

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE**Grant Guideline**

AGENCY: State Justice Institute.

ACTION: Proposed Grant Guideline.

SUMMARY: This Guideline sets forth the administrative, programmatic, and financial requirements attendant to Fiscal Year 1996 State Justice Institute grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts.

DATES: The Institute invites public comment on the Guideline until September 28, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent to the State Justice Institute, 1650 King St. (Suite 600), Alexandria, VA 22314.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David I. Tevelin, Executive Director; Richard Van Duizend, Deputy Director; or Katie Ames, Publications Coordinator, State Justice Institute, 1650 King St. (Suite 600), Alexandria, VA 22314, (703) 684-6100.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the State Justice Institute Act of 1984, 42 U.S.C. 10701, et seq., as amended, the Institute is authorized to award grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts to State and local courts, nonprofit organizations, and others for the purpose of improving the administration of justice in the State courts of the United States.

Status of FY 1996 Appropriations

At the time of publication, the status of SJI's fiscal year 1996 Congressional appropriation is uncertain. In H.R. 2076, the House of Representatives voted to eliminate funding for the Institute in FY 1996; the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies chaired by Senator Phil Gramm is scheduled to consider the bill shortly after Labor Day. The grant program proposed in this Guideline and the funding targets noted for specific programs are contingent on the availability of appropriations in FY 1996 at about the same \$13.55 million level that SJI has received from Congress each of the past four fiscal years. Subject to the availability of funds to support a grant program in FY 1996, publication of the Final Grant Guideline is scheduled for approximately October 16, 1995.

Types of Grants Available and Funding Schedules

The SJI grant program is designed to be responsive to the most important needs of the State courts. To meet the full range of the courts' diverse needs, the Institute offers six different types of

grants. The types of grants available in FY 1996 and the funding cycles for each program are provided below:

Project Grants. These grants are awarded to support education, research, demonstration, and technical assistance projects to improve the administration of justice in the State courts. With limited exceptions (see sections II.B.2.b.i., II.B.2.b.v., and II.C.), project grants are intended to support innovative projects of national significance. As provided in section V. of the Guideline, project grants may ordinarily not exceed \$300,000 a year; however, grants in excess of \$200,000 are likely to be awarded only to support projects likely to have a significant national impact. Applicants must ordinarily submit a concept paper (see section VI.) and an application (see section VII.) in order to obtain a project grant.

As indicated in Section VI.C., the Board may make an "accelerated" grant of less than \$40,000 on the basis of the concept paper alone when the need for the project is clear and little additional information about the operation of the project would be provided in an application.

The FY 1996 mailing deadline for project grant concept papers is November 28, 1995. Papers must be postmarked or bear other evidence of submission by that date. With the exceptions noted immediately below, the FY 1996 funding cycle will be substantially similar to the FY 1995 cycle: The Board will meet in early March, 1996 to invite formal applications based on the most promising concept papers; applications will be due in May; and awards will be approved by the Board in July.

The exceptions to this schedule pertain to proposals to follow up on national conferences SJI has supported or will be supporting in 1995. Concept papers following up on the March 1995 National Conference on Eliminating Race and Ethnic Bias in the Courts must be mailed by October 6, 1995. See section II.B.2.i. (This deadline was announced in the Institute's FY 1995 Grant Guideline.) The Board of Directors will consider those papers at its December 1995 Board meeting and invite applications to be mailed by January 19 for consideration at its March 1996 meeting.

Concept papers following up on three other conferences to be held this fall must be mailed by March 8, 1996. Those conferences are the National Town Hall Meeting on Improving Public Confidence in the Courts to be held October 14-15, 1995 (see section II.B.2.a.iii.); the National Interbranch

Conference on Funding the State Courts to be held September 27-October 1, 1995 (see section II.B.2.d.iv.); and the National Drug Court Symposium to be held December 3-6, 1995 (see section II.B.2.h). These concept papers will be considered at the Board's April 1996 meeting. Applications must be submitted by June 14 for consideration at the Board's July 1996 meeting.

Package Grants. This grant program permits applicants to submit one concept paper (or application) for a "package" of related grants rather than separate proposals for each related component of the package. Package grants of up to \$750,000 per year may be awarded to support projects that address interrelated topics or the core elements of a multifaceted program, or that require the services of all or some of the same key staff persons. Package grants must enhance not merely maintain an applicant's services and must otherwise meet the Institutes grant criteria. The Board retains the discretion to support all, none, or selected portions of the proposed package. Package grant concept papers and applications will be considered on the same schedule as project grants. See sections III.J., V.C. and D., VI.A.2.b. and 3.b., VIIA.3., VII.C., and VII.D. for more information about package grants.

Technical Assistance Grants. Under this program, a State or local court may receive a grant of up to \$30,000 to engage outside experts to provide technical assistance to diagnose, develop, and implement a response to a jurisdiction's problems. The Guideline allocates up to \$600,000 in FY 1996 funds to support technical assistance grants. See section II.C.2.

