



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Bureau of Justice Assistance](#) (BJA) is seeking applications from states, localities, and tribes that are interested in implementing or enhancing a Swift, Certain, and Fair Sanctions (SCF) program model. This program furthers the Department's mission by providing resources for state, local, and tribal governments to establish or enhance programming focused on modifying and reducing criminal behavior and enhancing public safety.

Swift, Certain, and Fair Sanctions Program (SCF): Replicating the Concepts Behind Project HOPE FY 2015 Competitive Grant Announcement

Eligibility

Applicants are limited to states, units of local government, territories, and federally recognized Indian tribes (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior).

BJA 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 March 9, 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 BJA 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 requirement of this solicitation, contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) Response Center: toll-free at 1-800-851-3420; via TTY at 301-240-6310 (hearing impaired only); email responsecenter@ncjrs.gov; fax to 301-240-5830; or web chat at <https://webcontact.ncjrs.gov/ncjchat/chat.jsp>. The NCJRS Response Center hours of operation are 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. eastern time, Monday through Friday, and 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. eastern time on the solicitation close date.

Grants.gov number assigned to this announcement: BJA-2015-4056

Release date: January 7, 2015

Contents

A. Program Description	4
Overview	4
Program-Specific Information	4
Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables	7
Evidence-Based Programs or Practices	9
B. Federal Award Information	10
Type of Award	10
Financial Management and System of Internal Controls	10
Budget Information	11
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement	11
Pre-Agreement Cost Approvals	12
Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver	12
Prior Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conference/Meeting/Training Costs	12
Costs Associated with Language Assistance (if applicable)	13
C. Eligibility Information	13
Cost Sharing or Match Requirement	13
Limit on Number of Application Submissions	13
D. Application and Submission Information	13
What an Application Should Include	13
How To Apply	24
E. Application Review Information	27
Selection Criteria	27
Review Process	29
F. Federal Award Administration Information	30
Federal Award Notices	30
Administrative, National Policy, and other Legal Requirements	31
General Information about Post-Federal Award Reporting Requirements	32
G. Federal Awarding Agency Contact(s)	32
H. Other Information	32
Provide Feedback to OJP	32
Application Checklist	33
Appendix 1	35
Appendix 2	36
Appendix 3	37

Swift, Certain, and Fair Sanctions Program (SCF): Replicating the Concepts Behind Project HOPE (CFDA #16.828)

A. Program Description

Overview

There are a multiple states, counties, cities, and tribes that are interested in implementing “Swift, Certain, and Fair” (SCF) models of supervision with offenders in the community. This interest has grown out of the potential promise that these SCF models have shown in effectively reducing recidivism and preventing crime. In particular, Hawaii’s Opportunity Probation with Enforcement (HOPE) program has been shown to have promise, and as a result there is significant interest and activity in implementing models of supervision and other versions of the HOPE model which rely on swift, certain, and fair sanctions to improve the outcomes of individuals under community supervision.

SCF approaches are intended to: (a) improve supervision strategies that reduce recidivism; (b) promote and increase collaboration among agencies and officials who work in community corrections and related fields to enhance swift and certain sanctions; (c) enhance the offenders’ perception that the supervision decisions are fair, consistently applied, and consequences are transparent; and (d) improve the outcomes of individuals participating in these initiatives. Through this FY 2015 grant announcement, BJA will select multiple applicants to implement or enhance a HOPE model using SCF. Applicants selected under this announcement will work with BJA and its SCF training and technical assistance (TTA) partner to implement the model with fidelity.

BJA is supporting this effort to enhance public safety, foster collaboration, and improve the outcomes of individuals under the supervision of community corrections. This program is funded under the Project HOPE appropriation (P.L. 113-235).

Program-Specific Information

Hawaii’s HOPE program, which started in 2004, was one of the first successful large-scale implementations of swift-and-certain sanctions. The HOPE model was designed by Judge Steven Alm in response to what he considered to be a failure of the status quo to effectively change the behavior of their primarily methamphetamine-using, moderate-to-high risk probationers. Compared to its predecessors, the HOPE program dramatically improved the swiftness and certainty of sanctions delivered by the Hawaii criminal justice system by adding regular random drug tests; delivering sanctions within days of the detected violation; and imposing short-term jail stays as sanctions (sometimes as short as 3 days).

By addressing every violation of program participants and responding quickly, HOPE sent a consistent message to probationers about personal responsibility and accountability. The program reflected the research about deterrence that certain punishment for a probation violation will influence future offending behavior. It also increased the likelihood of compliance by imposing consequences that are relative to the offense and consistently applied. The program’s success depended on streamlined judicial processes and careful coordination and collaboration between the courts, probation, law enforcement, and treatment providers. The program minimized delays within the court system by expediting the reporting of dirty tests, the

scheduling of court hearings, and the issuance of bench warrants to absconders. In addition, cooperation with law enforcement agencies ensured that bench warrants were prioritized and served within days.

