



The [U.S. Department of Justice](#) (DOJ), [Office of Justice Programs](#) (OJP), [Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention](#) (OJJDP), is pleased to announce that it is seeking applications for funding under the OJJDP FY 09 Mentoring Research Program. This program furthers the Department's mission by seeking to enhance what is known about mentoring as a prevention strategy for juvenile delinquency.

OJJDP FY 09 Mentoring Research Program

Eligibility

OJJDP invites applications from public agencies (including state agencies, units of local government, public universities and colleges, and federally-recognized Indian tribal governments) and private organizations (including faith-based community organizations).

(See "Eligibility," page 3.)

Deadline

Registration with [GMS](#) is required prior to application submission.

(See "Registration," page 3.)

All applications are due by 8:00 p.m., Eastern Time, on June 2, 2009.

(See "Deadline: Application," page 3.)

Contact Information

For assistance with the requirements of this solicitation, contact Michael Shader, Grant Program Specialist, at (202) 616-2605 at Michael.Shader@usdoj.gov.

This application must be submitted through [GMS](#). For technical assistance with submitting the application, contact the Grants Management System Support Hotline at 1-888-549-9901, option 3.

Note: The GMS Support Hotline hours of operation are Monday-Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Eastern Time.

The Funding Opportunity Number assigned to this announcement is OJJDP-2009-2192

CONTENTS

Overview	3
Deadline: Registration.....	3
Deadline: Application	3
Eligibility	3
General Statement of Eligibility	3
Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations.....	3
American Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Tribes and/or Tribal Organizations	4
Program-Specific Information	4
Performance Measures.....	7
How To Apply.....	8
What an Application Must Include.....	9
Standard Form - 424	9
Program Narrative	9
Budget and Budget Narrative	11
Indirect Cost Rate Agreement.....	12
Other Attachments	12
Selection Criteria.....	12
Review Process	12
Additional Requirements.....	13

OJJDP FY 09 Mentoring Research Program

CFDA #16.726

Overview

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) seeks to enhance what is known about mentoring as a prevention strategy for juvenile delinquency. While mentoring appears to be a promising intervention for disadvantaged youth, more evaluation work is needed to determine the components of a mentoring program that are necessary for bringing about positive youth development. OJJDP seeks proposals to evaluate the effectiveness of paid versus volunteer mentors within an existing mentoring program. The evaluator will conduct both a process and an outcome evaluation measuring the success of both paid and volunteer mentor programs in preventing delinquency. This initiative is authorized by the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 2009, Pub. L. 111-8.

Registration

Applicants must register with GMS prior to applying. The deadline to register is 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time on June 2, 2009.

Deadline: Application

The due date for applying for funding under this announcement is 8:00 p.m., Eastern Time, June 2, 2009.

Eligibility

General Statement of Eligibility. OJJDP invites applications from public agencies (including state agencies, units of local government, public universities and colleges, and federally-recognized Indian tribal governments) and private organizations (including faith-based community organizations). OJJDP welcomes joint applications from two or more eligible applicants; however, one applicant must be clearly indicated as the primary applicant (for correspondence, award, and management purposes) and the others indicated as co-applicants.

Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations. Consistent with Executive Order 13279, dated December 12, 2002, and 28 C.F.R. Part 38, DOJ invites and encourages faith-based and other community organizations that statutorily qualify as eligible applicants under DOJ programs to apply for assistance awards to fund eligible grant activities. DOJ will consider faith-based and other community organizations for awards on the same basis as other eligible applicants and, if they receive assistance awards, will treat them on an equal basis with all other grantees in the administration of such awards. DOJ will neither favor nor discriminate against any eligible applicant or grantee on the basis of its religious character or affiliation, religious name, or the religious composition of its board of directors or persons working in the organization.

Faith-based organizations receiving DOJ assistance awards retain their independence and do not lose or have to modify their religious identity (e.g., removing religious symbols) to receive assistance awards. Grantees, however, may not use DOJ grant funds to support any inherently religious activity, such as prayer or worship. Inherently religious activity is permissible, although

it cannot occur during an activity funded with DOJ grant funds; rather, the grantee must separate religious activity in time or place from the DOJ-funded program. Further, the participation of individuals receiving services in such activity must be voluntary. DOJ does not permit programs that it funds to discriminate in the provision of services on the basis of a beneficiary's religion.