Curriculum Adaptation Grants. A grant of up to \$20,000 may be awarded to a State or local court to replicate or modify a model training program developed with SJI funds. The Guideline allocates up to \$250,000 for these grants in FY 1996. See section II.B.2.b.ii.

Letters requesting Curriculum Adaptation grants may be submitted at any time during the fiscal year. However, in order to permit the Institute sufficient time to evaluate these proposals, letters must be submitted no later than 90 days before the projected date of the training program. See section II.B.2.b.ii.(c).

Scholarships. The Guideline allocates up to \$250,000 of FY 1996 funds for scholarships to enable judges and court managers to attend out-of-State education and training programs. See section II.B.2.b.v.

The Guideline establishes four deadlines for scholarship requests:

November 1, 1995 for training programs beginning between January 12 and April 12, 1996; February 1, 1996 for programs beginning between April 13 and July 12, 1996; April 15, 1996 for programs beginning between July 13 and September 30, 1996; and July 15, 1996 for programs beginning between October 1 and December 31, 1996.

Renewal Grants. There are two types of renewal grants available from SJI: Continuation grants (see sections III.G., V.C. and D., and IX.A.) and On-going support grants (see sections III.H., V.C. and D., and IX.B.). Continuation grants are intended to support limited duration projects that involve the same type of activities as the original project. On-going support grants may be awarded for up to a three-year period to support national-scope projects that provide the State courts with critically needed services, programs, or products.

The Guideline establishes a target for renewal grants of no more than \$3 million, a little more than 25% of the total amount available for grants in FY 1996. See section IX. Grantees should accordingly be aware that the award of a grant to support a project does not constitute a commitment to provide either continuation funding or on-going support.

An applicant for a continuation or on-going support grant must submit a letter notifying the Institute of its intent to seek such funding, no later than 120 days before the end of the current grant period. The Institute will then notify the applicant of the deadline for its renewal grant application. See section IX.

Special Interest Categories

The Guideline contains 13 Special Interest categories, i.e., those project areas that the Board has identified as being of particular importance to the State courts. The Institute has always sought extensive advice about the special interest categories from judges, court administrators, lawyers, members of the public, and other groups interested in the administration of justice. In order to more systematically obtain advice from the court community this year, SJI sent a survey to more than 400 court leaders across the nation asking, among other things, for their guidance about the Institute's funding priorities for FY 1996.

The respondents suggested that the Institute accord the following topics the highest funding priority next fiscal year: Public confidence in the courts'; application of technology; children and families in court; education and training; family violence and the courts; alternative dispute resolution; court financing; and delay and expense

reduction. All of these topics are addressed in the proposed Guideline; the first six are specific special interest categories.

In addition, survey respondents expressed an interest in having Institute grants more fully explore ways to improve the "quality of justice" provide by the American legal system. The Guideline addresses that issue in section II.B.2.a.ii.

Two new categories are proposed for addition this year: Responding Effectively to the Court-Related Needs of Mentally Disabled Persons (II.B.2.j.) and Improving the Security of Courthouses, Judges, Jurors, and Witnesses (II.B.2.m.) One FY 1995 category—Assessing the Impact of Health Care-Related Issues on the State Courts—is proposed for elimination. Two categories—Education and Training for Judges and Other Key Court Personnel (II.B.2.b.) and Children and Families in Court (II.B.2.e.)—have been significantly reorganized.

In response to the results of the survey and the suggestions of grantees, the proposed Guideline also includes several minor technical changes to clarify and simplify the grant process.

Recommendations to Grant Writers

Over the past 9 years, Institute staff have reviewed approximately 3,000 concept papers and 1,400 applications. On the basis of those reviews, inquiries from applicants, and the views of the Board, the Institute offers the following recommendations to help potential applicants present workable, understandable proposals that can meet the funding criteria set forth in this Guideline.

The Institute suggests that applicants make certain that they address the questions and issues set forth below when preparing a concept paper or application.

Concept papers and applications should, however, be presented in the formats specified in sections VI. and VII. of the guideline, respectively.

1. *What is the subject or problem you wish to address?* Describe the subject or problem and how it affects the courts and the public. Discuss how your approach will improve the situation or advance the state of the art or knowledge, and explain why it is the most appropriate approach to take. When statistics or research findings are cited to support a statement or position, the source of the citation should be referenced in a footnote or a reference list.

2. *What do you want to do?* Explain the goal(s) of the project in simple, straightforward terms. The goals should describe the intended consequences or

expected overall effect of the proposed project (e.g., to enable judges to sentence drug-abusing offenders more effectively, or to dispose of civil cases within 24 months), rather than the tasks or activities to be conducted (e.g., hold three training sessions, or install a new computer system).

To the greatest extent possible, an applicant should avoid a specialized vocabulary that is not readily understood by the general public. Technical jargon does not enhance a paper.

3. *How will you do it?* Describe the methodology carefully so that what you propose to do and how you would do it are clear. All proposed tasks should be set forth so that a reviewer can see a logical progression of tasks and relate those tasks directly to the accomplishment of the project's goal(s). When in doubt about whether to provide a more detailed explanation or to assume a particular level of knowledge or expertise on the part of the reviewers, provide the additional information. A description of project tasks also will help identify necessary budget items. All staff positions and project costs should relate directly to the tasks described. The Institute encourages applicants to attach letters of cooperation and support from the courts and related agencies that will be involved in or directly affected by the proposed project.

