its objectives and outcomes. Goals: Applicants should provide a broad statement, written in general terms, that conveys the project's intent to change, reduce, or eliminate the problem described. Objectives: Applicants should explain how the program will accomplish its goals. The objectives should be quantifiable and describe the steps necessary to accomplish project goals. When formulating the project's goals and objectives, applicants should be cognizant of the performance measures that will be required of successful applicants.

Applicants should detail how the comprehensive situational model of prevention will be adapted in the college or university community, including how the project will operate during the funding period and describe the strategies that will be used, including any environmental, structural, and policy changes. Applicants should address how the situational model of prevention will be incorporated in existing prevention efforts. Discussion should also address the theoretical models or the case studies used to justify the choice of strategies as well as any plans for monitoring and evaluation and the process for analyzing the data collected.

- Project timeline: Applicants should submit as an attachment a project timeline with each project goal, related objective, activity, expected completion date, and responsible person or organization. Please do not use actual calendar months in the timeline; instead prepare the timeline using "Month 1", etc.

c. Capabilities and Competencies

Applicants should describe the management structure and staffing of the project and include information describing the roles and responsibility of key organizational and functional

components and personnel. This section should describe the experience and capability of the applicant and any contractors that will be used to implement the project and highlight any previous experience implementing projects of similar design or magnitude. Applicants should also describe their expertise or experience in sexual violence prevention efforts and experience or expertise working with campuses. If the applicant is not a college or university campus, specific MOUs with a campus or multiple campuses should be included. The management and organizational structure described should match the staff needs necessary to accomplish the tasks outlined in the project work plan.

- Position descriptions and/or resumes for key positions/personnel should be submitted as an attachment.

d. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures

Applicants should describe how strategies and outcomes will be documented, monitored, and evaluated, including how the impact of the strategy implemented and/or enhancement will be determined. It should also discuss plans for sustainability, i.e., how the program will continue to operate beyond the period of the grant award. If personnel costs are supported by grant funds, specific discussion of how these positions will be maintained beyond the period of the grant award must be included.

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:

Objective	Performance Measure(s)	Data Grantee Provides
Develop and implement situational-based sexual assault prevention programs on college and university campuses	Number of new sexual assault prevention policies, procedures, strategies or interventions developed	Number of new sexual assault prevention policies, procedures, strategies or interventions developed that are culturally relevant during the reporting period
	Number of new sexual assault prevention policies, procedures, strategies or interventions implemented	Number of new sexual assault prevention policies, procedures, strategies or interventions implemented that are culturally relevant during the reporting period
	Number of new sexual assault prevention policies, procedures, strategies or interventions that are supported by evidence to be replicable or a best practice	Number of new sexual assault prevention policies, procedures, strategies or interventions that are supported by evidence to be replicable or a best practice

	Number of target population reached through training or public awareness	Number of individuals who have been reached by this initiative during the reporting period
	Percent of students and staff who exhibit a desired change in attitude about the acceptability of violent, abusive, and harassing behaviors	Number of students and staff who exhibit a change in attitude about the acceptability of violent, abusive, and harassing behaviors Number of students and staff surveyed
	Number of partnerships established	Number of partnerships, by type, established during the reporting period
	Number of partnerships maintained	Number of partnerships, by type, maintained during the reporting period
	Number of presentations or education activities conducted	Number of presentations or other educational activities/actions conducted to students, faculty, and/or administrative staff
Ensure victim safety through services and advocacy	Number of victims identified	Number of victims identified during the reporting period
	Number of victims served	Number of victims served
	Number of victim services provided	Number of victim services provided
	Percent decrease in reported incidents	Number of reports of sexual assault, sexual harassment and other indicators during the reporting period Number of reports of sexual assault, sexual harassment and other indicators in the previous reporting period