If the applicant is a faith-based organization that makes hiring decisions based on religious belief, it may be entitled, under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb, to receive federal funds and, at the same time, maintain that hiring practice, even if the law creating the funding program contains a general ban on religious discrimination in employment. For the circumstances under which this may occur, and the certifications that may be required, visit the [Civil Rights Compliance](#) link, under "Additional Requirements" in this announcement.

American Indian and Alaska Native Tribes and Tribal Organizations. Applicants are limited to for-profit (commercial) organizations, nonprofit organizations, faith-based and community organizations, institutions of higher learning, and consortiums with demonstrated organizational and community-based experience in working with American Indian and Alaska Native communities, including tribal commercial and nonprofit organizations, tribal colleges and universities, and tribal consortiums.

A current authorizing resolution of the governing body of the tribal entity or other enactment of the tribal council or comparable government body must accompany all tribal applications. If the grant will benefit more than one tribal entity, a current authorizing resolution or other enactment of the tribal council or comparable government body from each tribal entity must be included. If a party submits a grant application on behalf of a tribal entity, the party must include a letter or similar document authorizing the inclusion of the tribal entity named in the application.

OJJDP encourages applicants to review the [Civil Rights Compliance](#) section, under "Additional Requirements" in this announcement.

Program-Specific Information

- **Purpose**

OJJDP is committed to the development of intervention efforts to prevent and reduce delinquency and problem behaviors among at-risk youth. The commitment extends to the development of new and innovative programs and evaluation of promising practices. Some studies have shown mentoring to be a promising intervention for disadvantaged youth, however; more evaluation work is needed to determine the components of a mentoring program that are necessary for bringing about desired changes in at-risk youth participating in a mentoring program.

Research, however, indicates characteristics of mentoring programs that increase the likelihood for positive outcomes, which include the length, frequency, and quality of the mentoring relationship. Dubois et al (2002¹) completed a meta-analysis of mentoring programs and found that the "strongest empirical basis exists for utilizing mentoring as a preventative intervention

¹ DuBois, David L., Holloway, Bruce E., Valentine, Jeffrey C., and Cooper, Harris. 2002. "Effectiveness of Mentoring Programs for Youth: A Meta-Analytic Review." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 30:157-197.

with youth whose backgrounds include significant conditions of environmental risk and disadvantage” (p. 190).

While mentoring is seen as a promising practice, there can be some possible negative consequences for youth if the mentoring relationship is short lived or of low quality (Dubois and Karcher 2005²). Previous research documents that the length of the mentoring relationship is a crucial variable to success.

Recruitment of mentors and turnover are also significant impediments for successful mentoring programs. Mentoring programs have relied on many methods to recruit mentors including targeting college students and senior citizens, partnering with existing organizations, and advertising in print and on television. Stukos and Tanti (2008³) note that “despite these varied efforts, few programs manage to recruit sufficient volunteers, as indicated in the lengthy waiting lists of youth in many areas.” (p.245).

OJJDP is committed to supporting efforts that make existing promising intervention strategies more effective and available to a larger population of at-risk juveniles. Currently there is some debate in the field about the utility of using paid mentors versus a strictly volunteer mentor program. Some argue that by paying the mentor one may taint the relationship between mentor and mentee. Others point to the long waiting lists and lack of volunteers as a reason to implement a paid mentor program. There is currently no solid body of research on paid mentoring programs and how they compare with volunteer programs. Anecdotal evidence suggests that paid mentoring programs can increase the recruitment of mentors and increase the length of the mentor/mentee matches. Since previous research has shown that both recruitment and length of match can impact program effectiveness, investigating the relationship between these two variables by paying mentors would benefit the field.

