

Solicitation Name: National Initiatives:  
Enhancing Law Enforcement and Crime  
Prevention

Applicant: Margolis, Healy & Associates

## APPLICATION FOR

		2. DATE SUBMITTED 05/18/2010	APPLICATION IDENTIFIER
1. TYPE OF SUBMISSION	3. DATE RECEIVED BY STATE		STATE APPLICATION IDENTIFIER
	4. DATE RECEIVED BY FEDERAL AGENCY		FEDERAL IDENTIFIER
5. APPLICANT INFORMATION			
Legal Name Margolis, Healy & Associates		Organizational Unit	
Address (city, state, and zip code) 445 Greystone Drive Richmond, Vermont 05477		Name and telephone number of the person to be contacted on matters involving this application  Jonathan Kassa (866) 817-5817	
6. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (EIN) t		7. TYPE OF APPLICANT Small Business	
8. TYPE OF APPLICATION New		9. NAME OF FEDERAL AGENCY Bureau of Justice Assistance	
10. CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE Number: 16.751 CFDA Title: 16.751 & 16.738 & 16.015 - National Initiatives		11. DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF APPLICANT'S PROJECT Best Practices for Campus Crime Prevention: Developing Evidence-Based, Modern Crime Prevention Strategies for Institutions of Higher Education	
12. AREAS AFFECTED BY PROJECT Institutions of Higher Education in all 50 States			
13. PROPOSED PROJECT		14. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT(S) OF	
Start Date: 10/01/2010	Ending Date: 09/30/2012	a. Applicant	b. Project
15. ESTIMATED FUNDING		16. IS APPLICATION SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS?	
a. Federal	\$399,800	Program is not covered by E.O. 12372	
b. Applicant	\$0		
c. State	\$0		
d. Local	\$0		
e. Other	\$0		
f. Program Income	\$0		
g. Total	\$399,800	17. IS THE APPLICANT DELINQUENT ON ANY FEDERAL DEBT? N	
18. TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF, ALL DATA IN THIS APPLICATION/PREAPPLICATION ARE TRUE AND CORRECT, THE DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DULY AUTHORIZED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE APPLICANT AND THE APPLICANT WILL COMPLY WITH THE ATTACHED ASSURANCES IF THE ASSISTANCE IS REQUIRED.			
a. Typed Name of Authorized Representative Gary Margolis		b. Title Managing Partner	c. Telephone number (802) 434-6788
d. Signature of Authorized Representative		e. Date Signed	

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Recent reports speak to the relative safety of college campuses (BJS Survey, 2004 – 2005; related articles and statistical compilations). Burglary, motor vehicle thefts, the illegal use of alcohol and other drugs, property crimes, theft and violence against women crimes account for the majority of crime on campus (US Department of Education; Department of Justice BJS/COPS; US Dept of Ed; Fisher, Cullins & Turner, 2000; McFarlane, et al., 1999; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). Violent crime at institutions of higher education has been a key focus since the murders at VA Tech in 2006, and was recently chronicled in The Campus Attacks Report: Targeted Violence Affecting Higher Education<sup>1</sup>. The numerous reports issued by gubernatorial panels and compendiums published by higher education professional associations, have made an effective argument for behavioral threat assessment as a seminal crime prevention measure for campus violence. Towards this purpose, Margolis, Healy & Associates was awarded \$400,000 from the US Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services in 2008 and 2009 to develop and deliver the national curriculum on campus behavioral threat assessment. And while a focus on threat assessment is clearly appropriate, the higher education community continues to need further attention on crime prevention for less lethal crimes. The higher education community currently lacks a modern approach to campus crime prevention for the crimes and behaviors far more common than the violent acts that have received so much attention in recent years.

The basic premise of crime prevention as a philosophical underpinning of community safety is that crime, violent and other, can be significantly reduced with well-developed and

---

<sup>1</sup> United States Secret Service, United States Department of Education, Federal Bureau of Investigation, (2010). Campus Attacks: Targeted Violence Affecting Institutions of Higher Education. Washington, DC.

delivered education and training. According to Sir Robert Peel, the father of modern policing, “The test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder, not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with it.” A robust campus crime prevention program is essential to achieving this goal.

