

Uniform Notice for Funding Opportunity (NOFO)
Illinois Partnerships to Reduce Violent Crime
September 21, 2016

	Data Field	
1.	Awarding Agency Name:	Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
2.	Agency Contact:	Reshma Desai, Strategic Policy Specialist Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority 300 West Adams, Suite 200 Chicago, IL 60606 Reshma.desai@illinois.gov 312-814-1708
3.	Announcement Type:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Initial announcement <input type="checkbox"/> Modification of a previous announcement
4.	Type of Assistance Instrument:	Grant
5.	Funding Opportunity Number:	ICJIA-2016-0003
6.	Funding Opportunity Title:	Illinois Partnerships to Reduce Violent Crime
7.	CSFA Number:	546-00-1407
8.	CSFA Popular Name:	JAG Partnerships
9.	CFDA Number(s):	16.738
10.	Anticipated Number of Awards:	1-2
11.	Estimated Total Program Funding:	\$150,000
12.	Award Range	Not applicable
13.	Source of Funding:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal or Federal pass-through <input type="checkbox"/> State <input type="checkbox"/> Private / other funding Mark all that apply
14.	Cost Sharing or Matching Requirement:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
15.	Indirect Costs Allowed Restrictions on Indirect Costs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, provide the citation governing the restriction:
16.	Posted Date:	September 21, 2016
17.	Closing Date for Applications:	November 7, 2016
18.	Technical Assistance Session:	Session Offered: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Session Mandatory: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Register for mandatory webinar via website: http://www.icjia.state.il.us/

A. Program Description

The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority is a state agency dedicated to improving the administration of criminal justice. The Authority brings together key leaders from the justice system and the public to identify critical issues facing the criminal justice system in Illinois, and to propose and evaluate policies, programs, and legislation that address those issues. The statutory responsibilities of the Authority fit into four areas: grants administration; research and analysis; policy and planning; and information systems and technology.

The Authority is the state administering agency for the Bureau of Justice Assistance's Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program (JAG) for which there are seven purpose areas: 1) Law Enforcement; 2) Courts, Prosecution and Indigent Defense; 3) Prevention and Education Programs; 4) Corrections and Community Corrections Programs; 5) Drug Treatment and Enforcement Programs; 6) Crime Victim and Witness Programs, and 7) Planning, Evaluation, and Technology Improvement Programs. Under the Law Enforcement Purpose Area, the Authority is committed to funding programs that support the development and implementation of policing strategies that are data-driven, evidence-informed, or promising in practice to reduce serious crime, especially violent crime, and that strengthen partnerships and trust between citizens and the justice system. The goal of this solicitation is to select local jurisdictions in which to seed procedural justice and focused deterrence. These practices require significant community engagement and cross-systems collaboration.

Program Design

Jurisdictions will have varying degrees of readiness to implement procedural justice and focused deterrence. To facilitate readiness and promote implementation, the Authority will make available funds (through separate contracts) for each of the three steps or cycles of the process: assessment/planning, training and implementation. Although the steps are sequential, an applicant can request exemption from the assessment period if they can demonstrate recent completion of planning and assessment. Applicants interested in this should complete this application as outlined, justify the use of an alternative assessment model, describe why it meets the needs of the planning phase, and include a recent assessment report. If justification is sufficient and the application is recommended for funding, the Authority may ask for additional information prior to funding applicant for the second or third cycle of program.

First Cycle: Assessment/Planning

Selected jurisdictions will convene local multi-disciplinary teams (MDTs) consisting of the city mayor, law enforcement, local and federal prosecutors, community corrections (probation, parole), and community stakeholders. Applicants are encouraged to collaborate with all players of the criminal justice system, including agencies such as the Office of the Public Defender.

Each agency's commitment to the assessment process is essential to its success. Each agency is responsible for assigning a staff member with decision-making power to attend the regular (monthly, at minimum) meetings, share information and data, when applicable, and participate in these planning grant activities:

- Enhance effective working relationships with community, criminal justice, and social service agencies.
- Collaborate across criminal justice agencies.
Conduct crime analyses using the Problem-Oriented Policing Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment (SARA) Model. The Problem-Oriented Policing SARA Model is a highly regarded and utilized comprehensive tool for local law enforcement officials to identify their needs and focus their work. More details regarding the SARA Model and a comprehensive outline can be found at <http://www.popcenter.org/about?p=sara>.¹ See Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators section for minimally required data elements.
- Conduct assessment of community and police relations.
- Identify training needs.

Planning period funds may be allocated to:

- A full-time project manager to facilitate leadership development and cross-system collaboration, engage in the SARA assessment process for the MDT in partnership with an identified research partner, and develop an implementation plan.
- A research partner to assist the MDT in conducting crime analysis and developing an implementation plan that includes data collection to facilitate a process and outcome evaluation.
- Travel within Illinois to attend up to four regional networking and information sharing events.
- See the U.S. Office of Justice Program Financial Guide for a complete list of allowable and unallowable costs at <http://ojp.gov/financialguide/index.htm>.

Second Cycle: Training

Jurisdictions that have demonstrated training needs, as identified during the planning phase, to assist in implementation may seek additional funding to address those needs. Continued funding for training and/or implementation is contingent on satisfactory progress in the preceding performance period and continued funding appropriation. Training funds will be made available to:

- Assist in MDT agencies accessing training on focused deterrence, procedural justice, and community engagement.

¹ Applicants proposing another assessment model must justify why the alternative model meets the applicant's needs and how it compares to the SARA model.

- Ongoing technical assistance provided by identified experts.

Third Cycle: Implementation

Once assessment and training is completed, jurisdictions may apply for implementation funding. Continued funding for training and/or implementation is contingent upon satisfactory progress in the preceding performance period and continued funding appropriation. Grant deliverables and measurables will vary by selected model.

Background

Consistent with national trends, Illinois has experienced an overall decline in its violent index crime rate since the early 1990s. In fact, Illinois has experienced a decline in its violent index crime rate nearly every year since 1993, the year when violent crime peaked in Illinois. Today, Illinois violent index crime rate is 66 percent lower than in it was in 1993. Similar declines were noted for both murder and reported aggravated assaults and batteries.

While these trends are encouraging, high rates of violent crime and victimization continue to plague many communities in Illinois, with some communities experiencing violent index crime, murder, and aggravated assault and battery rates notably above the state's average. Illinois' communities that experience higher levels of crime and victimization also tend to suffer from high and persistent concentrations of social and economic disadvantage, including unemployment, poverty, family disruption, and racial isolation. These communities also experience disproportionate rates of incarceration.