Research Questions. The goal of this solicitation is to answer the question: Is there a significant difference in the effectiveness of volunteer versus paid mentors? The key variable of interest is the future delinquency of a juvenile paired with a volunteer versus a paid mentor. There are other key questions to measure. What will the impact of paying mentors be on recruitment efforts? What is the impact on the length of matches? Does having a paid mentor versus a volunteer mentor affect the frequency or quality of the relationship? In an effort to isolate the impact of being a paid mentor from other possible program effects, augmenting an existing volunteer program appears as the most suitable way to address this question.

Program Design. OJJDP is open to a variety of methodological approaches to investigate this topic. Due to issues with program implementation and fidelity, this evaluation would best be situated within an existing volunteer mentoring program that is willing to consider augmenting its recruitment and retention through monetary compensation to its mentors. OJJDP will give preference to rigorous experimental designs that include random assignment of participants when feasible. A strong research design would also include three groups for analysis: a control group, a volunteer mentor group, and a paid mentor group.

Since currently there is no known program that includes both paid and volunteer mentors suitable for comparison, some of the program design will be left up to the applicant. The best

² DuBois, David L. and Karcher, Michael J. 2005. *Handbook of Youth Mentoring*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

³ Stukas, Arthur A. and Tanti, Chris. 2005. Recruiting and Sustaining Volunteer Mentors. In *Handbook of Youth Mentoring*, edited by David. L. Dubois and Michael J. Stukas. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

way to augment an existing mentoring program with a paid component will likely vary depending on how the existing program operates. The compensation for each “paid” mentor is not set and may also vary between programs. Applicants, however, should detail what their plans are for payment.

Expected Partnerships. Due to several unique aspects of this evaluation, close partnerships will be necessary between the applicants and an existing mentoring program. The application should include letters of commitment or cooperation from the relevant program or agency involved in the proposed study. Applicants should also detail partnerships for implementing their methodology and the use of control groups.

- **Goals, Objectives, and Deliverables**

The Goal. The goal of this evaluation is to assess the ways that adding a paid component to a previously volunteer mentoring program can impact both process and effectiveness. The evaluator will conduct process and outcome evaluations to measure the success of both the program’s paid and volunteer mentors. The process evaluation will measure changes in recruitment, mentor retention and length of matches. The outcome evaluation will measure the prevention of delinquency and the positive youth development of program participants.

Objectives. The objectives of the program are as follows:

- determine the utility of augmenting existing mentoring initiatives with compensation for mentors.
- conduct a process evaluation of the integration of a paid component into an established mentoring program.
- conduct an outcome evaluation of an existing mentoring program that allows the inclusion of paid mentors.
- establish contact and demonstrate a relationship with an existing mentoring program that is willing and able to augment its program to include mentors who receive monetary compensation. The grantee will maintain a positive and collaborative relationship with the mentoring program throughout the evaluation.
- establish an advisory group to provide additional oversight and guidance throughout the evaluation. This group should include experts in mentoring research and evaluation of prevention programs. Ideally, this group would convene periodically throughout the evaluation to discuss methodological issues that arise as well as for the analysis and dissemination of findings. It is not necessary to include letters of commitment from potential advisory group members in this application, but the applicant must include a list of potential candidates in the project design.
- contribute to the field through research results about the efficacy of paid mentors.

Deliverables. The deliverables of the program are as follows:

- submit detailed progress reports to OJJDP every 6 months of the project. These reports will describe the status of the evaluation, methodological and implementation issues, progress

toward the project goals, findings of the process and outcome evaluations, and other issues that are relevant to the completion of the study.

- hold advisory board meetings before, during, and after the collection of data. The grantee will document, in minutes, the issues, discussions, and resolutions at these meetings and share them with OJJDP staff. The grantee will meet with OJJDP staff within the first 6 months to review strategy and will annually review progress, methodology, analysis, etc.
- complete several reports. One will be suitable for publication based on the results of this study and will document the theoretical and implementation issues of the research question. OJJDP encourages the evaluators to seek publication in refereed journals. The grantee will also summarize this longer report in a second shorter version suitable for an OJJDP bulletin. The final grant report should be a detailed summary of the entire project from start to finish and include both process and outcome evaluation information.