According to the 2005 BJS Special Report on Campus Law Enforcement, nearly 9 in 10 students were enrolled on a campus where campus law enforcement provided general crime prevention and rape prevention programs.<sup>2</sup> A preliminary review of available literature, and general observations of campus public safety agencies and crime prevention programs from personal and professional experience, reveals that institutions have implemented crime prevention strategies culled from thirty-year old efforts in K-12 school and community settings with no consideration for modern communication strategies, and no measures of effectiveness.<sup>3</sup> The National Crime Prevention Council’s Campus Crime Prevention program, developed through BJA grant funding, relies on standard crime prevention topics using standard, dated methodologies.<sup>4</sup> Our collective experience questions their efficacy in the higher education setting. College students come to campus proficient in the use of technology and with communication habits significantly different from the current generation of public safety professionals and student affairs leaders. The standard pizza party tactic to draw students into discussions on safety, security and crime prevention are ineffective.

---

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs, *Campus Law Enforcement, 2004-05*, February 2008, NCJ 219374, various sections

<sup>3</sup> For example, see [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m2194/is\\_n11\\_v62/ai\\_15139852/](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2194/is_n11_v62/ai_15139852/) for article related to implementation of the “Gotcha Program,” or [http://www.reed.edu/community\\_safety/information/crime/index.html](http://www.reed.edu/community_safety/information/crime/index.html) for information about the use of flyers and other advertisements as crime prevention methods.

<sup>4</sup> See <http://www.ncpc.org/training/training-topics/campus-crime-prevention> for information regarding the curriculum for this program.

Absent evidenced-based research and the collection of best and promising practices in campus crime prevention and crime prevention branding for the current generation of students and employees, institutions continue blind implementation of “what has been” with little regard for what is needed and what actually works. There is little unified acknowledgement and appreciation for the use of social networking (i.e., Facebook, MySpace, Twitter), Internet-based technology and modern communication, marketing and branding methods for modern campus crime prevention. Recent research on millennial students reveals that students are easily bored and desire, or need, “entertainment value” in exchange for good learning. We know from the research, for instance, that video content with a mix of vignettes and statistics is more impactful than lecture-style training and traditional distance learning.<sup>5</sup> Those who spend time with college students, or who regularly interact with high school students, know that email is now an outdated communication tool in favor of texting and instant messaging. The lack of modern, evidence-based programming is, at a minimum, a waste of time and resources.

This project will examine and identify successful, evidence-based and age-appropriate crime prevention programming appropriate for institutions of higher education. To paraphrase the US Department of Education’s Higher Education Center, many of the essential elements to developing and implementing effective campus crime prevention efforts are the processes by which one creates cultural—or “environmental”—change. These processes are germane to building partnerships and coalitions, and taking into account what others in the field are doing to address similar problems. Duration for this project is 2.0 years (10/01/10 - 09/30/12).

---

<sup>5</sup> Research conducted by 360 Stay Safe, LLC, 2008, in conjunction with Red Consulting, Minneapolis, MN.

---

## PROJECT DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

MH&A proposes to use an inclusive, research-focused strategy to identify, evaluate, refine, develop and replicate best and promising practices in evidence-based updated approaches to crime prevention programming at institutions of higher education.

**PHASE I:** MH&A will conduct a thorough review of campus crime statistics available through the US Department of Education, and conduct a combined focus group of campus public safety officials; student affairs practitioners; students; and institutional leaders to discuss crimes on college campuses not captured through federal reporting requirements and which should be considered for prevention efforts. The information gleaned through research and listening will inform and strengthen the decision on which crimes to focus prevention programming on.