The overreliance on incarceration at the community level stands in stark contrast to what research has established about high rates of crime; namely, that an extremely small number of people who often operate in groups or gangs are responsible for most serious offenses. In fact, researchers in Boston found that gangs consisting of less than 1 percent of the city's youth (between age 14 and 24) perpetrated more than 60 percent of the city's youth homicide (Braga & Weisburd, 2015.) These findings indicate law enforcement strategies directed at those groups and gangs rather than the whole community are most effective.

Research has shown that trust is an essential aspect of the criminal justice system (Meares, 2009). The importance of law enforcement is highlighted by the recent President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. The task force's final report opens by stating, "Trust between law enforcement agencies and the people they protect and serve is essential in a democracy. It is the key to the stability of our communities, the integrity of our criminal justice system, and the safe and effective delivery of policing services," (Presidents Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015, p. 1). In fact, the quintessential Boston Ceasefire model, focused deterrence implementation would not have been so successful if it weren't for the long-standing and robust collaborative relationship the Boston Police Department had with a community violence prevention group called the Ten Point Coalition (Braga & Winship, 2006).

The primary law enforcement mechanism to rebuild trust is through implementing procedural justice principles and practices throughout the law enforcement agency. In summary, procedural justice is based on four key pillars:

1. Fairness (the perception that you will be treated equitably).
2. Voice (the perception that your side of the story has been heard).
3. Transparency (the perception that processes are explained to you).
4. Impartiality (the perception that the decision-making process is unbiased and trustworthy) (Tyler, 1990).

Applicants selected through this solicitation will require training in these concepts and must incorporate the concepts into their implementation plans.

Focused deterrence, also known as “pulling levers,” is listed as a promising practice on crime solutions.gov and is supported by the U.S. Department of Justice. In summary, focused deterrence was pioneered in Boston in the 1990s, where it was coined “Boston Ceasefire.” The strategy is being implemented nationally in many large and small communities. The framework includes:

- Drawing on effective relationships between criminal justice agencies, community groups and social service agencies with a strong collaboration history.
- Selecting a particular crime problem, such as youth homicide or open air drug markets.
- Pulling together an interagency enforcement group, typically including police, probation, parole, state and federal prosecutors, and sometimes federal law enforcement agencies.
- Conducting research, usually relying heavily on the field experience of front-line police officers, to identify key offenders, and groups of offenders such as street gangs, drug crews, and the like-and the patterns and context of their behavior.
- Framing a special enforcement operation directed at those offenders and groups of offenders, such as using any and all legal tools (or levers) to sanction groups.
- Matching those enforcement operations with direct services and the moral voices of affected communities to those same offenders and groups.
- Communicating directly and repeatedly with offenders and groups that they are under particular scrutiny, acts, such as shootings, that will get special attention, to particular offenders and groups, and what they can do to avoid enforcement action. This communication occurs in “forums,” “notifications,” or “call ins,” in which offenders are invited or directed as part of probation or parole to attend in-person meetings with law enforcement officials, service providers, and community figures. (Kennedy, 2006)

Applicants are encouraged to also review the [Group Violence Intervention Implementation Guide](#), written by the National Network for Safe Communities with a grant from the Community Oriented Policing Strategies Office.

Many jurisdictions implementing focused deterrence have shown marked decreases in violence ranging from a 63-percent reduction in youth homicides in Boston to a 34-percent reduction in total homicides in Indianapolis (Braga, Kennedy, Waring, & Piehl, 2001;

McGarrell, Chermak, Wilson, & Cosaro, 2006). In 2012, the Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group conducted a systematic review and concluded that the approach can positively alter offenders' perceptions of sanction risk. Collaboration and coordination across multiple criminal justice agencies was a key aspect of successful model implementation, according to the group. The review also found that the multi-faceted strategies used in this model are largely responsible for the dramatic reductions in violence (Braga, Papachristos, & Hureau, 2012).

Evidence-Based Programs and Practices

The applicant is strongly urged to provide practices and services that are based in evidence and appropriate for the target population. The applicant should identify the evidence-based practice being proposed for implementation, identify and discuss the evidence that shows that the practice is effective, discuss the population(s) for which this practice has been shown to be effective, and show that the practice is appropriate for the proposed target population.

Authorizing Statutes

Section 7(k) of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Act (20 ILCS 3930/7(k)) establishes the Authority as the agency "to apply for, receive, establish priorities for, allocate, disburse and spend grants of funds that are made available...from the United States pursuant to the federal Crime Control Act of 1973, as amended, and similar federal legislation, and to enter into agreements with the United States government to further the purposes of this Act, or as may be required as a condition of obtaining federal funds."

Pursuant to the Authority's rules entitled "Operating Procedures for the Administration of Federal Funds" (20 Illinois Administrative Code 1520 *et seq.*), the Authority awards federal funds received by the State of Illinois pursuant to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 2002 and agency agreements with state agencies and units of local government for their use.

The agency must comply with all applicable provisions of state and federal laws and regulations pertaining to nondiscrimination, sexual harassment, and equal employment opportunity, including, but not limited to: The Illinois Human Rights Act (775 ILCS 5/1-101 *et seq.*), The Public Works Employment Discrimination Act (775 ILCS 10/1 *et seq.*), The United States Civil Rights Act of 1964 (as amended) (42 USC 2000a-and 2000H-6), Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 USC 794), The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 USC 12101 *et seq.*), and The Age Discrimination Act (42 USC 6101 *et seq.*).

Goals, Objectives, and Performance Metrics

The following table depicts process and outcome objectives linked to performance indicators to show progress toward the proposed program goal. Complete the table by entering ambitious yet realistic numbers for each objective based on your proposed program.

Selected programs will be required to submit quarterly data reports reflecting information about these performance measures.

Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators

Goal: To reduce group-related violent crime through strengthened governmental collaboration and increased trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve.	
Process objectives	
Hire MDT Program Manager by XX date or XX month of the program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date MDT Program Manager hired.
Form multi-disciplinary team (MDT) composed of community stakeholders and decision makers from the city mayor's office, law enforcement, local and federal prosecution and community corrections by second month of the program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date MDT formed • MDT membership by agency affiliation and assigned staff.
Hire Research Partner by XX date or XX month of the program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date Research Partner hired.
Convene regular MDT (at minimum monthly) MDT meetings which include at least XX % of all required members in attendance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of meetings held • Number of meetings with at least 80 % of all assigned staff of required agencies in attendance.
Identify and convene meetings with XX community agencies and leaders to discuss procedural justice, planning process and survey.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of meetings convened. • List of community agencies contacted.
Implement survey that assesses community perceptions of law enforcement to at least XX % of community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of surveys released. • Number of completed surveys returned.
Survey results are prepared in report by XX date, reviewed by MDT Partners and community leaders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date survey report submitted for MDT review.
MDT partners and community leaders review survey report by XX date	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of survey report review by MDT partners and community leaders.
Submit required crime data to MDT for review. At minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shootings by date/time, suspect(s) and victim(s) involved, group(s) involved, neighborhood, motive, weapon(s) used • Individual and group-specific data for targeted intervention. • Total crime guns recovered and submitted to ATF for trace. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XX months/quarters required data reported to MDT for review. • Number of Shootings by date/time, suspect(s) and victim(s) involved, group(s) involved, neighborhood, motive, weapon(s) used. • Number of Individual and group-specific data for targeted intervention. • Total crime guns recovered and

	submitted to ATF for trace.
Attend regional MDT information sharing events hosted by the Authority.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Authority information sharing events attended • Number and agency affiliation of attendees.
Initiate SARA analysis by XX date.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date SARA analysis initiated • Number of MDT meetings in which key tasks are accomplished as reflected in meeting notes.
Complete SARA analysis by XX date.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date SARA analysis completed
MDT reviews and accepts SARA analysis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of MDT review/approval of SARA analysis.
Develop draft plan for Year 2 by XX date.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date draft plan developed.

B. Funding Information

Earlier this year, the Authority allocated \$800,000 in FFY14 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant funds to support program planning grant periods of up to 12 months. Available is \$150,000 of that allocation for eligible agencies. The Authority anticipates selecting one or two applicants from this solicitation. Future decisions on grant awards requested to support training and/or implementation periods will be made based on previous performance and continued funding appropriation.

Agreements that result from this funding opportunity are contingent upon and subject to the availability of funds. The Authority may terminate or suspend this agreement, in whole or in part, without penalty or further payment being required, if (1) the Illinois General Assembly or the federal funding source fails to make an appropriation sufficient to pay such obligation, or if funds needed are insufficient for any reason (30 ILCS 500/20-60), (2) the Governor decreases the Authority's funding by reserving some or all of the Authority appropriation(s) pursuant to power delegated to the Governor by the Illinois General Assembly, or (3) the Authority determines, in its sole discretion or as directed by the Office of the Governor, that a reduction is necessary or advisable based upon actual or projected budgetary considerations. The implementing entity will be notified in writing of the failure of appropriation or of a reduction or decrease.

Applicants will be required to submit an Implementation Schedule (*Appendix D*) that describes how the program activities will be carried out. The Implementation Schedule should include necessary detail to enable the Authority to assess grant activity relative to planned project performance.

C. Eligibility

An entity may apply for a grant but will not be eligible for a grant award until the entity has pre-qualified through the Grant Accountability and Transparency Act (GATA) Grantee Portal, www.grants.illinois.gov. During pre-qualification, Dun and Bradstreet verifications are performed, including a check of Debarred and Suspended status and good standing with the Illinois Secretary of State. The pre-qualification process also includes a financial and administrative risk assessment with an Internal Controls Questionnaire. All entities found to be ineligible for an award will be notified and informed of corrective action needed for award eligibility.

Eligible Applicants: Municipalities within the following counties are eligible to apply for funds through this funding opportunity:

- Kane
- Kankakee
- Lake
- Macon
- St. Clair
- Vermillion
- Will

These counties were selected through an analysis of violent crime in Illinois that identified counties with a mid-sized urban center and high crime rates. In addition, no eligible applications were received from these jurisdictions during this project's last funding opportunity.

Each eligible county should develop a partnership that consists of the city mayor, major police department(s), state's attorney's office, county sheriff's office, county probation and parole, community and faith based organizations, and U.S. Attorney's Offices. Applicants also are encouraged to include the public defender's office and all other players of the criminal justice system. This group must select one governmental entity as the applicant agency, responsible for submitting grant reports and other required documentation. A Memorandum of Understanding that outlines each party's roles and responsibilities is recommended as part of the application and will be required before grant execution.² Applicant, including any proposed subcontractors, must report any debt due to the State of Illinois or involvement in grant recovery within past five years.

Cost Sharing or Matching

JAG funds may be used to pay up to 75 percent of the program costs described in *Exhibit B*. Applicants must provide non-federal funding for at least 25 percent of the program costs described in *Exhibit B*. See the award fund calculator below for guidance:

² Memorandum of Understanding template available upon request.

A	B	A+B=C	Confirm match
A= Grant amount requested	Divide grant amount requested by 3	C = the requested grant award plus the required match	Divide C by 4 to confirm match amount
\$200,000	\$66,667	\$266,667	\$66,667
\$175,000	\$58,333	\$233,333	\$58,333
\$150,000	\$50,000	\$200,000	\$50,000
\$125,000	\$41,667	\$166,667	\$41,667
\$100,000	\$33,333	\$133,333	\$33,333
<u>\$75,000</u>	<u>\$25,000</u>	<u>\$100,000</u>	<u>\$25,000</u>
\$50,000	\$16,667	\$66,667	\$16,667

Match Waiver

Jurisdictions applying for JAG funding may request a match waiver. Applicants may request a matching funds waiver of up to 25 percent of the total program costs. JAG match waivers will only be granted on the basis of financial hardship. Applicants may request the waiver by submitting a letter with the funding application. The letter must be on applicant agency letterhead and must include the following minimum requirements:

- A brief description of the applicant agency and the proposed JAG-funded project.
- A thorough explanation of why the full/partial match amount is a financial hardship for the applicant agency.
- The amount of matching funds the applicant agency is able to provide, and the amount of match that the applicant agency is requesting to be waived.
- Any other relevant information that supports the request for a match waiver.

Cash Match

Cash match funds used for personnel must be used to pay for salaries of new hires, with a few exceptions.

- 1) Cash matching funds may be used to pay salaries of existing employees now performing in a grant program position if their previous non-grant position is filled through the hire of a new employee.

- 2) Cash matching funds may be used to pay salaries of existing employees if their work on the program is in addition to their existing, established work schedule, such as overtime.