	Percent of respondents who report feeling safe	Number of changes in campus climate survey of bystander intervention, sexual harassment, sexual assault, focusing on situations where students perpetrated these behaviors Number of students, faculty, or administrative staff completing the campus climate survey
Increase campus community awareness of sexual assault prevention programs	Number of students, faculty, or administrative staff reached by public awareness campaigns	Number of students, faculty or administrative staff affected by the policy, environment or structural change
	Number of public awareness campaigns	Number of public awareness campaigns completed during the reporting period
	Percent of responses to information requests	Number of responses to information requests Number of request for information from the victim, offender and/or community member
	Number of tips/leads received	Number of contacts made between the community and a program or use of structural strategy (e.g., blue box) Number of contacts made between the community and professionals during the reporting period
Provide the SMART Office with additional knowledge and evidence on perpetration prevention strategies and potential for replication on additional campuses	Number of deliverables that are completed on time Number of deliverables that meet expectations	Provide monitoring and evaluation plans for information collection and analysis as described in the Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables section in the solicitation

	Final report with a comprehensive overview of the project	Final report that provides a comprehensive overview of the project that contains the information as described in the Goals, Objectives and Deliverables section in the solicitation
--	---	---

The SMART Office does not require applicants to submit performance measures data with their application. Performance measures are included as an alert that the SMART Office 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.

Note on Project Evaluations

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

Research, for the purposes of human subjects protections for OJP-funded programs, is defined as, “a systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge” 28 C.F.R. § 46.102(d). For additional information on determining whether a proposed activity would constitute research, see the decision tree to assist applicants on the “Research and the Protection of Human Subjects” section of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](http://www.ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SolicitationRequirements/EvidenceResearchEvaluationRequirements.htm) Web page (www.ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SolicitationRequirements/EvidenceResearchEvaluationRequirements.htm). Applicants whose proposals may involve a research or statistical component also should review the “Data Privacy and Confidentiality Requirements” section on that Web page.

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. Applicants that submit their budget in a different format should include the budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet.

For questions pertaining to budget and examples of allowable and unallowable costs, see the Financial Guide at www.ojp.gov/financialguide/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.

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 non-competitive 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 if the applicant has a current federally approved indirect cost rate. (This requirement does not apply to units of local government.) 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. 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>.

6. Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)

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

comparable legal documentation from each tribal governing body) may submit, instead, a copy of its consortium bylaws with the application.

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

7. Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status

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

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

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

8. Additional Attachments

Applicants should submit the following information as attachments to their application:

- Project Timeline
- Position descriptions and/or resumes for key positions/personnel

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

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

Applicants should include the table as a separate attachment, with the file name “Disclosure of Pending Applications,” to their application. 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 the SMART Office 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.

9. Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire

In accordance with [2 CFR 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](#).

10. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

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

How to Apply

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

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

Note on 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 (.)	When using the ampersand (&) in XML, applicants must use the “&#amp;” format.		

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

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

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

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

- 3. Acquire an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) and a Grants.gov username and password.** Complete the AOR profile on Grants.gov and create a username and password. The applicant organization’s DUNS number must be used to complete this

step. For more information about the registration process, go to www.grants.gov/web/grants/register.html.

4. **Acquire confirmation for the AOR from the E-Business Point of Contact (E-Biz POC).** The E-Biz POC at the applicant organization must log into Grants.gov to confirm the applicant organization's AOR. Note that an organization can have more than one AOR.
5. **Search for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov.** Use the following identifying information when searching for the funding opportunity on Grants.gov. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number for this solicitation is 16.203 titled "Promoting Evidence Integration in Sex Offender Management" and the funding opportunity number is SMART-2015-4157.
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.

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, the SMART Office 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](#) to report the technical issue and receive a tracking number. Then applicant must e-mail the SMART Office 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 e-mail must describe the technical difficulties, and include a timeline of the applicant's submission efforts, the complete grant application, the applicant's DUNS number, and any Grants.gov Help Desk or SAM tracking number(s). **Note: The SMART Office does not automatically approve requests.** After the program office reviews the submission, and contacts the Grants.gov or SAM Help Desks to validate the reported technical issues, OJP will inform the applicant whether the request to submit a late application has been approved or denied. If OJP determines that the applicant failed to follow all required procedures, which resulted in an untimely application submission, OJP will deny the applicant's request to submit their application.