*(TIMELINE: Award Date +/- 180 days)*

**PHASE II:** MH&A will identify and collect model programs exhibiting evidence of success in changing student behaviors and reducing the crimes at institutions of higher education (IHEs) identified in Phase I. These programs must be designed to prevent basic and violent crimes, such as violence against women crimes (sexual assault, stalking, domestic violence and the human trafficking of college women<sup>6</sup>); theft and burglary; alcohol and drug-related crimes; Internet-based crimes connected to social networking and identity theft<sup>7</sup>; and crimes of hazing, for example. In order to identify model programs and delivery strategies, MH&A will survey a

---

<sup>6</sup> According to research released by the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, the probability of a female student being sexually assaulted during her four years of college is one in four; slightly more than one in eight college women is stalked by a fellow student during an academic year. Fisher, Bonnie S., Francis T. Cullen, and Michael G. Turner. Washington, DC: 2000.

<sup>7</sup> According to the *Identity Fraud and Survey Report*, Javelin Strategy and Research Survey and Better Business Bureau: January 2006, 8.9 million U.S. adults were victims of identity theft and fraud in 2006, resulting in \$56.6 billion in losses.

sampling of institutions and coordinate with national campus public safety organizations and higher education associations (as needed). MH&A will work collaboratively with the Department of Education Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools; the National Crime Prevention Council; the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, and experts in the fields of education, crime prevention, violent crime, marketing and branding. Investigators will group programs as follows to indicate the presence of the evidence of success:

- Group 1: Programs indicating significant evidence of changing behaviors and reducing crimes on campus;
- Group 2: Programs showing some promise of effectiveness;
- Group 3: Programs that require additional evaluation to prove their effectiveness;

While it is unwise to regard any single institution as a model to replicate, many good ideas and “for instances” can be derived by examining what others have attempted in their prevention approaches. *(TIMELINE: Award Date +/- 300 days)*

**PHASE III:** MH&A will conduct additional analysis of five to ten Group 1 or 2 programs as identified in Phase II and identify the thematic elements that contribute to their success and delivery. MH&A will conduct site visits and interviews to fully understand the purpose of the programs, methods of delivery, and success measurements. *(TIMELINE: Award Date +/- 360 days)*

**DELIVERABLES:** The proposed methodology will contribute to the development of an evidence-based strategy for modern crime prevention programming at institutions of higher education. Upon identification of both the content and delivery methodology of successful programs explored in Phase II, and analyzed in Phase III:

1. MH&A will produce crime prevention program templates, and technology-based delivery strategies, for crimes identified in this grant, and disseminate to institutions at no cost through national higher education associations and the website as indicated below. Research-in-Brief papers will be published at the end of each phase, with a full report documenting the entire project;
2. MH&A will host a web-based Technical Assistance Center (TAC) for a minimum of 12 months after completion of the grant. The TAC will serve as a dissemination point for the templates and social-networking resource for those seeking further information and assistance on crime prevention strategies. The TAC will provide support and assistance to exchange knowledge, lessons learned, and programmatic ideas through an on-line forum.
3. MH&A will present findings at national or regional meetings of applicable higher education associations and/or by way of web-based video and teleconferencing services.

*(TIMELINE: Award Date +/- 720 days)*

The beneficiaries of the proposed project are ultimately the faculty, staff, students and surrounding communities at the universities and colleges successfully implementing the evidenced-based crime prevention programming. MH&A will provide website server hosting; phone; Internet; and web-based survey tools as an in-kind contribution to the grant.

### **CAPABILITIES AND COMPETENCIES**

Margolis, Healy & Associates, LLC (MH&A), a minority- and veteran-owned small business, is a professional services firm specializing in higher education safety and security. Our focus includes, but is not limited to, safety and security program assessments; emergency management training and policy development; campus public safety management studies;

litigation consultation; Clery Act documentation audits; and campus public safety arming studies.

Our clients are located throughout the United States and Canada.

MH&A was awarded competitive grants in 2008 and 2009 from the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services to develop and deliver the national curriculum on behavioral threat assessment. Phase 1 of the project focused on the development of the curriculum while Phases 2 & 4 is its delivery at ten locations around the United States. Phase 3 is the development of a case study guidebook for intact teams to utilize for training. The project demonstrates MH&A's curriculum development capability, and capacity to develop, deliver and facilitate a national program with a technical assistance component. It showcases MH&A's ability to manage a federal grant, and coordinate small and large meetings, conferences and workshops, including agenda development and faculty identification. Completing Phase 1, while concurrently planning and completing Phases 2, 3 and 4 highlights our ability to prioritize tasks effectively. More about this project can be found at [www.CampusThreatAssessment.org](http://www.CampusThreatAssessment.org).