- **Award Information**

OJJDP will make one award of up to \$3.5 million for a 5-year project period. The award amount will cover the entire requested project period. All awards are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and any modifications or additional requirements that may be imposed by law.

Limitation on Use of Award Funds for Employee Compensation; Waiver. No portion of any award of more than \$250,000 made under this solicitation may be used to pay any portion of the total cash compensation (salary plus bonuses) of any employee of the award recipient whose total cash compensation exceeds 110 percent of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the federal government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year. (The salary table for SES employees is available at www.opm.gov.) This prohibition may be waived at the discretion of the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs. An applicant that wishes to request a waiver must include a detailed justification in the budget narrative of the application.

Match Requirement. Match is not required for this program.

Performance Measures

To assist the Department in fulfilling its responsibilities under the Government Performance and Results Act, Pub.L. 103-62, applicants that receive funding under this solicitation must provide data that measures the results of their work. For this solicitation, OJJDP has identified mandatory performance measures, outlined in the table below, and will require applicants selected for funding to submit data during the project period. In their proposal narrative, applicants must describe their understanding of the mandatory performance measures and discuss their data collection methods. Mandatory performance measures for this solicitation are as follows:

Objective	Performance Measures	Data Grantee Provides
To implement a process and outcome evaluation of an existing mentoring program	The following are mandatory performance measures for projects funded through this	Program performance will be determined by OJJDP. Grantees will submit relevant reports and

DUNS Number. The Office of Management and Budget requires that all businesses and nonprofit applicants for federal funds include a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number in their application for a new award or renewal of an award. Applications without a DUNS number are incomplete. A DUNS number is a unique nine-digit sequence recognized as the universal standard for identifying and tracking entities receiving federal funds. The identifier is used to validate address and point of contact information for federal assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. The DUNS number will be used throughout the grant life cycle. Obtaining a DUNS number is a free, simple, one-time activity. Call 1-866-705-5711 or apply online at <http://www.dnb.com/us/>. Individuals are exempt from this requirement.

Central Contractor Registration. OJP requires that all applicants for federal financial assistance, other than individuals, maintain current registrations in the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) database. The CCR database is the repository for standard information about federal financial assistance applicants, recipients, and subrecipients. Organizations that have previously submitted applications via Grants.gov are already registered with CCR, as it is a requirement for Grants.gov registration. Please note, however, that applicants must update or renew their CCR at least once per year to maintain an active status. Information about registration procedures can be accessed at www.ccr.gov.

What an Application Must Include

Standard Form–424

Applicants must complete the Application for Federal Assistance (SF–424), a standard form that most federal agencies use, following the instructions it provides.

Program Narrative

Applicants must submit a program narrative that presents a detailed description of the purpose, goals, objectives, strategies, design, and management of their proposed program. The program narrative must be double-spaced with 1-inch margins, not exceeding 30 pages of 8½ by 11-inches, and use a standard 12-point font, preferably Times New Roman. Pages must be numbered “1 of 30,” etc. Material required under the “Budget and Budget Narrative” and “Other Attachments” sections will not count toward the program narrative page count. OJJDP may reject applications that are incomplete, do not respond to the scope of the solicitation, or fail to comply with format requirements.

The program narrative must address the following selection criteria: (1) statement of the problem/program narrative, (2) impact/outcomes and evaluation/performance measure data collection plan, (3) project/program design and implementation, and (4) capabilities/competencies. The applicant must clearly delineate the connections between and among each of these sections. For example, the applicant must derive goals and objectives directly from the problems to be addressed. Similarly, the project design section must clearly explain how the program's structure and activities will accomplish the goals and objectives identified in the previous section.

- **Statement of the Problem**

Applicants should describe any research or evaluation studies that relate to the problem and contribute to the applicant's understanding of its causes and potential solutions. While OJJDP

expects applicants to review the research literature for relevant studies, they should also explore whether unpublished local sources of research or evaluation data are available.