4. *How will you know it works?* Include an evaluation component that will determine whether the proposed training, procedure, service, or technology accomplished the objectives it was designed to meet. Concept papers and applications should describe the criteria that will be used to evaluate the project's effectiveness and identify program elements which will require further modification. The description in the application should include how the evaluation will be conducted, when it will occur during the project period, who will conduct it, and what specific measures will be used. In most instances, the evaluation should be conducted by persons not connected with the implementation of the procedure, training, service, or technique, or the administration of the project.

The Institute has also prepared a more thorough list of recommendations to grant writers regarding the development of project evaluation plans. Those recommendations are available from the Institute upon request.

5. *How will others find out about it?* Include a plan to disseminate the results of the training, research, or demonstration beyond the jurisdictions

and individuals directly affected by the project. The plan should identify the specific methods which will be used to inform the field about the project, such as the publication of law review or journal articles, or the distribution of key materials. A statement that a report or research findings "will be made available to" the field is not sufficient. The specific means of distribution or dissemination as well as the types of recipients should be identified. Reproduction and dissemination costs are allowable budget items.

6. *What are the specific costs involved?* The budget in both concept papers and applications should be presented clearly. Major budget categories such as personnel, benefits, travel, supplies, equipment, and indirect costs should be identified separately. The components of "Other" or "Miscellaneous" items should be specified in the application budget narrative, and should not include set-asides for undefined contingencies.

7. *What, if any, match is being offered?* Courts and other units of State and local government (not including publicly-supported institutions of higher education) are required by the State Justice Institute Act to contribute a match (cash, non-cash, or both) of not less than 50 percent of the grant funds requested from the Institute. All other applicants also are encouraged to provide a matching contribution to assist in meeting the costs of a project.

The match requirement works as follows: If, for example, the total cost of a project is anticipated to be \$150,000, a State or local court or executive branch agency may request up to \$100,000 from the Institute to implement the project. The remaining \$50,000 (50% of the \$100,000 requested from SJI) must be provided as match.

Cash match includes funds directly contributed to the project by the applicant, or by other public or private sources. It does not include income generated from tuition fees or the sale of project products. Non-cash match refers to in-kind contributions by the applicant, or other public or private sources. This includes, for example, the monetary value of time contributed by existing personnel or members of an advisory committee (but not the time spent by participants in an educational program attending program sessions). When match is offered, the nature of the match (cash or in-kind) should be explained and, at the application stage, the tasks and line items for which costs will be covered wholly or in part by match should be specified.

8. *Which of the two budget forms should be used?* Section VII.A.3. of the

SJI Grant Guideline encourages use of the spreadsheet format of Form C1 if the funding request exceeds \$100,000. Form C1 also works well for projects with discrete tasks, regardless of the dollar value of the project. Form C, the tabular format, is preferred for projects lacking a number of discrete tasks, or for projects requiring less than \$100,000 of Institute funding. Generally, use the form that best lends itself to representing most accurately the budget estimates for the project.

9. *How much detail should be included in the budget narrative?* The budget narrative of an application should provide the basis for computing all project-related costs, as indicated in section VII.D. of the SJI Grant Guideline. To avoid common shortcomings of application budget narratives, include the following information:

- Personnel estimates that accurately provide the amount of time to be spent by personnel involved with the project and the total associated costs, including current salaries for the designated personnel (e.g., Project Director, 50% for one year, annual salary of \$50,000=\$25,000). If salary costs are computed using an hourly or daily rate, the annual salary and number of hours or days in a work-year should be shown.
- Estimates for supplies and expenses supported by a complete description of the supplies to be used, nature and extent of printing to be done, anticipated telephone charges, and other common expenditures, with the basis for computing the estimates included (e.g., 100 reports \times 75 pages each \times .05/page=\$375.00). Supply and expense estimates offered simply as "based on experience" are not sufficient.

In order to expedite Institute review of the budget, make a final comparison of the amounts listed in the budget narrative with those listed on the budget form. In the rush to complete all parts of the application on time, there may be many last-minute changes; unfortunately, when there are discrepancies between the budget narrative and the budget form or the amount listed on the application cover sheet, it is not possible for the Institute to verify the amount of the request. A final check of the numbers on the form against those in the narrative will preclude such confusion. The Institute will provide an illustrative budget and budget form upon request.

10. *What travel regulations apply to the budget estimates?* Transportation costs and per diem rates must comply with the policies of the applicant organization, and a copy of the applicant's travel policy should be submitted as an appendix to the

application. If the applicant does not have a travel policy established in writing, then travel rates must be consistent with those established by the Institute or the Federal Government (a copy of the Institute's travel policy is available upon request). The budget narrative should state which regulations are in force for the project and should include the estimated fare, the number of persons traveling, the number of trips to be taken, and the length of stay. The estimated costs of travel, lodging, ground transportation, and other subsistence should be listed separately. When combined, the subtotals for these categories should equal the estimate listed on the budget form.