MH&A is led by Dr. Gary J. Margolis and Mr. Steven J. Healy, both experienced former university police chiefs, and nationally recognized experts on campus safety and security. Dr. Margolis and Mr. Healy are often invited to provide keynote presentations at the leading higher education association meetings at the national and state levels. Together, they will provide overall leadership, management and direction for the engagement and will be the primary liaisons with BJA. MH&A will engage the research expertise of Dr. Penny Shtull and Dr. Stanley Shernock. Drs. Shtull and Shernock bring to the project a combined 60 years of experience in empirical research and practice.

**Dr. Gary J. Margolis** is a Managing Partner of Margolis, Healy & Associates, LLC and a Research Associate Professor in the University of Vermont College of Education & Social Services. He was the Chief of Police at the University of Vermont from 1998 to 2009, and brings nearly two decades of experience in law enforcement as a police officer, police academy administrator, and police executive. Dr. Margolis is a Commissioner for the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, and a Past General Chair of the University & College Section of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP). He is a former member of the IACP Research Advisory Committee, and the IACP Executive Committee. Dr. Margolis is active in the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators as a member of the association's Government Relations Committee and Chair of the Education Committee. Prior to becoming a police chief, he was the director of basic and in-service training at the Vermont Criminal Justice Training Council (Vermont Police Academy), and has extensive experience in curriculum and program development. He earned a Masters Degree in Education (M.Ed) and a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies from the University of Vermont.

**Steven J. Healy** is a Managing Partner of Margolis, Healy & Associates, LLC and was the Director of Public Safety at Princeton University from 2003 through 2009. He is a Past President of the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA), has served as a member of the IACLEA Government Relations Committee for 12 years, and is noted as a Clery Act expert. Mr. Healy has appeared on numerous news programs and talk shows addressing campus security issues, including CNN with Lou Dobbs, ABC Nightly News, CBS, the Fox Network, MSNBC, and National Public Radio. He has testified

before the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and before the House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor on best practices for campus safety. Security Magazine has named Mr. Healy as one of the “Top 25 Most Influential People in the Security Industry.” Prior to Princeton, Mr. Healy was the Chief of Police at Wellesley College in Wellesley, MA. He also served as Director of Operations at the Department of Public Safety at Syracuse University. Mr. Healy is a 1984 graduate of the United States Air Force Academy and spent 10 years on active duty with the United States Air Force as Security Police Officer.

**Dr. Penny R. Shtull, Research Associate.** Penny Shtull is an associate professor of criminal justice in the Department of Justice Studies at Norwich University. She earned a Ph.D. and M.Phil. in Criminal Justice, as well as a M.A. in Forensic Psychology from John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York City and a B.S.W. from McGill University in Montreal. In addition to her publications in police and criminological journals, Dr. Shtull has served as a consultant for various organizations and state agencies including the Police Foundation (Washington, D.C.); the New York City Police Department; the Vera Institute of Justice (N.Y.); the Criminal Justice Research Center (N.Y.); the Vermont Center for Justice Research; the Burlington Police Department (VT); the Vermont Department of Corrections; the Chittenden Unit for Special Investigations (CUSI); the Vermont Criminal Justice Training Council; and the Vermont Children’s Alliance and Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) Program. Professor Shtull is a Past President of the Northeastern Association of Criminal Justice Sciences (NEACJS) and has served on its Executive Board in various capacities since 1997.