The outcomes of a 2009 evaluation of Hawaii HOPE (Hawken & Kleiman, 2009) showed that close monitoring of probation conditions—coupled with swift and certain responses to detect violations—improved compliance with terms of probation and enhanced desistance from drug use. Specifically, about half of the HOPE probationers never tested positive after their initial warning hearing (and didn't require a sanction). Furthermore, when compared to the control group after one year, HOPE probationers were:

- 55 percent less likely to be arrested for a new crime
- 72 percent less likely to use drugs
- 61 percent less likely to skip appointments with their supervisory officer
- 53 percent less likely to have their probation revoked

As a result, HOPE probationers served 48 percent fewer days in prison, on average, than the control group (Hawken & Kleiman, 2009).

How HOPE Works¹

HOPE starts with a formal warning, delivered by a judge in open court, that any violation of probation will result in an immediate, brief jail stay. Before HOPE, probationers in Hawaii typically received notice of drug tests as much as a month ahead of time. Under HOPE, probationers are given a color code at the warning hearing. Every morning, they must call a hot line to hear which color has been selected for that day. If it is their color, they must appear at the probation office before 2 p.m. for a drug test.

If a HOPE probationer fails to appear for the drug test, a bench warrant is issued and served immediately. A probationer who fails the random drug test is immediately arrested and within 72 hours is brought before a judge. If the probationer is found to have violated the terms of probation, he or she is immediately sentenced to a short jail stay. Typically, the term is several days, servable on the weekend if the probationer is employed; sentences increase for successive violations.

HOPE differs from other programs by:

- Focusing on reducing drug use and missed appointments rather than imposing drug treatment on every participant.
- Mandating drug treatment for probationers only if they continue to test positive for drug use, or if they request a treatment referral. A HOPE probationer who has a third or fourth missed or "dirty" drug test may be mandated into residential treatment as an alternative to probation revocation.
- Requiring probationers to appear before a judge only when a violation is detected—in this respect, HOPE uses court resources in a more efficient and targeted manner.

¹ Information from the National Institute of Justice, www.nij.gov/topics/corrections/community/drug-offenders/Pages/hawaii-hope.aspx.

- Having probationers who are employed serve any jail time, at least initially, on a weekend so they do not jeopardize their employment.

Why HOPE Effectively Reduces Violations²

The HOPE program is strongly grounded in research that shows that crime generally is committed by people for whom deferred and low-probability threats of severe punishment are less effective than immediate and high-probability threats of mild punishment.

"Swift and certain" punishment for violating terms of probation sends a consistent message to probationers about personal responsibility and accountability. Research has shown that a swift response to an infraction improves the perception that the sanction is fair and that the immediacy is a vital tool in shaping behavior.

Although the central idea of HOPE is common sense—certainty and swiftness work better than severity—the challenge was how to turn that idea into a reality in the face of scarce resources. Because only a small fraction of HOPE probationers receive mandated treatment, the program can afford to use intensive long-term residential treatment, rather than relying primarily on outpatient drug-free counseling as most diversion programs and drug courts do.

According to the National Institute of Justice, researchers call this flexible and targeted approach to drug treatment "behavioral triage." They found that HOPE's behavioral triage has several advantages over an assess-and-treat model:

- It is more cost-efficient because it covers a large number of clients while delivering intensive treatment to those who prove to need it.
- It puts a smaller strain on treatment capacity by avoiding the situation in which clients for whom treatment is mandated crowd out clients who voluntarily seek treatment.
- Because the treatment mandate follows repeated failures, it helps break through denial; an offender who has spent three brief spells in jail for dirty drug tests may find it hard to keep telling himself that he is in control of his drug use.

If treatment is mandated, a HOPE probationer must abstain from drug use (not merely comply with an order to appear for treatment) to avoid a prison term; this, the researchers found, positions the treatment provider as the probationer's ally in the effort to stay out of jail.

Other initiatives using a HOPE SCF model that have shown promise include Texas' SWIFT, 24/7 Sobriety in South Dakota, and PACE in Alaska. The Texas SWIFT (Supervision with Intensive Enforcement) program, which also focuses on probationers, uses progressive sanctions including a court admonishment, community service hours, increased reporting requirements, additional fines, and jail time. The evaluation of SWIFT showed that compared to a matched comparison group, subjects in SWIFT were significantly less likely to violate the terms of their probation, were half as likely to be revoked, and were half as likely to be convicted for new crimes (Snell, 2007).

24/7 Sobriety, initiated in South Dakota in 2005, was created in reaction to the state having the highest rates of drunken driving and roadside fatalities in the United States. 24/7 Sobriety requires individuals arrested for or convicted of alcohol-involved offenses to submit to breathalyzer tests twice per day or wear an alcohol monitoring bracelet at all times. Positive

² Information from the National Institute of Justice, www.nij.gov/topics/corrections/community/drug-offenders/Pages/hawaii-hope.aspx.

tests result in swift and certain, though modest, penalties, such as a day or two in jail. The approach was based on the idea that the certainty and rapidity, rather than the severity, of the punishment would more effectively deter problem drinking. A study by Kilmer et al. (2013) found strong support for the hypothesis that frequent alcohol testing with swift, certain, and modest sanctions could reduce problem drinking and improve public health outcomes.