The following conditions are generally insufficient to justify late submissions:

- Failure to register in SAM or Grants.gov in sufficient time
- Failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its Web site
- Failure to follow each instruction in the OJP solicitation
- Technical issues with the applicant’s computer or information technology environment, including firewalls

Notifications regarding known technical problems with Grants.gov, if any, are posted at the top of the OJP funding Web page at www.ojp.gov/funding/Explore/CurrentFundingOpportunities.htm.

E. Application Review Information

Selection Criteria

1. Statement of the Problem (10%)
2. Project Design and Implementation (40%)
3. Capabilities and Competencies (20%)
4. Plan for Collecting the Data Required for this Solicitation’s Performance Measures (15%)
5. Budget: complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). 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.²¹ (10%)
6. Other: Project Timeline, Position descriptions and/or resumes for key positions/personnel, and Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (5%)

Review Process

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

Peer reviewers will review the applications submitted under this solicitation that meet basic minimum requirements. For purposes of assessing whether 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”

²¹ 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.

- Applicants will be checked against the General Services Administration’s Excluded Parties List

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

The SMART Office 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 the SMART Office 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 non-Federal entities
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

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, all final award decisions will be made by the Assistant Attorney General, who may consider factors including, but not limited to, peer review ratings, underserved populations, geographic diversity, strategic priorities, past performance under prior the SMART Office and OJP awards, and available funding when making awards.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

Federal Award Notices

OJP award notification will be sent from GMS. 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 requirements²² with which recipients of federal funding must comply; uniform administrative requirements, cost principles, and audit requirements; and program-specific terms and conditions required based on applicable program (statutory) authority or requirements set forth in OJP solicitations and program announcements, 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 [Mandatory Award Terms and Conditions](#) page of the [OJP Funding Resource Center](#).

As stated above, the SMART Office anticipates that it 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 the SMART Office.

²² 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)).

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, symposium, training activities, or similar events funded under the award, consistent with OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting.

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 2 CFR Part 200. 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 additional Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s), see the Title page.

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

H. Other Information

Provide Feedback to OJP

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

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

If you are interested in being a reviewer for other OJP grant applications, please e-mail your resume to ojppeerreview@lmbps.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

SMART FY 15 Campus-Focused Sexual Assault Perpetration Prevention and Education Program

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

What an Applicant Should Do:

Prior to Registering in Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire a DUNS Number (see page 23)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 23)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 24)
- _____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 24)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- _____ Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 24)
- _____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 24)
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov email [notifications](#) (optional) (see page 22)
- _____ Read [Important Notice: Applying for Grants in Grants.gov](#)

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 22)

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

- _____ contact the SMART Office regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 24)

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 \$1,000,000.

Eligibility Requirement: Eligible applicants include nonprofits with 501(c)(3) status, private or public and state controlled institutions of higher education, tribal institutions of higher education, for-profit organizations, or small businesses. For profit organizations must agree to forgo any profit or management fee.

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 11)
- _____ Project Abstract (see page 12)
- _____ Program Narrative (see page 12)
- _____ Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 17)
- _____ Budget Narrative (see page 18)

- _____ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable)
(see page 10)
- _____ Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting
available at ojp.gov/financialguide/PostawardRequirements/chapter15page1.htm
(see page 10)
- _____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 22)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 18)
- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable) (see page 18)
- _____ Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status (see page 19)
- _____ Additional Attachments: (see page 19)
 - _____ Project Timeline
 - _____ Position description and/or resumes for key positions/personnel
- _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications (see page 19)
- _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity (see page 20)
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (if applicable)
(see page 22)