**Dr. Stanley K. Shernock, Research Associate.** Stan K. Shernock is Charles A. Dana Professor and Chair of the Department of Justice Studies & Sociology at Norwich University. He received his B.A. in criminology from University of California (Berkeley), his M.A. in sociology from Indiana University, where he held a National Institute of Mental Health fellowship in deviant behavior, and his Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Virginia, where he held a National Defense Foreign Language (East Europe) fellowship. He has been President of the Northeastern Association of Criminal Justice Sciences, and served on the Ethics Committee of the American Society of Criminology and the Peer Review and Publications Committees of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. He has served on the editorial boards of Criminal Justice Policy Review, Criminal Justice Studies, Journal of Criminal Justice Education, and Criminal Justice and Behavior, and is currently Book Editor for Policing: An International Journal of Police Management and Strategies and editor of a special issue of Criminal Justice and Behavior on police training and homeland security. He is an accomplished criminal justice researcher.

#### **IMPACT/OUTCOMES & EVALUATION/DESCRIPTION**

<b>PERFORMANCE MEASURES</b>	<b>EVALUATION</b>
Evidence-based crime prevention strategies	Successfully identifying 5 - 10 evidence based approaches addressing crimes identified in Phase I.
Dimensions of successful crime prevention activities that can be replicated for other campus crime prevention needs	Identifying 3 - 5 dimensions
Technical Assistance Center	Number of campus crime prevention practitioners using the website and accessing technical assistance

# Budget Detail Worksheet

**Purpose:** The Budget Detail Worksheet may be used as a guide to assist you in the preparation of the budget and budget narrative. You may submit the budget and budget narrative using this form or in the format of your choice (plain sheets, your own form, or a variation of this form). However, all required information (including the budget narrative) must be provided. Any category of expense not applicable to your budget may be deleted.

**A. Personnel** - List each position by title and name of employee, if available. Show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time to be devoted to the project. Compensation paid for employees engaged in grant activities must be consistent with that paid for similar work within the applicant organization.

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
		<input type="text"/>
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>		<b>\$134,500.00</b>

**B. Fringe Benefits** - Fringe benefits should be based on actual known costs or an established formula. Fringe benefits are for the personnel listed in budget category (A) and only for the percentage of time devoted to the project. Fringe benefits on overtime hours are limited to FICA, Workman's Compensation, and Unemployment Compensation.

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
Fringe benefit 1, each benefit entry is limited to one line		\$0.00
Fringe benefit 2		
Fringe benefit 3		
Fringe benefit 4		
Fringe benefit 5		
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>		<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total Personnel &amp; Fringe Benefits</b>		<b>\$134,500.00</b>

**C. Travel** - Itemize travel expenses of project personnel by purpose (e.g., staff to training, field interviews, advisory group meeting, etc.). Show the basis of computation (e.g., six people to 3-day training at \$X airfare, \$X lodging, \$X subsistence). In training projects, travel and meals for trainees should be listed separately. Show the number of trainees and the unit costs involved. Identify the location of travel, if known. Indicate source of Travel Policies applied, Applicant or Federal Travel Regulations.

Purpose of Travel	Location	Item	Computation	Cost
Phase I	TBD	air, ground, lodging, per die	18 people, 2 days, \$1200	\$21,000.00
Phase III	TBD	air, ground, lodging, per die	3 people, 2 days, 10 trips, \$1	\$35,000.00
Deliverables	TBD	air, ground, lodging, per die	2 people, 2 days, \$1200	\$12,000.00
Travel entry 4				
Travel entry 5				
Travel entry 6				
Travel entry 7				
<b>TOTAL</b>				\$68,000.00

**D. Equipment** - List non-expendable items that are to be purchased. Non-expendable equipment is tangible property having a useful life of more than two years and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. (Note: Organization's own capitalization policy may be used for items costing less than \$5,000). Expendable items should be included either in the "supplies" category or in the "Other" category. Applicants should analyze the cost benefits of purchasing versus leasing equipment, especially high cost items and those subject to rapid technical advances. Rented or leased equipment costs should be listed in the "Contractual" category. Explain how the equipment is necessary for the success of the project. Attach a narrative describing the procurement method to be used.

Item	Computation	Cost
Hardware and Software	Computer, Software	\$5,000.00
equipment entry 2		
equipment entry 3		
equipment entry 4		
equipment entry 5		
<b>TOTAL</b>		\$5,000.00

**E. Supplies** - List items by type (office supplies, postage, training materials, copying paper, and expendable equipment items costing less than \$5,000, such as books, hand held tape recorders) and show the basis for computation. (Note: Organization's own capitalization policy may be used for items costing less than \$5,000). Generally, supplies include any materials that are expendable or consumed during the course of the project.