11. *May grant funds be used to purchase equipment?* Generally, grant funds may be used to purchase only the equipment that is necessary to demonstrate a new technological application in a court, or that is otherwise essential to accomplishing the objectives of the project. Equipment purchases to support basic court operations ordinarily will not be approved. The budget narrative must list the equipment to be purchased and explain why the equipment is necessary to the success of the project. Written prior approval of the Institute is required when the amount of computer hardware to be purchased or leased exceeds \$10,000, or the software to be purchased exceeds \$3,000.

12. *To what extent may indirect costs be included in the budget estimates?* It is the policy of the Institute that all costs should be budgeted directly; however, if an applicant has an indirect cost rate that has been approved by a Federal agency within the last two years, an indirect cost recovery estimate may be included in the budget. A copy of the approved rate agreement should be submitted as an appendix to the application.

If an applicant does not have an approved rate agreement, an indirect cost rate proposal should be prepared in accordance with Section XI.H.4. of the Grant Guideline, based on the applicant's audited financial statements for the prior fiscal year. (Applicants lacking an audit should budget all project costs directly.) If an indirect cost rate proposal is to be submitted, the budget should reflect estimates based on that proposal. Obviously, this requires that the proposal be completed at the time of application so that the appropriate estimates may be included; however, grantees have until three months after the project start date to submit the indirect cost proposal to the Institute for approval. An indirect cost rate worksheet on computer diskette is

available from the Institute upon request.

13. *Does the budget truly reflect all costs required to complete the project?* After preparing the program narrative portion of the application, applicants may find it helpful to list all the major tasks or activities required by the proposed project, including the preparation of products, and note the individual expenses, including personnel time, related to each. This will help to ensure that, for all tasks described in the application (e.g., development of a videotape, research site visits, distribution of a final report), the related costs appear in the budget and are explained correctly in the budget narrative.

Recommendations To Grantees

The Institute's staff works with grantees to help assure the smooth operation of the project and compliance with the SJI Guidelines. On the basis of monitoring more than 1000 grants, the Institute staff offers the following suggestions to aid grantees in meeting the administrative and substantive requirements of their grants.

1. *After the grant has been awarded, when are the first quarterly reports due?* Quarterly Progress Reports and Financial Status Reports must be submitted within 30 days after the end of every calendar quarter—i.e., no later than January 30, April 30, July 30, and October 30—regardless of the project's start date. The reporting periods covered by each quarterly report end 30 days before the respective deadline for the report. When an award period begins December 1, for example, the first Quarterly Progress Report describing project activities between December 1 and December 31 will be due on January 30. A Financial Status Report should be submitted even if funds have not been obligated or expended.

By documenting what has happened over the past three months, Quarterly Progress Reports provide an opportunity for project staff and Institute staff to resolve any questions before they become problems, and make any necessary changes in the project time schedule, budget allocations, etc. Thus, the Quarterly Project Report should describe project activities, their relationship to the approved timeline, and any problems encountered and how they were resolved, and outline the tasks scheduled for the coming quarter. It is helpful to attach copies of relevant memos, draft products, or other requested information. An original and one copy of a Quarterly Progress Report and attachments should be submitted to the Institute.

Additional Quarterly Progress Report or Financial Status Report forms may be obtained from the grantee's Program Manager at SJI, or photocopies may be made from the supply received with the award.

2. *Do reporting requirements differ for renewal grants or package grants?* Recipients of a continuation, on-going support, or package grant are required to submit quarterly progress and financial status reports on the same schedule and with the same information as recipients of a grant for a single new project.

A continuation grant and each yearly grant under an on-going support award should be considered as a separate phase of the project. The reports should be numbered on a grant rather than project basis. Thus, the first quarterly report filed under a continuation grant or a yearly increment of an on-going support award should be designated as number one, the second as number two, and so on, through the final progress and financial status reports due within 90 days after the end of the grant period.

Recipients of a package grant should file a summary Financial Status Report covering the entire package as well as separate financial reports for each of the projects in the package, identified by letter of the alphabet (e.g., SJI-93-15R-J-001-A; SJI-93-15R-J-001-B; SJI-93-15R-J-001-C).

3. *What information about project activities should be communicated to SJI?* In general, grantees should provide prior notice of critical project events such as advisory board meetings or training sessions so that the Institute Program Manager can attend if possible. If methodological, schedule, staff, budget allocations, or other significant changes become necessary, the grantee should contact the Program Manager prior to implementing any of these changes, so that possible questions may be addressed in advance. Questions concerning the financial requirements section of the Guideline, quarterly financial reporting or payment requests, should be addressed to the Grants Financial Manager listed in the award letter.

It is helpful to include the grant number assigned to the award on all correspondence to the Institute.