Cash matching funds may only be used to pay for additional costs incurred because of the grant program. For example, cash matching funds may be used to pay for additional utilities costs incurred because of the grant program.

D. Application and Submission Information

Obtaining Application Package and Application Deadline

Applications may be obtained at: <http://www.icjia.state.il.us/partnerships2016>. To request hard copies of the application materials, please contact:

Reshma Desai, Strategic Policy Specialist
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
300 West Adams, Suite 200
Chicago, IL 60606
Reshma.Desai@illinois.gov
312-814-1708

Completed application materials must be emailed to CJA.Partnerships@Illinois.gov by **11:59 p.m., November 7, 2016**, to be considered for funding. Proposals will not be accepted by mail, fax, or in-person. Incomplete applications will not be reviewed. Late submissions will not be reviewed.

Agencies are encouraged to submit their applications 72 hours in advance of the deadline to avoid unforeseen technical difficulties. Technical difficulties should be reported immediately to the Authority at CJA.Partnerships@Illinois.gov.

Required documents

For application review and consideration, the following documents must be emailed to CJA.Partnerships@Illinois.gov by the deadline:

- Completed and signed Uniform State Grant Application for each agency requesting funding in PDF (*Appendix A*).
- Completed and signed Programmatic Risk Assessment in PDF
- Completed Program Narrative in Word that meets program requirements outlined in Section A. Program Narrative must be submitted in Word and formatted as provided in *Appendix B*. Other documents should be submitted in PDF. Application should be 12 pages maximum, drafted in Times New Roman, 12-point font and double-spaced. Please number pages. (*Appendix B*)

- Certification of Commitment to Improve Crime Data Systems, if desired (*Appendix C*)
- One completed Budget/Budget Narrative in fillable PDF format for each funded agency (*Appendix D*).
- Completed Fiscal Information Sheet in Word (*Appendix E*).
- Completed and signed Audit Information Sheet in PDF–(*Appendix F*).
- Completed and signed Debarment certification (*Appendix G*).
- Completed and signed EEOP certifications (*Appendix H*).
 - Please leave the agreement number and award amount blank
- Completed and signed Civil Rights certifications (*Appendix I*).
- Mandatory Forms Checklist (*Appendix J*).

Dun and Bradstreet Universal Numbering System (DUNS) Number and System for Award Management (SAM) registration

Each applicant is required to:

(i) Be registered in SAM prior to application submission. Click here for SAM registration:<https://governmentcontractregistration.com/sam-registration.asp>

(ii) Provide a valid DUNS number.

(iii) Maintain an active SAM registration throughout the application and grant period. It also must state that the State awarding agency may not make a federal pass-through or state 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 Authority is ready to make a federal pass-through or state award, the Authority may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive an award and may use that determination as a basis for making a federal pass-through or state award to another applicant.

Mandatory Application Webinar

A mandatory application webinar will be held by the Authority at 1 p.m. on Thursday, October 6, 2016. Please register for the mandatory webinar by Monday October 3, 2016, through this website: <https://www.surveygizmo.com/s3/3051427/2016-Partnerships-to-Reduce-Violent-Crime-Notice-of-Funding-Opportunity-Applicant-Webinar-Registration>. This will be your opportunity to ask questions about this funding opportunity.

Information provided during the webinar will be unofficial and not binding on the state.

Intergovernmental Review

Not applicable.

Funding Restrictions

Allowable and Unallowable costs

See the U.S. Office of Justice Program Financial Guide for a complete list of allowable and unallowable costs at <http://ojp.gov/financialguide/index.htm>.

Supplanting

Supplanting means to deliberately reduce state or local funds because of the existence of federal funds. Awarded funds may be used to supplement existing funds for grant activities but must not replace state or local funds that have been appropriated for the same purpose. Supplanting shall be the subject of application review, as well as pre-award review, post-award monitoring, and audit. If there is a potential presence of supplanting, the applicant or grantee will be required to supply documentation demonstrating that the reduction in non-Authority funds resources occurred for reasons other than the receipt or expected receipt of Authority funds.

Supplanting Guidelines

Applicants must adhere to the following supplanting guidelines when implementing new programs:

- Federal Funds
 - Federal grant funds may not be used to pay existing employees' salaries, and, if used for personnel, may be used to pay for salaries of new hires, with the following exceptions:
 - (1) Federal grant funds may be used to pay salaries of existing employees now performing in a grant program position if their previous non-grant position is filled through the hire of a new employee.
 - (2) Federal grant funds may be used to pay salaries of existing employees if their work on the program is in addition to their existing, established work schedule, such as overtime.
 - Federal funds may not be used to pay existing contractual obligations (existing leases). They may be used to pay additional costs incurred because of the grant program. For example, federal funds may be used for rental costs only when the grantee has to acquire additional rental space for grant funded personnel and the grantee does not own or have a financial interest in the rental space.

Explanation of Budget Categories

1. **General.** Exhibit B contains seven sections *which are the budget coversheet tab*,

personnel tab, equipment tab, commodities tab, travel tab, contractual tab, and the fringe benefit tab. The tabs are further divided into budget and budget narrative.

A. *Pro-ration rates.* In some cases, equipment or contractual expenses are shared by an agency. Grant funds can only be used to pay for the share of those expenses attributed to the program. This process is done by pro-rating the cost of shared equipment and contractual expenses.

i. *Personal contractual cost.* This is the cost that is attributed to non-full-time individuals paid with the grant.

a. Examples of personal contract cost are cell phones, professional license fees, and malpractice insurance.

b. The pro-rated cost is determined by taking the cost of contractual expense multiplied by the employee's percentage of time working on the program.

c. Example formula for determining personal contract cost:

i. A cell phone cost \$50/month and the person using the cell phone is working on the grant 75% of the time.

ii. $\$50 \text{ (cost)} \times .75 \text{ (time working on the program)} \times 12 \text{ months (length of the program)} = \450 max. cost.

B. *Shared office equipment/contractual cost.* These are cost(s) for equipment or contractual expenses that are used by the entire office and not just the grant program.

i. Examples of shared office equipment: copiers, mail machines, rent and utilities.

ii. The pro-ration rate is determined by taking the number of full time equivalents (FTEs) divided by the total number of people in the office.

a. $2.5 \text{ (FTEs working on the grant)} \div 10 \text{ (total number of people working in the office)} = .25 \text{ proration rate.}$

b. Example of the pro-ration formula:

i. As determined in the above example, the proration rate is .25.

ii. The monthly rent is \$10,000.

iii. The maximum allowable rent expense for the year is \$3,000 ($\$1,000 \text{ rent} \times .25 \text{ proration rate} \times 12 \text{ months of the grant program}$).