Supply Items	Computation	Cost
Flipcharts, markers, pads, paper, office supplies, etc.	Basic office supply estimates for grant and meetings	\$4,000.00
supply item 2		
supply item 3		
supply item 4		
supply item 5		
supply item 6		
supply item 7		
supply item 8		
supply item 9		
<b>TOTAL</b>		\$4,000.00

**F. Construction** - As a rule, construction costs are not allowable. In some cases, minor repairs or renovations may be allowable. Check with the program office before budgeting funds in this category.

Purpose	Description of Work	Cost
four lines per entry, use boxes below or an additional page for more space if required		
<b>TOTAL</b>		\$0.00

**G. Consultants/Contracts** - Indicate whether applicant's formal, written Procurement Policy or the Federal Acquisition Regulations are followed.

**Consultant Fees:** For each consultant enter the name, if known, service to be provided, hourly or daily fee (8-hour day), and estimated time on the project. Consultant fees in excess of \$450 per day require additional justification and prior approval from OJP.

Name of Consultant	Service Provided	Computation	Cost
--------------------	------------------	-------------	------

*total* \$148,500.00

**Consultant Expenses:** List all expenses to be paid from the grant to the individual consultants in addition to their fees (i.e., travel, meals, lodging, etc.)

Item	Location	Computation	Cost
Included in the TRAVEL SECTION	maximum of three lines		
	maximum of three lines		
Consultant expense entry 1, one line per	maximum of three lines		

*Subtotal* \$0.00

**Contracts:** Provide a description of the product or service to be procured by contract and an estimate of the cost. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole source contracts in excess of \$100,000.

Item	Cost
maximum of four lines, additional information should be attached on a separate sheet(s)	
maximum of four lines	

*Subtotal* \$0.00

**TOTAL** \$148,500.00

**H. Other Costs** - List items (e.g., rent, reproduction, telephone, janitorial or security services, and investigative or confidential funds) by major type and the basis of the computation. For example, provide the square footage and the cost per square foot for rent, or provide a monthly rental cost and how many months to rent.

Description	Computation	Cost
Desktop Publishing of Reports, etc.	Estimate based on experience	\$8,000.00
Accountant/Bookkeeper	24 months, 10 hr/month, \$45/hour	\$10,800.00
Printing	Estimate based on experience	\$3,500.00
Conference Attendance Fees (Deliverables)	5 conferences, \$400/conference, 2 people	\$4,000.00
Website Design and Maintenance (Deliverables)	Estimate based on experience	\$10,000.00
Space Rental (Phase 1)	Estimate based on experience	\$3,500.00
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$39,800.00</b>

**I. Indirect Costs** - Indirect costs are allowed only if the applicant has a Federally approved indirect cost rate. A copy of the rate approval, (a fully executed, negotiated agreement), must be attached. If the applicant does not have an approved rate, one can be requested by contacting the applicant's 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 costs categories.

Description	Computation	Cost
one line per entry		
one line per entry		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$0.00</b>

**Budget Summary-** When you have completed the budget worksheet, transfer the totals for each category to the spaces below. Compute the total direct costs and the total project costs. Indicate the amount of Federal requested and the amount of non-Federal funds that will support the project.

Budget Category	Amount
A. Personnel	<u>\$134,500.00</u>
B. Fringe Benefits	<u>\$0.00</u>
C. Travel	<u>\$68,000.00</u>
D. Equipment	<u>\$5,000.00</u>
E. Supplies	<u>\$4,000.00</u>
F. Construction	<u>\$0.00</u>
G. Consultants/Contracts	<u>\$148,500.00</u>
H. Other	<u>\$39,800.00</u>
<b>Total Direct Costs</b>	<u>\$399,800.00</u>
I. Indirect Costs	<u>\$0.00</u>
<b>TOTAL PROJECT COSTS</b>	<u>\$399,800.00</u>
Federal Request	<u>\$399,800.00</u>
Non-Federal Amount	<u>\$0.00</u>

**BUDGET NARRATIVE**

**A. PERSONNEL COSTS**

**TOTAL PERSONNEL COSTS: \$134,500****B. FRINGE BENEFITS: N/A****C. TRAVEL EXPENSE**

Travel expenses are calculated using \$500 for airfare; \$120/night for hotel room based on an analysis of average 2010 GSA rates; \$65/day meal per diem; \$.50/mile; \$20/day for airport parking; \$40 travel agent fee; and \$80 for ground transportation per person per visit.