4. *Why is it important to address the special conditions that are attached to the award document?* In some instances, a list of special conditions is attached to the award document. The special conditions are imposed to establish a schedule for reporting certain key information, to assure that the Institute has an opportunity to offer suggestions at critical stages of the project, and to provide reminders of some, but not all

of the requirements contained in the Grant Guideline. Accordingly, it is important for grantees to check the special conditions carefully and discuss with their Program Manager any questions or problems they may have with the conditions. Most concerns about timing, response time, and the level of detail required can be resolved in advance through a telephone conversation. The Institute's primary concern is to work with grantees to assure that their projects accomplish their objectives, not to enforce rigid bureaucratic requirements. However, if a grantee fails to comply with a special condition or with other grant requirements, the Institute may, after proper notice, suspend payment of grant funds or terminate the grant.

Sections X., XI., and XII. of the Grant Guideline contain the Institute's administrative and financial requirements. Institute Finance and Management Division staff are always available to answer questions and provide assistance regarding these provisions.

5. *What is a Grant Adjustment?* A Grant Adjustment is the Institute's form for acknowledging the satisfaction of special conditions, or approving changes in grant activities, schedule, staffing, sites, or budget allocations requested by the project director. It also may be used to correct errors in grant documents, add small amounts to a grant award, or deobligate funds from the grant.

6. *What schedule should be followed in submitting requests for reimbursements or advance payments?* Requests for reimbursements or advance payments may be made at any time after the project start date and before the end of the 90-day close-out period. However, the Institute follows the U.S. Treasury's policy limiting advances to the minimum amount required to meet immediate cash needs. Given normal processing time, grantees should not seek to draw down funds for periods greater than 30 days from the date of the request.

7. *Do procedures for submitting requests for reimbursement or advance payment differ for renewal grants or package grants?* The basic procedures are the same for any grant. A continuation grant or the yearly grant under an on-going support award should be considered as a separate phase of the project. Payment requests should be numbered on a grant rather than a project basis. Thus, the first request for funds from a continuation grant or a yearly increment under an on-going support award should be designated as number one, the second as

number two, and so on through the final payment request for that grant.

Recipients of a package grant should file separate requests for each project in the package. For example, if there are three projects within a package grant, a grantee should prepare three separate payment requests, each identified by the letter of the alphabet designated in the award document (e.g., SJI-93-15R-J-001-A; SJI-93-15R-J-001-B; SJI-93-15R-J-001-C). Subsequent payment requests should be numbered consecutively for each project within the package (e.g., project SJI-93-15R-J-001-A payment number 2; SJI-93-15R-J-001-B payment number 4; etc.).

8. *If things change during the grant period, can funds be reallocated from one budget category to another?* The Institute recognizes that some flexibility is required in implementing a project design and budget. Thus, grantees may shift funds among direct cost budget categories. When any one reallocation or the cumulative total of reallocations are expected to exceed five percent of the approved project budget, a grantee must specify the proposed changes, explain the reasons for the changes, and request Institute approval.

The same standard applies to renewal grants and package grants. In addition, prior written Institute approval is required to shift leftover funds from the original award to cover activities to be conducted under the renewal award, or to use renewal grant monies to cover costs incurred during the original grant period. Prior written Institute approval also is needed to shift funds between projects included in a package grant.

9. *What is the 90-day close-out period?* Following the last day of the grant, a 90-day period is provided to allow for all grant-related bills to be received and posted, and grant funds drawn down to cover these expenses. No obligations of grant funds may be incurred during this period. The last day on which an expenditure of grant funds can be obligated is the end date of the grant period. Similarly, the 90-day period is not intended as an opportunity to finish and disseminate grant products. This should occur before the end of the grant period.

Starting the day after the end of the award period, and during the following 90 days, all monies that have been obligated should be expended. All payment requests must be received by the end of the 90-day "close-out-period." Any unexpended monies held by the grantee that remain after the 90-day follow-up period must be returned to the Institute. Any funds remaining in the grant that have not been drawn down by the grantee will be deobligated.

10. *Are funds granted by SJI "Federal" funds?* The State Justice Institute Act provides that, except for purposes unrelated to this question, "the Institute shall not be considered a department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government." 42 U.S.C. § 10704(c)(1). Because SJI receives appropriations from Congress, some grantee auditors have reported SJI grants funds as "Other Federal Assistance." This classification is acceptable to SJI but is not required.

11. *If SJI is not a Federal Agency, do OMB circulars apply with respect to audits?* Except to the extent that they are inconsistent with the express provisions of the SJI Grant Guideline, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circulars A-110, A-21, A-87, A-88, A-102, A-122, A-128 and A-133 are incorporated into the Grant Guideline by reference. Because the Institute's enabling legislation specifically requires the Institute to "conduct, or require each recipient to provide for, an annual fiscal audit" [see 42 U.S.C. § 10711(c)(1)], the Grant Guideline sets forth options for grantees to comply with this statutory requirement. (See Section XI.J.)

Prior to FY 1994, the Institute did not require grantees to comply with the audit-related provisions of OMB circulars A-110, A-128, or A-133, but did require that grantees, lacking an audit report prepared for a Federal agency, conduct an independent audit in compliance with generally accepted auditing standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants.