2. **Budget.** Detailed cost section for the seven budget categories. This is where all of the grant expenses are listed.

A. *Round to nearest whole number.* Whole numbers should be used. Round as appropriate.

B. *Accuracy.* Applicant is responsible for ensuring the formulas being used are correct.

- C. *Consistency*. Figures listed in the budget should not contradict those noted in the budget narrative.
- 3. **Budget Narrative**. Used to explain the need for a particular program expense. Information must be provided for each cost detailed in the budget, no matter how large or small.
 - A. *Detail*. The budget narrative should contain enough detail so that the reader can understand the grant program without having to refer to the Program Narrative
 - B. *Consistency*. Figures listed in the budget should not contradict those noted in the budget narrative.
 - C. *Rounding*. Rounding that occurred in the budget should be explained in the budget narrative.
- 4. **Personnel Page**. Listing of all of the agency's personnel dedicated to the grant program.
 - A. *Job title*. The title of each position must be listed in the budget and in the budget narrative.
 - i. The title for the position must be consistent in the budget and budget narrative.
 - ii. The title must match the position names used in *Exhibit A*.
 - iii. Each position should have a short description of what they are doing for the grant program.
 - iv. Do not use proper names for individuals holding the positions.
 - B. *Maximum allowable salary*. This is the maximum that the grant (combining grant and match funds) can pay, based on the percentage of time spent on the program. This is determined with the following formulas:
 - i. 12-month grant:
 - a. Formula: *Annual salary x percentage of time on the program*
 - b. Example: \$50,000 (annual salary) x .5 (50% time on the program) = \$25,000 (maximum salary amount that can be charged to the grant)
 - ii. Less than 12-month grant:
 - a. Formula: *Annual salary ÷ 12 x number of months on the grant x percentage of time on the program*.
 - b. Example- \$50,000 (annual salary) ÷ 12 x 11 (months on the program) x .5 (50% time on the program) = \$22,917
 - C. *Fringe benefit breakout*: If personnel listed in the budget are receiving fringe benefits then a breakout of all fringe benefits applicable, including percentage calculations, must be included.
 - D. *Detailed narrative*: The budget narrative should provide enough detail that an average person can understand what is being purchased and the reason for the purchase.

Travel

On work-related travel and any travel to training or conferences:

- A. *Reasonable and justifiable*: All travel must be reasonable and justifiable.
- B. *Separate and distinct*: Each travel-related item must have its own budget line item and detailed narrative on its need and usage.
- C. *State mileage must be used*. Please check with the State of Illinois Central Management Unit Travel Guide (<http://www2.illinois.gov/cms/Employees/travel/Pages/default.aspx> for the current state mileage rate. The state mileage rate must be used unless the agency mileage rate is less than the lesser amount has to be used. Mileage reimbursement is only provided with use of personal vehicles.
- D. *Justification for estimate cost*: Grantee should indicate basis for cost estimates.
- E. *Per diem*: Reimbursement for meal expenses when traveling is allowable with a program-related overnight stay less any conference-provided meals. Conference meals provided must be deducted from the per diem. The state per diem rates are:
 - i. In-state travel: \$28 per day
 - ii. Out-of-state travel: \$32 per day
- F. *Lodging rate*: Lodging rate is the maximum rate for a hotel room that can be charged to the grant. If the lodging rate exceeds the maximum allowable rate, non-grant, non-match funds must be used to make up the difference.
 - i. In-state travel: The state lodging rate must be used. View the state travel guide for current rates:
<http://www2.illinois.gov/cms/Employees/travel/Pages/default.aspx>.
 - ii. Out-of-state travel: The federal lodging rate must be used.
Current lodging rates: :
<http://www.gsa.gov/portal/category/21287>
- G. *Pre-approval of all out-of-state travel*: All out-of-state travel must be pre-approved by the Authority.
- H. *Conference travel*: Only employees on the grant contract are allowed to use grant funds to travel to conferences. A justification for conference attendance must be included.
- I. *Airfare*: Only the most reasonable airfare should be purchased, and all available discounts must be applied.

Equipment

Equipment means tangible personal property (including information technology systems) having a useful life of more than one year and a per-unit acquisition cost which equals or exceeds the lesser of the capitalization level established by the non-federal entity for financial statement purposes, or \$5,000.

- A. *Reasonable and justifiable.*** All purchases must be reasonable and justifiable.
- B. *Cost to be pro-rated:*** Prorate equipment cost if the equipment is not solely being used for the grant program.
- C. *Disposal of equipment:*** The grantee has a duty to inform the Authority when disposing of purchased equipment with a value of more than \$5,000. This duty exceeds the life of the grant.
- D. *Competitive selection process:*** When selecting a vendor the selection process must be competitive.
 - i. Prior to purchasing equipment costing less than \$100,000, the grantee must get bids from at least three vendors.
 - ii. If the equipment being purchased is more than \$100,000 the grantee must coordinate a request for proposals (RFP) or Invitation for Bid (IFB) process. The Authority must pre-approve the RFP or IFB.
 - iii. Grantee should indicate in the budget narrative the manner in which the vendor is selected.
- E. *Sole source:*** In certain instances, a competitive selection process might not be possible. In that case, grantees may choose a vendor without engaging in the competitive bid process.
 - i. A Sole Source Checklist must be completed by the grantee. In this document, the grantee will have to explain and justify that this vendor is the ONLY vendor capable of providing this service.
 - ii. The Authority must pre-approve all sole source purchases of more than \$25,000.
- F. *Detailed narrative:*** The budget narrative should provide enough detail that an average person can understand what is being purchased and the reason for the purchase.
- G. *Brand name checklist:*** Federal rules require that budget and budget narratives do not contain brand name of products. However, if a grantee must include the brand name of a product, a completed brand name checklist is required.

Supplies

Supplies refers to items that will be consumed during the grant period and cost less than \$500.

- A. *Reasonable and justifiable:*** All purchases must be reasonable and justifiable.

- B. *Separate and distinct:*** Each item must have its own budget line item and detailed narrative on its need and usage.
- C. *Detailed narrative:*** The narrative should provide enough detail that an average person can understand what is being purchased and the reason for the purchase. The grantee also must explain how the cost was determined.
- D. *Pro-ration:*** All commodities must be pro-rated if they cannot be directly contributed to the program and are based on the cost of the whole agency. Formula(s) used must be shown.