In 2010, Alaska implemented the PACE program, based on HOPE's critical elements: warning hearings, frequent drug tests, a streamlined judicial process, and swift, certain, and fair sanctions for probationers who failed their random drug tests. Preliminary results from the experimental design suggested reductions in positive drug tests (Carns & Martin, 2011). Failed drug test rates dropped from 25 percent during the 3 months prior to enrollment to 9 percent in the 3 months following enrollment. In the same period of comparison, the portion of participants with any failed or missed tests dropped from 68 percent to only 20 percent (Carns & Martin, 2011).

Finally, in 2013, Grommon et al. conducted a randomized control trial to study the relapse and recidivism outcomes of parolees who were frequently and randomly drug tested with consequences for use. The authors sample consisted of 529 offenders released on parole in a large urban county in a Midwestern industrialized state. Grommon et al. (2013) found that frequent monitoring of drug use with randomized testing protocols, immediate feedback, and certain consequences was effective in lowering rates of relapse and recidivism. These findings lend support to the use of random testing with swift, certain, and fair sanctions with parolees.

Swift and certain sanctions for violating terms of supervision sends a consistent message to offenders about personal responsibility and accountability, and research has shown that this response to infractions improves the perception that the sanction is fair and the immediacy is a vital tool in shaping behavior. Given the growing body of research and practice reinforcing the potential of approaches that employ the SCF concepts, BJA is issuing this solicitation to work with jurisdictions interested in developing or enhancing their SCF efforts.

Please review the following resources:

NCJA Webinar recording: The Evidence Behind Swift and Certain Sanctions in Community Supervision: <http://ncja.org/webinars-events/ncja-bja-webinars#evidence>

NCJA Webinar slides: The Evidence Behind Swift and Certain Sanctions in Community Supervision: <http://ncja.org/sites/default/files/documents/evidence-behind-swift-webinar-slides.pdf>

Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables

The goals of this program are to develop and enhance SCF initiatives and implement a SCF model with fidelity, resulting in reduced recidivism and better outcomes for program participants.

The objectives of this SCF program are to:

- Demonstrate the use and efficacy of SCF practices and principles to improve the delivery of supervision strategies and practices.
- Improve supervision strategies that will reduce recidivism.
- Increase the *number of supervision decisions* that are fair and consistently applied, and with consequences that are transparent.

- Promote and increase collaboration among agencies and officials who work in probation, parole, pretrial, law enforcement, treatment, reentry, and related community corrections fields.
- Develop and implement strategies for the identification, targeting, supervision, and treatment of “high-risk/high-needs” offenders who are being supervised in the community.

Increase the *number of participants* in the program who believe that the supervision decisions are fair, consistently applied, and consequences are transparent.

Mandatory Project Components

All projects are required to include the following components within their proposal materials:

- Provide letters on official letterhead that demonstrates a commitment to the proposed initiative, from the following:³
 - Chief Judge
 - One main SCF/HOPE Judge, with a back-up SCF/HOPE Judge
 - Community Correction leadership and Officers
 - Court Administrator and staff
 - Prosecutor
 - Public Defender/Defense Attorneys
 - Law Enforcement
 - Jail Administrator
 - Other essential partners, consistent with the proposed application and circumstances of the applicant’s jurisdiction.
- Clearly demonstrate an understanding of the Swift, Certain, and Fair sanction initiative that is being submitted for consideration.
- Clearly demonstrate that the applicant and its partners have the authority to implement the required elements of the model, including decisionmaking about the terms of supervision; capacity to assess and effectively target moderate-to-high risk offenders; capacity to issue and serve warrants quickly; drug testing capacity; and access to jails beds, treatment, and other services as needed.

Onsite Project Coordinator

Each site must hire or assign a **full-time** onsite Project Coordinator to manage the day-to-day operations of the SCF initiative. The Project Coordinator should be housed in the community corrections office. This person should have experience working in the field of criminal justice and have proven capacity to work effectively with the key SCF Team members, including the judge, court staff, community corrections, law enforcement, and other partners, where applicable. The Project Coordinator will work closely with the SCF TTA Resource Center team to:

- Build the infrastructure, including policies and procedures, to implement the SCF model.
- Monitor the implementation of the SCF model.
- Identify the TTA needs of SCF team members.
- Continually assess fidelity to the SCF model.
- Facilitate communication and logistics within the site’s SCF team members.
- Identify, collect, and analyze SCF administrative data.
- Respond to requests for data, reports, and information about the SCF initiative.

³ See Appendix 3 for the roles and responsibilities of key members of a SCF/HOPE team.

- Ensure that the SCF team meets regularly so all the members remain informed of the project's status and developments.

Training and Technical Assistance

TTA will be provided by the SCF TTA Resource Center team. The SCF TTA team will help each site that receives BJA funding:

- Understand the importance of each component of a SCF model.
- Develop focused strategies.
- Develop a plan to assess and monitor fidelity.
- Provide training and coaching for jurisdictions to enhance program fidelity.
- Understand adaptation and prevent program “drift.”⁴
- Collect, analyze, interpret, and disseminate data on program outcomes.
- Encourage collaboration.