The current Guideline makes it clear that SJI will accept audits conducted in accordance with the Single Audit Act of 1984 and OMB Circulars A-128, or A-133, in satisfaction of the annual fiscal audit requirement. Grantees who are required to undertake these audits in conjunction with Federal grants may include SJI funds as part of the audit even if the receipt of SJI funds would not require such audits. This approach gives grantees an option to fold SJI funds into the governmental audit rather than to undertake a separate audit to satisfy SJI's Guideline requirements.

In sum, educational and nonprofit organizations that receive payments from the Institute that are sufficient to meet the applicability thresholds of OMB Circular A-133 must have their annual audit conducted in accordance with Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States rather than with generally accepted auditing standards. Grantees in this category that receive amounts below the minimum threshold

referenced in Circular A-133 must also submit an annual audit to SJI, but they would have the option to conduct an audit of the entire grantee organization in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards; include SJI funds in an audit of Federal funds conducted in accordance with the Single Audit Act of 1984 and OMB Circulars A-128 or A-133; or conduct an audit of only the SJI funds in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. (See Guideline Section XI.J.) A copy of the above-noted circulars may be obtained by calling OMB at (202) 395-7250.

12. *Does SJI have a CFDA number?* Auditors often request that a grantee provide the Institute's Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for guidance in conducting an audit in accordance with Government Accounting Standards. Because SJI is not a Federal agency, it has not been issued such a number, and there are no additional compliance tests to satisfy under the Institute's audit requirements beyond those of a standard governmental audit.

Moreover, because SJI is not a Federal agency, SJI funds should not be aggregated with Federal funds to determine if the applicability threshold of Circular A-133 has been reached. For example, if in fiscal year 1996 grantee "X" received \$10,000 in Federal funds from a Department of Justice (DOJ) grant program and \$20,000 in grant funds from SJI, the minimum A-133 threshold would not be met. The same distinction would preclude an auditor from considering the additional SJI funds in determining what Federal requirements apply to the DOJ funds.

Grantees that are required to satisfy either the Single Audit Act, OMB Circulars A-128, or A-133 and who include SJI grant funds in those audits, need to remember that because of its status as a private non-profit corporation, SJI is not on routing lists of cognizant Federal agencies. Therefore, the grantee needs to submit a copy of the audit report prepared for such a cognizant Federal agency directly to SJI. The Institute's audit requirements may be found in Section XI.J. of the Grant Guideline.

The following Grant Guideline is proposed by the State Justice Institute for FY 1996:

State Justice Institute Grant Guideline

Table of Contents

- I. Background
- II. Scope of the program
- III. Definitions
- IV. Eligibility for award
- V. Types of projects and grants; size of awards

- VI. Concept paper submission requirements for new projects
- VII. Application requirements for new projects
- VIII. Application review procedures
- IX. Renewal funding procedures and requirements
- X. Compliance requirements
- XI. Financial requirements
- XII. Grant adjustments
- Appendix I List of State contacts regarding administration of institute grants to State and local courts
- Appendix II SJI libraries: Designated sites and contacts
- Appendix III Judicial education scholarship application forms
- Appendix IV Preliminary budget form
- Appendix V Certificate of State approval form
- Appendix VI Illustrative list of model curricula

Summary

This Guideline sets forth the programmatic, financial, and administrative requirements of grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts awarded by the State Justice Institute. The Institute, a private, nonprofit corporation established by an Act of Congress, is authorized to award grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts to improve the administration and quality of justice in the State courts.

Grants may be awarded to State and local courts and their agencies; national nonprofit organizations controlled by, operating in conjunction with, and serving the judicial branch of State governments; and national nonprofit organizations for the education and training of judges and support personnel of the judicial branch of State governments. The Institute may also award grants to other nonprofit organizations with expertise in judicial administration; institutions of higher education; individuals, partnerships, firms, or corporations; and private agencies with expertise in judicial administration if the objectives of the funded program can be better served by such an entity. Funds may be awarded, as well, to Federal, State or local agencies and institutions other than courts for services that cannot be provided adequately through nongovernmental arrangements. In addition, the Institute may provide financial assistance in the form of interagency agreements with other grantors.

The Institute will consider applications for funding support that address any of the areas specified in its enabling legislation, as amended. However, the Board of Directors of the Institute has designated certain program categories as being of special interest.

The Institute has established one round of competition for FY 1996 funds. The concept paper submission deadline for all but four specific funding categories is November 28, 1995. Concept papers to implement the plans developed at the March 1995 National Conference on Eliminating Race and Ethnic Bias in the Courts must be mailed by October 6, 1995. Concept papers to follow up on the National Interbranch Conference on Funding the State Courts, the National Town Hall Meeting on Improving Public Confidence in the Courts, and the National Symposium on the Implementation and Operation of Drug Courts must be submitted by March 8, 1996.

It is anticipated that between \$11 million and \$11.5 million will be available for award. This Guideline applies to all concept papers and applications submitted, as well as grants awarded in FY 1996.

The awards made by the State Justice Institute are governed by the requirements of this Guideline and the authority conferred by Pub. L. 98-620, Title II, 42 U.S.C. 10701, *et seq.*, as amended.