Project Abstract. Applicants must include a project abstract as the first page of their program narrative. The abstract is included in the page limitation specified above. It must not exceed 200 words and briefly describe the project's purpose, identify the population the applicant will serve, and summarize the activities that the applicant will implement to achieve the project's goals and objectives. These goals and objectives must focus on short-term and intermediate outcomes (see "Impact and Outcomes," below). The abstract must describe how the applicant will measure progress toward these goals.

- **Impact and Outcomes**

Applicants must describe the goals of the proposed research or evaluation project and identify its objectives. When formulating the project's goals and objectives, applicants should consider the potential for significant advances in scientific or technical understanding of the problem and the potential for significant advances in the juvenile justice field and bear in mind the performance measures that OJJDP will use to gauge grantee performance (see "Performance Measures," below).

Goals. Applicants should provide a broad statement, written in general terms, that conveys the research or evaluation project's intent to study the problem or problems described. This section of the narrative must outline the specific goals of the project.

Objectives. Applicants should explain how the research or evaluation project will accomplish its goals. Objectives are specific, quantifiable statements of the desired results of the project, and they should be clearly connected to the problems identified in the preceding section. The objectives should be measurable.

Performance Measures. To ensure that the Performance Measures selected by the grantee reflect the specific problems, goals, objectives, and design strategy of the project, OJJDP has developed mandatory performance measures (see "Performance Measures," page 7.)

- **Project/Program Design and Implementation**

Applicants must describe the specific strategies that will be used to implement the proposed research or evaluation.

Design elements should follow directly from the research or evaluation project's goals and objectives, and the data to be collected should clearly support these ends. The applicant should describe the research or evaluation methodology in detail and demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the data that will be collected. Applicants should consider the rigor and soundness of the methodology and analytical and technical approaches for the proposed research or evaluation, and address the feasibility of the proposed project and any potential challenges

This section should also include details regarding any leveraged resources (cash or in-kind) from local sources to support the project and discuss plans for sustainability beyond the grant period.

Applicants should identify any other federal, state, or private foundation grants that serve the same local area and target population.

Logic Model. Applicants must include a logic model that graphically illustrates how the performance measures are related to the project's problems, goals, objectives, and design. Sample logic models are available at ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/grantees/performance.html. The applicant must submit the logic model as a separate attachment, as stipulated in "Other Attachments," page 12.

Timeline. Applicants must submit a timeline or milestone chart that indicates major tasks, assigns responsibility for each, and plots completion of each task by month or quarter for the duration of the award, using "Year 1," "Month 1," "Quarter 1," etc., not calendar dates (see "Sample Project Timelines" at ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/grantees/timelines.html). The applicant must submit the timeline as a separate attachment, as stipulated in "Other Attachments," page 12. On receipt of an award, the applicant may revise the timeline based on training and technical assistance that OJJDP will provide.

- **Capabilities/Competencies**

Applicants must describe the roles and responsibilities of project staff and explain the program's organizational structure and operations.

This section of the program narrative must describe how the applicant will manage and staff the project. The applicant must clearly and evidently connect management and staffing patterns to the project design described in the previous section. This section must describe the experience and capability of the applicant's organization and any contractors that will be used to effectively implement and manage this effort and its associated federal funding, highlighting any previous experience implementing projects of similar design or magnitude.

Budget and Budget Narrative

Applicants must provide a budget that: (1) is complete, allowable, and cost effective in relation to the proposed activities; (2) shows the cost calculations demonstrating how the applicant arrived at the total amount requested; and (3) provides a brief supporting narrative to link costs with project activities.

Applicants must submit a budget that includes a detailed worksheet itemizing all costs and a narrative explaining and justifying each budget item, as described below.

- **Budget Worksheet**

The worksheet must provide the detailed computation for each budget line item, listing the cost of each item and showing how the applicant calculated it. For example, costs for personnel must show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time devoted to the project for each employee paid through grant funds. The budget worksheet must present a complete and detailed itemization of all proposed costs. A budget worksheet template is available at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/forms/budget_detail.pdf.