Allowable Uses for Award Funds

Allowable uses for award funds can include the following activities to help state, local, and Tribal agencies develop or improve their SCF programs:

- Support the Project Coordinator position.
- Overtime for:
 - Court staff to complete paperwork
 - Community corrections staff to expedite bench warrant service
 - Community corrections officers and/or law enforcement officers to apprehend absconders
- The development, implementation, and maintenance of a color code hotline.
- The development of a robust, onsite, rapid drug-screening process.
- Costs for onsite urine analysis testing.
- Costs for offsite urine analysis or hair testing.
- Additional BJA-approved contracted jail space, if needed.
- Travel costs for SCF team members to attend BJA-approved SCF trainings, project meetings, and peer-to-peer meetings (provide an estimate based on a 4-person team, spending 2 days in Washington, DC).
- Other BJA-approved SCF project costs.

See the Swift, Certain, and Fair resource materials located in [Appendix 2](#).

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; and
- 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

⁴ This can occur when key components of the model are revised that may not support the goals of the program, or when attention or commitment to the program starts to wane.

(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

Amount and Length of Awards

BJA estimates that it will make up to 7 awards of up to \$400,000 each for an estimated total of \$2.8 million for a 24-month project period, beginning on October 1, 2015.

BJA 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 Award⁵

BJA expects that it will make any award from this announcement in the form of a cooperative agreement, which is a particular type of grant used if BJA 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 announcement.

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).

⁵ 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)).

(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

Unallowable Uses for Award Funds

In addition to the unallowable costs identified in the Financial Guide, award funds may not be used for the following:

- Prizes/rewards/entertainment/trinkets (or any type of monetary incentive)
- Client stipends
- Gift cards
- Vehicles
- Food and beverage
- Costs that do not support approved project activities

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

Cost Sharing or Match Requirement

This solicitation does not require a match. However, to demonstrate commitment and to support sustainability BJA is requesting a **25 percent voluntary match (cash or in-kind)** from each applicant. For each federal dollar awarded, BJA requests that the recipient provide 25 percent toward the total costs outlined in the project budget for this application. Failure to include such a voluntary match will not be considered in award decisions. However, if a successful applicant 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. Applicants must identify the source of the 25 percent non-federal portion of the total project costs and how they will use match funds. Note: Match funds are restricted to the same uses of funds as allowed for the federal funds.

The formula for calculating match is:

Federal Award Amount x Requested Recipient's Share Percentage = Requested Match

Example: For a federal award amount of \$400,000, the match would be:

\$400,000 x 25% = \$100,000 match

For additional cost sharing and match information, see Section [C. Eligibility Information](#).

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 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the Federal Government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year.⁶ The 2014 salary table for SES employees is available at www.opm.gov/salary-tables. 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.

Compensation Waiver request must be submitted as a separate attachment and entitled "**Waiver: Employee Compensation.**"

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/PostawardRequirements/chapter15page1.htm. OJP policy and

⁶ 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.

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 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, BJA 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 BJA has designated to be critical, will neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration. Under this solicitation, BJA has designated the following application elements as critical: Project Abstract, Program Narrative, Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative, Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable), and Additional Attachments. 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. 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). The applicant should include the full amount requested for the entire 24-month project period on the SF-424.

Selecting the Appropriate Point of Contact (POC) and the Authorized Representative.

Applicants should be cognizant that these two contacts should not be the same. The authorized representative must have the authority to enter the state, county, municipality, or other eligible unit of local government into a legal contract with the federal government. This person is typically a county commissioner, mayor, city manager, or other similarly designated official. The POC will serve as the primary point of contact and will be responsible for grant management duties such as a submission of reports. Make sure that the name, contact information, title and solicitation is correct.

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.

BJA recommends that the abstract be submitted as a Microsoft Word document labeled "Project Abstract."

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 BJA 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 program narrative must respond to the solicitation and should address the Selection Criteria (1-4) in the order given. The program narrative must be double-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with no less than 1-inch margins, and must not exceed 20 pages. Number pages “1 of 20,” “2 of 20,” etc.

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

The following sections should be included as part of the program narrative. See Selection Criteria on page 27 for more information about what each section should include.