I. Background

The Institute was established by Pub. L. 98-620 to improve the administration of justice in the State courts in the United States. Incorporated in the State of Virginia as a private, nonprofit corporation, the Institute is charged, by statute, with the responsibility to:

- A. Direct a national program of financial assistance designed to assure that each citizen of the United States is provided ready access to a fair and effective system of justice;
- B. Foster coordination and cooperation with the Federal judiciary;
- C. Promote recognition of the importance of the separation of powers doctrine to an independent judiciary; and

D. Encourage education for judges and support personnel of State court systems through national and State organizations, including universities.

To accomplish these broad objectives, the Institute is authorized to provide funds to State courts, national organizations which support and are supported by State courts, national judicial education organizations, and other organizations that can assist in improving the quality of justice in the State courts.

The Institute is supervised by an 11-member Board of Directors appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate. The Board is statutorily composed of six judges, a State court

administrator, and four members of the public, no more than two of whom can be of the same political party.

Through the award of grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements, the Institute is authorized to perform the following activities:

A. Support research, demonstrations, special projects, technical assistance, and training to improve the administration of justice in the State courts;

B. Provide for the preparation, publication, and dissemination of information regarding State judicial systems;

C. Participate in joint projects with Federal agencies and other private grantors;

D. Evaluate or provide for the evaluation of programs and projects funded by the Institute to determine their impact upon the quality of criminal, civil, and juvenile justice and the extent to which they have contributed to improving the quality of justice in the State courts;

E. Encourage and assist in furthering judicial education;

F. Encourage, assist, and serve in a consulting capacity to State and local justice system agencies in the development, maintenance, and coordination of criminal, civil, and juvenile justice programs and services; and

G. Be responsible for the certification of national programs that are intended to aid and improve State judicial systems.

II. Scope of the Program

During FY 1996, the Institute will consider applications for funding support that address any of the areas specified in its enabling legislation. The Board, however, has designated certain program categories as being of "special interest." See section II.B.

A. Authorized Program Areas

The Institute is authorized to fund projects addressing one or more of the following program areas listed in the State Justice Institute Act, the Battered Women's Testimony Act of 1992, the Judicial Training and Research for Child Custody Litigation Act of 1992, the International Parental Kidnapping Crime Act of 1993, and the Violent Crime Reduction Act of 1994.

1. Assistance to State and local court systems in establishing appropriate procedures for the selection and removal of judges and other court personnel and in determining appropriate levels of compensation;

2. Education and training programs for judges and other court personnel for

the performance of their general duties and for specialized functions, and national and regional conferences and seminars for the dissemination of information on new developments and innovative techniques;

3. Research on alternative means for using judicial and nonjudicial personnel in court decisionmaking activities, implementation of demonstration programs to test such innovative approaches, and evaluations of their effectiveness;

4. Studies of the appropriateness and efficacy of court organizations and financing structures in particular States, and support to States to implement plans for improved court organization and financing;

5. Support for State court planning and budgeting staffs and the provision of technical assistance in resource allocation and service forecasting techniques;

6. Studies of the adequacy of court management systems in State and local courts, and implementation and evaluation of innovative responses to records management, data processing, court personnel management, reporting and transcription of court proceedings, and juror utilization and management;

7. Collection and compilation of statistical data and other information on the work of the courts and on the work of other agencies which relate to and affect the work of courts;

8. Studies of the causes of trial and appellate court delay in resolving cases, and establishing and evaluating experimental programs for reducing case processing time;

9. Development and testing of methods for measuring the performance of judges and courts and experiments in the use of such measures to improve the functioning of judges and the courts;

10. Studies of court rules and procedures, discovery devices, and evidentiary standards to identify problems with the operation of such rules, procedures, devices, and standards; and the development of alternative approaches to better reconcile the requirements of due process with the need for swift and certain justice, and testing of the utility of those alternative approaches;

11. Studies of the outcomes of cases in selected areas to identify instances in which the substance of justice meted out by the courts diverges from public expectations of fairness, consistency, or equity; and the development, testing and evaluation of alternative approaches to resolving cases in such problem areas;

12. Support for programs to increase court responsiveness to the needs of

citizens through citizen education, improvement of court treatment of witnesses, victims, and jurors, and development of procedures for obtaining and using measures of public satisfaction with court processes to improve court performance;

13. Testing and evaluating experimental approaches to provide increased citizen access to justice, including processes which reduce the cost of litigating common grievances and alternative techniques and mechanisms for resolving disputes between citizens;

14. Collection and analysis of information regarding the admissibility and quality of expert testimony on the experiences of battered women offered as part of the defense in criminal cases under State law, as well as sources of and methods to obtain funds to pay costs incurred to provide such testimony, particularly in cases involving indigent women defendants;

15. Development of training materials to assist battered women, operators of domestic violence shelters, battered women's advocates, and attorneys to use expert testimony on the experiences of battered women in appropriate cases, and individuals with expertise in the experiences of battered women to develop skills appropriate to providing such testimony;