- **Budget Narrative**

The budget narrative must describe each budget item and relate it to the appropriate project activity. It must closely follow the content of the budget detail worksheet and justify all proposed costs listed in the budget worksheet (particularly supplies, travel, and equipment) and

demonstrate that they are reasonable. In the budget narrative, applicants must explain how they calculated fringe benefits, how they estimated travel costs, why they must purchase particular items of equipment or supplies, and how they calculated overhead or indirect costs (if applicable).

Indirect Cost Rate Agreement

Applicants that would like to establish a federally negotiated indirect cost rate must submit a proposal to their cognizant federal agency. Generally, the cognizant federal agency is the agency that provides the preponderance of direct federal funding. This can be determined by reviewing an organization's schedule of federal financial assistance. If DOJ is your cognizant federal agency, obtain information needed to submit an indirect cost rate proposal at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/pdfs/indirect_costs.pdf.

Other Attachments

Applicants must submit the following information, as stipulated in the cited pages, as attachments to their application.

- logic model (see “Logic Model,” page 11)
- timeline or milestone chart (see “Timeline,” page 11)
- résumés of all key personnel
- job descriptions outlining roles and responsibilities for all key positions
- letters of support/commitment and memoranda of understanding (MOUs) from partner organizations.

Selection Criteria

OJJDP will rate applications that proceed to peer review on a 100-point scale, based on the following point values for the selection criteria:

- Statement of the Problem (10 points)
- Impact and Outcomes (10 points)
- Project/Program Design and Implementation (50 points)
- Capabilities/Competencies (20 points)
- Budget (10 points).

See “Program Narrative,” page 9, for detailed descriptions of the above criteria.

Review Process

OJJDP is committed to ensuring a standardized process for awarding grants. OJJDP reviews each application to ensure that the information presented is reasonable, understandable, measurable, and achievable, as well as consistent with program or legislative requirements as stated in the solicitation.

Peer reviewers will review the applications submitted under this solicitation, as well. OJJDP may use either internal peer reviewers, external peer reviewers, or a combination of both to review the applications. An external peer reviewer is an expert in the field of the subject matter of a given solicitation who is not a current DOJ employee. An internal reviewer is an expert in the field of the subject matter of a given solicitation who is a current DOJ employee. OJJDP will screen applications initially to determine whether the applicant meets all eligibility requirements. Peer review panels will evaluate, score, and rate only those applications that meet all requirements and that eligible applicants submit. Peer reviewers' ratings and any resulting recommendations are advisory only. In addition to peer review ratings, OJJDP considerations may include, but are not limited to, underserved populations, strategic priorities, past performance, and available funding.

After the peer review is finalized, OJP's Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO), in consultation with OJJDP, conducts a financial review of all potential discretionary awards and cooperative agreements to evaluate the fiscal integrity and financial capability of applicants, examines proposed costs to determine if the budget and budget narrative accurately explain project costs and determines whether costs are reasonable, necessary, and allowable under applicable federal cost principles and agency regulations. OCFO also reviews the award document and verifies the OJP Vendor Number.

Absent explicit statutory authorization or written delegation of authority to the contrary, OJP's Assistant Attorney General, who may also consider factors including, but not limited to, underserved populations, strategic priorities, past performance, and available funding, will make all final grant award decisions.

Additional Requirements

Successful applicants selected for award must agree to comply with additional applicable requirements prior to receiving grant funding. OJJDP strongly encourages applicants to review the information pertaining to these additional requirements prior to submitting their applications. Additional information for each is available at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

- [Civil Rights Compliance](#)
- Funding to Faith-Based Organizations
- Confidentiality and Human Subjects Protection
- Anti-Lobbying Act
- Financial and Government Audit Requirements
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Compliance
- DOJ Information Technology Standards
- Single Point of Contact Review

- Non-Supplanting of State and Local Funds
- Criminal Penalty for False Statements
- Compliance with Office of Justice Programs [Financial Guide](#)
- Suspension or Termination of Funding
- Non-Profit Organizations
- For-Profit Organizations
- Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)
- Rights in Intellectual Property
- Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) of 2006.