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 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
Improve supervision strategies that will reduce recidivism including improvement in criminal thinking	Number of new SCF supervision strategies implemented Number of existing supervision strategies modified Percent reduction in recidivism rates for the SCF initiative participating in the new/revised SCF supervision strategy	During the reporting period: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of new SCF supervision strategies implemented • Number of supervision strategies modified A. Number of participants in the SCF initiative B. Number of SCF initiative participants who recidivate

<p>Promote and increase collaboration among agencies and officials who work in probation, parole pretrial, law enforcement, treatment, reentry, and related community corrections fields</p>	<p>Number of agencies participating in SCF initiative</p> <p>Number of partnerships established with other criminal justice agencies</p> <p>Percent of agencies/organizations who commit participation formally through a Memorandum of Understanding</p>	<p>During the reporting period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of agencies participating in the SCF initiative • Types of agencies participating in the SCF initiative • Number of partnerships established with other criminal justice agencies <p>A. Number of agencies/organizations participating in the SCF initiative</p> <p>B. Number of new formal agreements/partnerships (e.g. MOUs) established with other criminal justice agencies</p>
<p>Develop and implement strategies for the identification, targeting, supervision, and treatment of “high-risk/high-needs” offenders that are being supervised in the community</p>	<p>Percent of new participants selected and/or assigned to participate in the SCF initiative</p> <p>Recidivism rate for SCF initiative participants</p> <p>Percent increase in the number of SCF initiative participants screened utilizing a risk and needs assessment(s) tools</p>	<p>During the reporting period:</p> <p>A. Number of <u>new</u> participants selected and/or assigned to participate in the SCF initiative</p> <p>B. Total number of participants in the SCF initiative</p> <p>A. Number of participants in the SCF initiative</p> <p>B. Number of participants who were rearrested while participating in the SCF initiative</p> <p>C. Number of participants who were convicted while participating in the SCF initiative</p> <p>D. Number of participants who had a revocation of the terms of supervised release while participating in the SCF initiative</p> <p>E. Number of participants who were reincarcerated while participating in the SCF initiative</p> <p>A. Number of supervised SCF initiative participants screened utilizing risk and needs assessment tool six months prior to grant funding</p> <p>B. Number of supervised SCF initiative participants screened utilizing risk and needs assessment tool during current reporting period</p> <p>C. Name of risk and needs assessment instrument(s) used</p> <p>A. Number of SCF initiative participants</p>

	<p>Percentage of SCF initiative participants (by risk type) who recidivate</p> <p>Percentage of SCF initiative participants (by risk type) who violate conditions of supervised release</p>	<p>B. Number of SCF initiative participants assessed as high risk</p> <p>C. Number of SCF initiative participants assessed as moderate risk</p> <p>D. Number of SCF initiative participants assessed as low risk</p> <p>E. Number of SCF initiative participants (by risk type) who recidivate</p> <p>F. Number of SCF initiative participants (by risk type) who violate conditions of supervised release</p>
<p>Demonstrate the use and efficacy of SCF practice and principles to improve the delivery of supervision strategies and practices.</p>	<p>For SCF initiative participants who violate conditions of supervised release, the percent decrease in the average wait time for face-to-face contact between judge, supervising officer, or other team member</p>	<p>During the reporting period: Number of face-to-face contacts between judge, supervising officer, or other team member and SCF initiative participants by type:</p> <p>A. Regular meetings with supervising officer</p> <p>B. Warning hearings</p> <p>C. Violation hearings</p> <p>D. Other contacts (please explain)</p> <p>E. For SCF initiative participant who violate conditions of supervised release, the time elapsed between violation of conditions of supervised release and face-to-face contact between judge, supervising officer, or other team member <u>prior to</u> the implementation of the SCF initiative (establish baseline)</p> <p>F. For SCF initiative participant who violate conditions of supervised release, the time elapsed between violation of conditions of supervised release and face-to-face contact between judge, supervising officer, or other team member during the <u>previous</u> reporting period</p> <p>G. For SCF initiative participant who violate conditions of supervised release, the time elapsed between violation of conditions of supervised release and face-to-face contact between judge, supervising officer, or other team member during the <u>current</u> reporting period</p> <p>Average number of days between a violation of conditions of supervised release and the administration of a sanction</p>

	<p>Average number of days between a violation of conditions of supervised release and the administration of a sanction</p> <p>Percent decrease in the average number of days between a violation of conditions of supervised release and the administration of a sanction</p> <p>Percentage of positive substance (drug and/or alcohol) tests</p> <p>Number of SCF initiative participants who received sanctions</p> <p>Number of SCF initiative participants who received incentives</p> <p>Percentage of SCF initiative participants referred to in-patient treatment services</p> <p>Percentage of SCF initiative participants referred for in-patient services (by type) that receive those services</p> <p>Percentage of SCF initiative participants referred to out-patient treatment services</p> <p>Percentage of SCF initiative participants referred for out-patient</p>	<p>A. Average number of days between a violation of conditions of supervised release and the administration of a sanction <u>prior to</u> the implementation of the SCF initiative (establish baseline)</p> <p>B. Average number of days between a violation of conditions of supervised release and the administration of a sanction during the <u>previous</u> reporting period</p> <p>C. Average number of days between a violation of conditions of supervised release and the administration of a sanction during the <u>current</u> reporting period</p> <p>A. Number of random substance tests administered</p> <p>B. Of these, number of tests that were positive</p> <p>A. Number of SCF initiative participants who received sanctions</p> <p>B. Types of sanctions used</p> <p>A. Number of SCF initiative participants who received incentives</p> <p>B. Types of incentives used</p> <p>Number of SCF initiative participants referred to in-patient services by type:</p> <p>A. Number of SCF initiative participants</p> <p>B. Mental health treatment services</p> <p>C. Alcohol and other drug treatment services</p> <p>D. Co-occurring disorders treatment services</p> <p>E. Employment services</p> <p>F. Education services</p> <p>G. Housing services</p> <p>Number of SCF initiative participants referred to out-patient services by type:</p> <p>A. Number of SCF initiative participants</p> <p>B. Mental health treatment services</p>
--	---	--

	services (by type) that receive those services	C. Alcohol and other drug treatment services D. Co-occurring disorders treatment services E. Employment services F. Education services G. Housing services
--	--	--