Contractual

Expenses that are incurred per a contractual agreement.

- A. *Reasonable and justifiable:*** All expenses must be reasonable and justifiable.
- B. *Separate and distinct:*** Each item must have its own budget line item and detailed narrative on its need and usage.
- C. *Pro-ration:*** If contractual expenses cannot be directly contributed to the grant program but the whole agency's contractual cost are used then these cost must be pro-rated. Formula(s) used must be shown.
- D. *Detailed narrative:*** The narrative should provide enough detail that an average person can understand what is being purchased and the reason for the purchase.
- E. *Publication:*** When contracting for printing, a note in the narrative should be made indicating the Authority's disclaimer will be printed on all materials.
- F. *Conference travel:*** Only employees on the grant contract are allowed to use grant funds for conference expenses
- G. *Contractual employees:*** List the salary of the contractual employee and a brief description of the employee's grant program duties.
 - i. Contractual employees are pursuant to a written agreement.
 - ii. Explain fringe benefits in the budget narrative.
 - iii. If a competitive process was not used to select the contractor, a Sole Source Justification Checklist is required.
 - iv. If the contractor earns more than \$450/day or more than \$56.25/hour, a Contractor Justification is required.
- H. *Review of contracts:*** The Authority must review and approve all contracts that exceed \$100,000 in federal and match funds. The Authority may require preapproval from the grantee for any contract.
- I. *Rent:*** Grant and match funds may be used to cover reasonable rent costs.
 - i. Grant-funded rent payment is not an option when the grantee has a financial interest in the building.
 - ii. Both total rent and pro-rated amounts must be listed in the budget.
- J. *Utilities:*** Grant and match funds may be used to cover reasonable costs of utilities used by grant personnel.
 - i. Both total utility and pro-rated utility costs must be listed in the budget.

Indirect Cost Rate

- i. In order to charge indirect costs to a grant, the applicant must have an annually negotiated indirect cost rate agreement (NICRA). The three types of NICRAs include:
- ii. a) Federally Negotiated Rate: Applicant organizations that receive direct federal funding may have an indirect cost rate that was negotiated with the Federal Cognizant Agency. Illinois will accept the federally negotiated rate. The organization must provide a copy of the federally NICRA.
- iii.b) State Negotiated Rate: The organization must negotiate an indirect cost rate with the State of Illinois if they do not have Federally Negotiated Rate or elect to use the De Minimis Rate. The indirect cost rate proposal must be submitted to the State of Illinois within 90 days of the notice of award.
- iv.c) De Minimis Rate: An organization that has never received a Federally Negotiated Rate may elect a de minimis rate of 10% of modified total direct cost (MTDC). Once established, the de minimis rate may be used indefinitely. The State of Illinois must verify the calculation of the MTDC annually in order to accept the de minimis rate.

Applicant must provide a complete rate which must include, **but not be limited to**, all operating and personnel expenses, such as overhead, salaries, administrative expenses, profit, and supplies.

Pre-Award Costs

No costs incurred before the start date of the interagency agreement may be charged to awards resulting from this funding opportunity.

State Travel Guidelines

All travel costs charged to the Authority per contractual agreement must conform to State Travel Guidelines, which may be found here:

https://www.illinois.gov/cms/Employees/travel/Documents/travelguide_FY2016.pdf

Pre-Approvals

In compliance with federal guidance, the Authority:

- (1) Encourages minimization of conference, meeting, and training costs.
- (2) Requires prior written approval (which may affect project timelines) of conference, meeting, and training costs for grant recipients.
- (3) Sets cost limits, including a general prohibition of all food and beverage costs.

Food and Beverage Costs

Authority policy dictates that food and beverages may not be purchased grant funding. The Authority recognizes that there are certain situations that make this policy impracticable; therefore, there are exceptions. Exceptions numbered 1 through 3 in the list below are federally recognized and apply to all grants that are sponsoring conferences. Conferences are defined broadly, and include meetings, retreats, seminars, symposiums, or training activities. If conferences are being held onsite and therefore no tax, gratuity, or services charges the price in parenthesis should be used.

Qualifying exceptions to the Authority's Food and Beverage Policy:

- 1) Food is not otherwise available (e.g., extremely remote areas)
- 2) The size of the event and lack of food/beverage vendors in vicinity of the event makes it impractical for attendees to secure their own meals and/or refreshments.
- 3) There is nationally or regionally recognized expert making a special presentation to a plenary session (not a breakout session) and the only time to make the presentation would be during a meal time and the agenda does not allow time for obtaining food at another time. The standard working lunch is not sufficient to meet this exception.

Any grantee requesting grant funds to pay for food and beverages must complete and submit a Food and Beverage Allowability Checklist in addition to disclosing these costs in the budget. The checklist must be completed and submitted to your grant monitor at least four weeks in advance of the conference/grant activity in which food and beverages are to be provided. This time is necessary in order for the grant monitor to get supervisor approval.

There are limitations on the cost per person (which includes any tax, gratuity or service charge). Traditional meal times are breakfast (6- 8 AM), lunch (12-2 PM), and dinner (5-7 PM). In addition, there has to be substantive discussion or activities before and after food or beverages are provided, and the activity or conference cannot start or end with the providing of food and beverage.

Grantees shall not obligate any funds for food and beverages until they have received a copy of their approved checklist from their monitor. A separate checklist is needed for each event.

E. Application Review Information

Criteria

Application selection will be made using the following criteria.