**PHASE I:** We estimate 2 days of of travel and 1 day on site for the focus group for the Project Co-Directors, Research/Project Assistant and 15 focus group members. (PHASE I Travel Expense total is \$21,000).

**PHASE III:** To facilitate program reviews as identified in the program narrative for Phase III, we estimate 2 days of travel and 2 days on site at for a total of 4 days of travel per campus. 10 campus visits total 40 days of travel for the Project Co-Directors and Research/Project Assistant. (PHASE III Travel Expense total is \$35,000).

**DELIVERABLES:** To present our findings at national higher education association conferences, we estimate 2 days of travel and 2 days on site for a total of 4 days per national association. 5 conferences, 4 days each for a total of 20 days of travel for the Project Co-Directors.

(DELIVERABLES Travel Expense total is \$12,000). NOTE: We intend to explore the combined use of video and web conferencing services for the presentations outlined in the Deliverables section of the program narrative. If this is the case, it will impact these travel expenses and those monies re-allocated as appropriate and allowed.

**TOTAL TRAVEL EXPENSE: \$68,000**

**D. EQUIPMENT**

Equipment needs for technology (hardware and software) are estimated at \$5,000.

**TOTAL EQUIPMENT COST: \$5,000**

**E. SUPPLIES**

Supplies required include flipchart pads, markers, writing pads, pens and folders and general office supplies for a total of \$4,000 for the life of the grant.

**TOTAL SUPPLY COST: \$4,000**

**F. CONSTRUCTION: N/A**

**G. CONSULTANTS/CONTRACTS**

**TOTAL CONSULTANT/CONTRACT EXPENSES: \$148,500****H. OTHER**

1. Desktop Publishing: Production of the final reports and development of necessary marketing collateral. \$8,000.
2. Printing and Shipping Services: Printing services, and shipping of collateral, supplies and handouts for site visits and focus group as needed. \$3,500.
3. Conference Attendance Fees: Attendance fees for 2 people for the 5 conferences of the national associations in Deliverables @ \$400/conference. \$4,000.
4. Website Design and Maintenance: Services by Incubox for design of technical assistance website and ongoing maintenance for the life of the grant. (Note: web hosting is an in-kind contribution by MH&A). \$10,000.
5. Space rental fee for Focus Group in Phase I: \$3,500
6. Accounting Services: To manage the grant accounting and reporting functions, we plan to engage the services of Lawrence J. Brown, CPA and Robert Spinner. We estimate their services for the life of the grant to be \$10,800 based on 10 hours/month for 24 months at \$45/hour.

**TOTAL OTHER EXPENSES: \$39,800****I. INDIRECT COSTS: N/A**

**SUMMARY**

PERSONNEL.....	\$134,500
FRINGE.....	\$0
TRAVEL.....	\$68,000
EQUIPMENT.....	\$5,000
SUPPLIES.....	\$4,000
CONSTRUCTION.....	\$0
CONSULTANTS.....	\$148,500
OTHER.....	\$39,800
INDIRECT.....	\$0

**TOTAL PROJECT COSTS: \$399,800**

**Federal Request: \$399,800**

**In-Kind Contributions:** MH&A will provide website server hosting; phone; Internet; and web-based survey tools as an in-kind contribution to the grant.

**Length of Project:** 24 months (2.0 years); 10/1/10 - 09/30/12

NOTE: MH&A has explored with the US Department of Justice the establishment of a federal fringe rate. Given the lean, efficient operating structure we have opted not to establish a federal fringe rate and instead place as much of the grant funds into the project.