BJA does not require applicants to submit performance measures data with their application. Performance measures are included as an alert that BJA 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://ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SolicitationRequirements/EvidenceResearchEvaluationRequirements.htm) web page (<http://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 <http://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf>. Applicants that submit their budget in a different format should include all budget categories listed in the sample budget worksheet. Applicants should utilize the following approved budget categories to label the requested expenditures:

- Personnel
- Fringe Benefits
- Travel
- Equipment
- Supplies
- Consultants/Contracts (specific information for each consultant and/or contract must be included in the budget narrative)
- Other Costs
- Indirect Costs

Applicants must show all computations. The budget detail worksheet should provide itemized break downs of all costs. If the computations do not show sufficient amount of detail or are incorrect, the budgets will be returned for corrections.

The budget summary page must reflect the amounts in the budget categories as included in the budget detail worksheet. These amounts should mirror the amounts in the budget narrative.

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

Comprehensive budget detail and budget narrative information should be included for the applicant and proposed subcontractors/consultants.

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 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.

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; and
- 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

- a. **Letters from Essential Team Members** demonstrating commitment to the project and to providing data/information to monitor fidelity to the project, including:
 - 1) Judge for the Project
 - 2) Court Administrator
 - 3) Agency Head—Community Corrections
 - 4) Community Corrections Supervisor
 - 5) Head of Law Enforcement
 - 6) Other Essential Partners’ Agency Heads
- b. **Project Timeline** with each project goal, related objective, activity, expected completion date, and responsible person or organization.
- c. **Position Descriptions** for key positions and **Resumes** for personnel in those positions.
- d. **Letters of Support** from other key partners, detailing the commitment to work with the application to promote the mission of the project.
- e. **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.”).

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 BJA 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.

BJA 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/applicants/get_registered.jsp.
- 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 16.828 titled "Swift and Certain Sanctions/Replicating the Concepts Behind Project HOPE" and the funding opportunity number is BJA-2015-4056.
- 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, BJA 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 BJA 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: BJA 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 (30 percent)

- Clearly define the scope of the problem that the proposed project seeks to impact, consistent with the SCF model.
- Describe the size and demographic makeup of the population in the jurisdiction currently under community supervision.
- Describe the size and demographic makeup of the population that will be candidates for the proposed initiative.
- Describe the current violation rate (revocation rate or unsuccessful completion rate), and translate that into a baseline recidivism rate which may be used to assess the effectiveness of the project. Clearly articulate how the recidivism rate is calculated.
- In describing your jurisdictions' needs, demonstrate an understanding of Swift, Certain, and Fair (SCF) sanction initiatives and their potential to improve individual and criminal justice system outcomes. Summarize the research base for these strategies.

- Demonstrate an understanding of the key elements, components, and team members in describing the SCF approach being proposed.
- Describe the key collaborative relationships needed in your jurisdiction to successfully implement the proposed SCF approach.
- Describe potential issues with maintaining fidelity in your jurisdiction to the proposed SCF approach.

2. Project Design and Implementation (30 percent)

- Describe the proposed SCF initiative.
- Describe the goals, objectives, and deliverables needed to effectively develop and implement the proposed SCF approach.
- Describe the strategies for communicating expectations for participation in the SCF approach.
- Describe the expected outcomes from implementing the proposed SCF approach. Use data and/or research to support the use of the proposed SCF approach.
- Describe a plan for assessing your SCF project's training and technical assistance needs.
- Describe how your team would assess, monitor, and enhance fidelity of SCF implementation.
- Demonstrate a commitment to the proposed initiative from the following, where applicable:
 - Chief judge
 - Court administrative staff
 - Community corrections leadership and officers
 - Law enforcement
 - Other essential partners
- Describe how the applicant anticipates the project's implementation will improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the delivery of supervision.

3. Capabilities and Competencies (25 percent)

- Describe the management structure and staffing of the project, identifying the agency responsible for the project and the grant coordinator.
- Describe the current organizational/management structure of the responsible supervising agency/entity, including the number of supervising staff and the staff/supervisee ratio.
- Describe the proposed process to identify and select an experienced full-time project coordinator.
- Demonstrate the capability and commitment of the SCF team members to implement the proposed SCF approach, including the staff time and leadership support to implement and coordinate the program.
- Demonstrate that the applicant and its partner agencies have the authority over the elements of the SCF model to fully implement it, including terms of supervision, timely drug testing, and service of warrants and jail space.