Scoring Criteria	Possible Points
Executive Summary: Provides a clear, concise summary of the proposal. States problems or needs, objectives, and outcomes to be gained.	10
Statement of the Problem: Provides a comprehensive description of the jurisdiction's violent crime issues. Completes local crime statistics chart. Clearly describes the applicant's and partner criminal justice agency's current local data collection and analysis capacity. Clearly explains current strategies being implemented to address violent crime throughout the local criminal justice system.	20
Community Description: Clearly states required demographics. Provides a clear description of current agencies addressing issue. Clearly describes extent of community engagement and community-police relationships. Clearly describes the strengths and challenges applicant's community faces.	20
Multi-disciplinary Team: Lists all agencies that will be part of the jurisdiction's multi-disciplinary team. Includes the commitment from each entity to meeting roles and responsibility. Clearly describes history and degree of current collaboration across criminal justice agencies.	15
Project Management: Thoroughly completes Implementation Schedule to include major tasks and events in sufficient detail, lists responsible party, and timeline.	10
Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators: Provides reasonable process objectives in performance metrics chart	5
Adequacy of Cost Estimates	
Budget: Complete, allowable, and cost-effective in relation to the proposed activities.	10
Budget Narrative: Clearly details how the applicant arrived at and calculated the budget amounts, including match, if applicable.	10
Total Possible Points	100
Total Possible Points with Certification of Commitment to Improve Crime Data Systems	105

Additional points

Certification of Commitment to Improve Crime Data Systems: Eligible applicants can receive up to 5 additional points by certifying commitment to improving crime data systems. A certification form (*Appendix C*) details what the applicant agency and any relevant state agency partners would be committing to addressing over the grant cycle. Data systems include:

Criminal History Record Information System is the state's criminal record information system. Mandated reporting requirements are outlined in the Criminal Identification Act (20 ILCS 2630). This includes ensuring that arrest, charging, and disposition information are being properly reported.

eTrace (Electronic Tracing System) is an Internet-based system that allows participating law enforcement agencies to submit firearm traces to the ATF National Tracing Center (NTC). Authorized users can receive firearm trace results via this same internet web site, search a database of all firearm traces submitted by their individual agency, and perform analytical functions.³

National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS) is an incident-based reporting system for crimes known to the police. For each crime incident coming to the attention of law enforcement, a variety of data are collected about the incident.⁴ To qualify for the incentive points, the applicant must submit a NIBRS conformant five-year development plan. Contact Mike Carter at mike.carter@illinois.gov for more information.

Review and Selection Process

Proposals will be reviewed by a panel of the Authority legal, research, and program staff. Proposal selection will be made using the criteria listed above. The Authority reserves the right to reject any or all applications if it is determined that submission(s) are not satisfactory. The Authority also reserves the right to invite one or more applicants to resubmit amended applications.

A panel of Authority senior staff will conduct a final review of applications for allowable costs. Their recommendations will be forwarded to the Authority Budget Committee for approval. Applicants will be notified of the Committee's decision.

³ See https://www.atfonline.gov/etrace/request_mou.do?action=init to request a MOU for your agency. See <http://www.icjia.state.il.us/assets/sites/reduceviolentcrime/IL%20Criminal%20Justice%20Conference%20110415.pdf> for a PowerPoint overview of eTrace.

⁴ See <https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/ucr-program-data-collections> for more information on NIBRS

Programmatic Risk.

All applications must include a completed GATA Programmatic Risk Assessment file. The scoring of this assessment will determine the applicant risk status and required special conditions to the interagency agreement.

Minimum Scores

Applications must receive an average score of at least 75 points to be recommended for funding.

Unsuccessful applicant appeals are limited to the evaluation process. Evaluation scores may not be protested. Only the evaluation process is subject to appeal. Unsuccessful applicants may request a debriefing for feedback on improving applications for future funding. Briefings should take the form of advice to applicants on the strengths and weaknesses of their applications in terms of the evaluation and review criteria. Requests for debriefings must be made in writing and submitted within seven (7) calendar days after receipt of notice. The written appeal/request shall include at a minimum the following:

- The name and address of the appealing party.
- Identification of grant program.
- A statement of reason for the appeal.

Please send to:

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
JAG Partnerships to Reduce Violent Crime/Desai
300 W. Adams Street, Suite 200
Chicago, IL 60606

Anticipated Announcement and State Award Dates

Milestones

Target Date

Release of NOFO and open application	September 21, 2016
Pre-application mandatory webinar	October 6, 2016
Last date for submission of questions	October 27, 2016
Application Closes	November 7, 2016
Application Review Opening	November 9, 2016
Award Announcement	December 9, 2016
Authority Budget Committee Meeting	January/February 2017
Start Program Performance Period	Upon execution of contract

F. Award Administration Information

State Award Notices

The Authority will email a Notice of State Award Finalists letter to applicants on or about December 9, 2016, indicating whether their submissions will be recommended for funding. The Authority Budget Committee will review and approve designations in January or February 2017. The Authority will send a Notice of State Award to grantees along with executed contract in January or February 2017. No costs incurred before contract execution may be charged to the grant agreements.

Administrative and National Policy Requirements

If selected for funding, in addition to implementing the funded project consistent with the agency-approved project proposal and budget, the grantee must comply with grant terms and conditions, and other legal requirements, including, but not limited to, the Office of Management and Budget Grants Accountability and Transparency Act and other federal regulations which will be included in the award, incorporated into the award by reference, or are otherwise applicable to the award. Additional programmatic and administrative special conditions may be required.

Reporting

Recipients must submit quarterly financial and progress reports and final financial and progress reports. Federal reporting requirements state that funding agencies must report all mandatory information to the federal agency (ICJIA) no later than 30 days after the end of the designated quarter. To do so, the Authority will require all programs funded to report electronically at minimum on a quarterly basis and no later than 15 days after the end of each reporting period. Mandatory fiscal and progress reports will be provided. Failure to comply with mandatory reporting requirements will cause immediate suspension of all grant funding administered to the agency by the Authority and possible termination of the grant. If applicable, an annual audit report in accordance with the Part 200 Uniform Requirements must be submitted. Future awards and fund drawdowns may be withheld if reports are delinquent.

G. State Awarding Agency Contact

For more information or and technical assistance regarding submission of an application, contact:

Reshma Desai, Strategic Policy Specialist
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
300 West Adams, Suite 200
Chicago, IL 60606
Reshma.Desai@Illinois.gov
312-814-1708

The deadline to submit questions is 11:59 p.m., October 27, 2016, to ensure all substantive questions and answers are accessible to all applicants. Please do not discuss your application directly or indirectly with any Authority employee other than the respondent of this email address. Only written answers to questions shall be binding on the state.

H. Other Information

1. Neither the State of Illinois nor the Authority are obligated to make any award as a result of this announcement. The Authority Executive Director has sole authority to bind the state government to the expenditure of funds through the execution of interagency grant agreements.

2. Definitions

Community based organization: a local not for profit agency with at least two years of experience working on community issues.

Federal program: (a) All federal awards which are assigned a single number in the CFDA. (b) When no CFDA number is assigned, all federal awards to non-federal entities from the same agency made for the same purpose must be combined and considered one program. (c) Notwithstanding paragraphs (a) and (b) of this definition, a cluster of programs. The types of clusters of programs are: (1) Research and development (R&D); (2) Student financial aid (SFA); and (3) "Other clusters," as described in the definition of Cluster of Programs.