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

- Describe the process for measuring project performance, including meeting timelines and deliverables, and obtaining input and feedback from customers and stakeholders.

- Identify who will collect the data, who is responsible for performance measurement, how the data will be stored, how any personally identifiable information (PII) will be protected, and how the information will be used to guide the program.

5. Budget (10 percent)

- Provide a budget detail that is complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities). Budget narratives should generally demonstrate how applicants (and their subcontractors/consultants) will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures. Budget narratives should demonstrate cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project.⁷
- Provide a proposed detailed budget worksheet and budget narrative that is reasonable, complete, allowable, and cost effective in relation to the proposed activities for the applicant and proposed subcontractors/consultants.
- The budget must support the strategies and approaches outlined in the project design and include a narrative to describe the expenditures under each cost area and how it will contribute to the overall program goals.
- Provide a budget detail and narrative on subcontract/consultant agreements with all key partners confirming their work commitment and involvement with the proposed work and decision making, if the applicant is awarded.
- Refer to the additional Budget and Budget Narrative requirements on page 19 for more detailed information.
- Travel costs for SCF team members to attend BJA-approved SCF trainings, project meetings, and peer-to-peer meetings (provide an estimate based on a 4-person team, spending 2 days in Washington, DC).
- Consultant rates in excess of \$650 per day or \$81.25 per hour must receive prior approval from BJA post-award through a Grant Adjustment Notice (GAN).
- Sole source contracts in excess of \$150,000 must receive prior approval from BJA post-award through a GAN. The justification must demonstrate that the item or service is available only from a single source; a true public exigency or emergency exists; or after competitive solicitation, competition is considered inadequate.

Note: An approved award budget is not prior approval; prior approval must be received post-award through the GAN process.

Review Process

OJP is committed to ensuring a fair and open process for awarding grants. BJA 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

⁷ Generally speaking, a reasonable cost is a cost that if, 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.

- 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 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](#).

BJA 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 BJA 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 BJA 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](#).

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 requirements⁸ 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, BJA anticipates that it will make any award from this announcement 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

⁸ 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)).

approved proposal and budget, and the award terms and conditions. Responsibility for oversight and redirection of the project, if necessary, rests with BJA.

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

FY 2015 Swift, Certain, and Fair Sanctions Program (SCF): Replicating the Concepts Behind Project HOPE

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 25)
- _____ Acquire or renew registration with SAM (see page 26)

To Register with Grants.gov:

- _____ Acquire AOR and Grants.gov username/password (see page 26)
- _____ Acquire AOR confirmation from the E-Biz POC (see page 26)

To Find Funding Opportunity:

- _____ Search for the Funding Opportunity on Grants.gov (see page 26)
- _____ Download Funding Opportunity and Application Package (see page 26)
- _____ Sign up for Grants.gov email notifications (optional) (see page 25)
- _____ 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 26)

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

- _____ contact BJA regarding experiencing technical difficulties (see page 27)

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 \$400,000.

Eligibility Requirement: Applicants are limited to states, units of local government, territories, and federally recognized Indian tribes (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior).

What an Application Should Include:

- _____ Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424) (see page 14)
- _____ *Project Abstract (see page 14)
- _____ *Program Narrative (see page 15)
- _____ *Budget Detail Worksheet (see page 19)
- _____ *Budget Narrative (see page 20)
 - _____ Employee Compensation Waiver request and justification (if applicable) (see page 12)
 - _____ Read OJP policy and guidance on conference approval, planning, and reporting available at ojp.gov/financialguide/PostawardRequirements/chapter15page1.htm (see page 12)

- _____ Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (SF-LLL) (see page 24)
- _____ Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (if applicable) (see page 21)
- _____ Tribal Authorizing Resolution (if applicable)* (see page 21)
- _____ Applicant Disclosure of High Risk Status (see page 21)
- _____ *Additional Attachments (see page 22)
 - _____ Letters from Essential Team Members
 - _____ Project Timelines
 - _____ Position Descriptions and Resumes
 - _____ Letter of Support
 - _____ Applicant Disclosure of Pending Applications
 - _____ Research and Evaluation Independence and Integrity
- _____ Financial Management and System of Internal Controls Questionnaire (if applicable) (see page 24)

* NOTE: These elements are the basic minimum requirements for applications. Applications that do not include these elements shall neither proceed to peer review nor receive further consideration by BJA.

Appendix 1 References

Carns, T. W., & Martin, S. (2011). Anchorage PACE probation accountability with certain enforcement: A preliminary evaluation of the Anchorage pilot PACE project. Alaska Judicial Council.

Grommon, E., Cox, S.M., Davidson, W.S., & Bynum, T.S. (2013) Alternative models of instant drug testing: evidence from an experimental trial. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 9:145-168.

Hawken, A., & Kleiman, M. A. R. (2009). Managing drug involved probationers with swift and certain sanctions: Evaluating Hawaii's HOPE. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Kilmer B, Nicosia N, Heaton P, and Midgette G. (January 2013). Efficacy of Frequent Monitoring with Swift, Certain, and Modest Sanctions for Violations: Insights from South Dakota's 24/7 Sobriety Project, *American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 103, No. 1, pp. e37–e43 (EP-51155, www.rand.org/pubs/external_publications/EP51155.html).