Grant agreement: A legal instrument of financial assistance between a federal awarding agency or pass-through entity and a non-federal entity that, consistent with 31 U.S.C. 6302, 6304: (a) Is used to enter into a relationship the principal purpose of which is to transfer anything of value from the federal awarding agency or pass-through entity to the non-federal entity to carry out a public purpose authorized by a law of the United States (see 31 U.S.C. 6101(3)); and not to acquire property or services for the federal awarding agency or pass-through entity's direct benefit or use; (b) Is distinguished from a cooperative agreement in that it does not provide for substantial involvement between the federal awarding agency or pass-through entity and the non-federal entity in carrying out the activity contemplated by the federal award. (c) Does not include an agreement that provides only: (1) Direct United States Government cash assistance to an individual; (2) A subsidy; (3) A loan; (4) A loan guarantee; or (5) Insurance.

Indirect (F&A) costs: Costs incurred for a common or joint purpose benefitting more than one cost objective, and not readily assignable to the cost objectives specifically benefitted, without effort disproportionate to the results achieved. To facilitate equitable distribution of indirect expenses to the cost objectives served, it may be necessary to establish a number of pools of indirect (F&A) costs. Indirect (F&A) cost pools must be distributed to benefitted cost objectives on bases that will produce an equitable result in consideration of relative benefits derived.

Internal controls: A process, implemented by a non-federal entity, designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the achievement of objectives in the following categories: (a) Effectiveness and efficiency of operations; (b) Reliability of reporting for internal and external use; and (c) Compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

Internal control over compliance requirements for federal awards: A process implemented by a non-Federal entity designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding the achievement of the following objectives for federal awards: (a) Transactions are properly recorded and accounted for, in order to: (1) Permit the preparation of reliable financial statements and federal reports; (2) Maintain accountability over assets; and (3) Demonstrate compliance with federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal award; (b) Transactions are executed in compliance with: (1) Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the federal award that could have a direct and material effect on a Federal program; and (2) Any other federal statutes and regulations that are identified in the Compliance Supplement; and (c) Funds, property, and other assets are safeguarded against loss from unauthorized use or disposition.

Local government : Any unit of government within a state, including a: (a) County; (b) Borough; (c) Municipality; (d) City; (e) Town; (f) Township; (g) Parish; (h) Local public authority, including any public housing agency under the United States Housing Act of 1937; (i) Special district; (j) School district; (k) Intrastate district; (l) Council of governments, whether or not incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under state law; and (m) Any other agency or instrumentality of a multi-, regional, or intra-state or local government.

Match: Cash vs In-Kind: Match is typically stated as a percentage of the total project costs for an award. For example, a 20-percent match on a \$100,000 project would be \$20,000, where \$80,000 is provided by the federal government and \$20,000 is provided by the recipient. There are two kinds of match:

- Cash match (hard) includes cash spent for project-related costs. Cash match includes costs that are allowable with federal funds, except acquisition of land, when applicable.
- In-kind match (soft) includes, but is not limited to, the valuation of non-cash contributions. In-kind match may be in the form of services, supplies, real property, and equipment.

For example, if in-kind match is permitted by law (other than cash payments), then you can use the value of donated services to comply with the match requirement. Also, third party in-kind contributions may count toward satisfying match requirements, provided the recipient of the contributions expends them as allowable costs.

Memorandum of Understanding: Describes a bilateral or multilateral agreement between two or more parties. It expresses a convergence of will between the parties, indicating an intended common line of action. It is often used in cases where parties either do not imply a legal commitment or in situations where the parties cannot create a legally enforceable agreement.

Nonprofit organization: A corporation, trust, association, cooperative, or other organization, not including Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs), that: (a) Is operated primarily for scientific, educational, service, charitable, or similar purposes in the public interest; (b) Is not organized primarily for profit; and (c) Uses net proceeds to maintain, improve, or expand the operations of the organization.

Pass-through entity: A non-federal entity that provides a subaward to a subrecipient to carry out part of a federal program.

Performance goal: A target level of performance expressed as a tangible, measurable objective, against which actual achievement can be compared, including a goal expressed as a quantitative standard, value, or rate. In some instances (e.g., discretionary research awards), this may be limited to the requirement to submit technical performance reports (to be evaluated in accordance with agency policy).

Recipient: A non-federal entity that receives a federal /state award directly from a federal/state awarding agency to carry out an activity under a federal program. The term recipient does not include subrecipients.

Subrecipient: A non-Federal entity that receives a subaward from a pass-through entity to carry out part of a federal program; but does not include an individual that is a beneficiary of such program. A subrecipient may also be a recipient of other federal/state awards directly from a federal awarding agency.

Supplanting: To deliberately reduce or reallocate state or local funds because of the existence of federal funds. Applicants must maintain a level of non-federal financial support (such as state or local support) for criminal justice system or crime victim assistance activities, exclusive of any federal funds, that is equal to, or greater than, the non-federal level existing prior to receiving federal funds. An example of supplanting would be when state funds are appropriated for a particular criminal justice purpose and federal funds are awarded for that same criminal justice purpose; the applicant replaces its appropriated state funds with federal funds, thereby reducing the total amount available for that criminal justice purpose.

References

- Braga, A.A., Kennedy, D.M., Waring, E.J., & Piehl, A.M. (2001). Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: An evaluation of Boston's Operation Ceasefire. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38(3), 195-226.
- Braga, A. A., & Winship, D. (2006). Partnership, accountability, and innovation: clarifying Boston's experience with pulling levers. In A. Braga & D. Weisburd (Eds.), *Police innovation contrasting perspectives* (pp. 171-187). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Braga, A., Papachristos, A., & Hureau, D. Hot spots policing effects on crime.

- Kennedy, D. M. (2006). Old wine in new bottles: policing and the lessons of pulling levers. In A. Braga & D. Weisburd (Eds.), *Police innovation contrasting perspectives* (pp. 155-170). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- McGarrell, E.F., Chermak, S., Wilson, J.M., & Corsaro, N. (2006). Reducing, homicide through a “lever-pulling” strategy, *Justice Quarterly*, 23(2), 214-231.
- Meares, T. (2009). The legitimacy of police among young African-American men. *Marquette Law Review*, 92 (4), 651-666.
- National Network for Safe Communities. 2013. *Group Violence Intervention: An Implementation Guide*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
- President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). *Final report of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
- Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.