Snell, C. (2007). Fort Bend County Community Supervision and Corrections Special Sanctions Court Program. Unpublished Evaluation Report. Fort Bend County, Texas.

Appendix 2
Swift, Certain, and Fair/Project HOPE
Resource Materials

Anchorage PACE: Probation Accountability with Certain Enforcement:
www.ajc.state.ak.us/reports/pace2011.pdf

http://justice.uaa.alaska.edu/forum/28/2-3summerfall2011/c_pace.html

CrimeSolutions.gov: Hawaii Opportunity Probation with Enforcement (HOPE) page:
<http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?id=49>

Example of a Warning Hearing:
<http://www.nij.gov/topics/corrections/community/drug-offenders/documents/229023-appendix-2-example-warning-hearing.pdf>

HOPE - Hawaii's Opportunity Probation with Enforcement Program web page:
<http://hopehawaii.net/>

HOPE: Theoretical Underpinnings and Evaluation Findings:
www.crimevictimsunited.org/issues/treatment/hope/hawken090410.pdf

National Institute of Justice (NIJ) "Swift and Certain" sanctions webpage:
<http://www.nij.gov/topics/corrections/community/drug-offenders/pages/hawaii-hope.aspx>

National Network for Safe Communities: Swift, Certain, and Fair webpage:
<http://nnscommunities.org/our-work/strategy/swift-certain-fair>

NIJ Report: Managing Drug Involved Offenders:
<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/247315.pdf>

South Dakota's 24/7 Sobriety project: <http://druggeddriving.org/pdfs/MtPlainsEvaluation247.pdf>

www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_briefs/2012/RAND_RB9692.pdf

www.rand.org/pubs/external_publications/EP51155.html

Swift, Certain, and Fair web page: <http://www.swiftcertainfair.com/>

Washington Intensive Supervision Program (WISP):
www.seattle.gov/council/burgess/attachments/2011wisp_draft_report.pdf

NCJA Webinar recording: The Evidence behind Swift and Certain sanction in Community Supervision: <http://ncja.org/webinars-events/ncja-bja-webinars#evidence>

NCJA Webinar slides: The Evidence behind Swift and Certain sanction in Community Supervision: <http://ncja.org/sites/default/files/documents/evidence-behind-swift-webinar-slides.pdf>

Appendix 3 Key Members of the SCF/HOPE Team

The stakeholders listed below are integral to the success of a SCF/HOPE program.

- Chief Judge
- One main SCF/HOPE Judge, with a back-up SCF/HOPE Judge
- Community Correction leadership and Officers
- Court Administrator and staff
- Prosecutor
- Public Defender/Defense Attorneys
- Law Enforcement
- Jail Administrator

Roles and Responsibilities of Key Members of the SCF/HOPE Team	
Chief Judge	The Chief Justice should give a letter of consent to support the program in her or his state since the judge is integral to all aspects of program fidelity.
The SCF/HOPE Judge, with a back-up SCF/HOPE Judge	The judge presiding over a SCF/HOPE calendar is responsible for delivering warning hearings to SCF/HOPE probationers, setting the sanctions for missed appointments or positive drug tests in Motion's to Modify hearings, and revoking probation. The presiding judge will also communicate key components of the program to the probation officers, attorneys, and court staff on an ongoing basis. Thus, the judge has primary oversight of the program.
Community corrections leadership and Officers	A key component of a SCF/HOPE program is that the Community Corrections leadership and the Community Corrections officers. The community corrections officer serves as the front-line monitor of program compliance and ensures the process for swift, certain, and fair sanction delivery.
Court Administrator and staff	The Court Administrator's staff prepare for the warning hearings (often done en masse), motions to modify, and revocation hearings. The staff will facilitate adherence to the program and answer questions/provide guidance on the SCF/HOPE court processes.
Prosecutor	The prosecutor represents the interest of the State or County in all SCF/HOPE proceedings, including warning hearings and probation modification hearings. Essential that the prosecutor understands the philosophy of the SCF/HOPE initiative, and at least agrees to work within the SCF/HOPE framework. Should attend and be involved in team meetings.
Public Defender/Defense Attorneys	The public defender/defense attorney represents the interests of the probationer/parolee during the SCF/HOPE proceeding. It is essential that the public defender/defense attorney understands the philosophy of the SCF/HOPE initiative, and at least agrees to work within the SCF/HOPE framework. Should attend and be involved in team meetings.
Law Enforcement	The Sheriff's Office or local Police Department will be responsible for taking offenders into custody who fail drug testing, and also to serve arrest warrants for absconders. Bench warrants should be served within two to three days for SCF/HOPE probationers/parolees.
Jail Administrator	The jail administrator's responsibility is to detain the probationer/parolee prior to modification hearings and ensure transport of the SCF/HOPE probationers/parolees under the expedited hearing schedule.