16. Research regarding State judicial decisions relating to child custody litigation involving domestic violence;

17. Development of training curricula to assist State courts to develop an understanding of, and appropriate responses to child custody litigation involving domestic violence;

18. Dissemination of information and training materials and provision of technical assistance regarding the issues listed in paragraphs 14-17 above;

19. Development of national, regional, and in-State training and educational programs dealing with criminal and civil aspects of interstate and international parental child abduction;

20. Development, testing, presentation, and dissemination of model educational programs and materials for judges and court personnel on the nature and incidence of rape, sexual assault, incest, child sexual abuse, domestic violence, and other gender-related violent crimes; the impact of such crimes on the victim and on society; the evolution and application of the laws governing those crimes; the attitudes toward those crimes including the stereotypes of the victims; the sentencing of persons convicted of those crimes; the use of expert testimony regarding the effects on victims of those crimes; the

application of rape shield laws and other limits on the introduction of evidence; and the interpretation of defenses based on self-defense or provoked responses by victims of rape, sexual assault, incest, child sexual abuse, domestic violence, and other gender-related crimes of violence.

21. Other programs, consistent with the purposes of the State Justice Institute Act, as may be deemed appropriate by the Institute, including projects dealing with the relationship between Federal and State court systems in areas where there is concurrent State-Federal jurisdiction and where Federal courts, directly or indirectly, review State court proceedings.

Funds will *not* be made available for the ordinary, routine operation of court systems or programs in any of these areas.

B. Special Interest Program Categories

1. General Description

The Institute is interested in funding both innovative programs and programs of proven merit that can be replicated in other jurisdictions. Although applications in any of the statutory program areas are eligible for funding in FY 1996, the Institute is especially interested in funding those projects that:

a. Formulate new procedures and techniques, or creatively enhance existing arrangements to improve the courts;

b. Address aspects of the State judicial systems that are in special need of serious attention;

c. Have national significance in terms of their impact or replicability in that they develop products, services, and techniques that may be used in other States; and

d. Create and disseminate products that effectively transfer the information and ideas developed to relevant audiences in State and local judicial systems or provide technical assistance to facilitate the adaptation of effective programs and procedures in other State and local jurisdictions.

A project will be identified as a "Special Interest" project if it meets the four criteria set forth above and (1) it falls within the scope of the "special interest" program areas designated below, or (2) information coming to the attention of the Institute from the State courts, their affiliated organizations, the research literature, or other sources demonstrates that the project responds to another special need or interest of the State courts.

Concept papers and applications which address a "Special Interest" category will be accorded a preference

in the rating process. (See the selection criteria listed in sections VI.B., "Concept Paper Submission Requirements for New Projects," and VIII.B., "Application Review Procedures.")

2. Specific Categories

The Board has designated the areas set forth below as "Special Interest" program categories. The order of listing does not imply any ordering of priorities among the categories.

a. *Improving Public Confidence in the Courts.* This category includes research, demonstration, evaluation and education projects designed to improve the responsiveness of courts to public concerns regarding the fairness, accessibility, timeliness, and comprehensibility of the court process, and to test innovative methods for increasing the public's confidence in the State courts.

i. The Institute is particularly interested in supporting innovative projects that examine, develop, and test methods that trial or appellate courts may use to:

- Improve service to individual litigants and trial participants, including innovative methods for handling cases involving unrepresented litigants fairly and effectively;
- Test methods for more clearly and effectively communicating decisions and the reasons for them to litigants and the public;
- Address court-community problems resulting from the influx of legal and illegal immigrants, including projects to define the impact of immigration on State courts; design and assess procedures for use in custody, visitation, and other domestic relations cases when key family members or property are outside the United States; facilitate communication with Federal authorities when illegal aliens are involved in State court proceedings; and develop protocols to facilitate service of process, the enforcement of orders of judgment, and the disposition of criminal and juvenile cases when a non-U.S. citizen or corporation is involved; and

- Increase public understanding of jury decisions and the juror selection and service and service process; foster positive attitudes toward jury service; and enhance the attractiveness of juror service through, e.g., incentives to participate, modifications of terms of service, and/or juror orientation and education programs.

Institute funds may not be used to directly or indirectly support legal representation of individuals in specific cases. In addition, it is unlikely that the

Institute will continue to support development or testing of additional automated kiosks such as those being used by the courts in Arizona, California, Florida and New York.

ii. The Institute also is interested in supporting projects designed to improve the quality of justice including those testing methods for improving court operations based on the research examining "procedural" and "distributive" justice, and those assessing the impact of live television coverage of trials on court proceedings, public understanding, and fairness to litigants.

iii. The Institute is sponsoring a National Town Hall Meeting on Improving Public Confidence in the Courts that will be convened, via a videoconference, in 17 sites across the country on October 13-14, 1995. During the one-and-one-half day meeting, the downlink sites will tailor the Town Hall Meeting activities to the concerns of the local court constituencies. Information about the National Town Hall Meeting may be obtained from the National Center for State Courts (P.O. Box 8798, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8798, 804-253-2000) and the American Judicature Society (25 E. Washington Street, Suite 1600, Chicago, IL 60602, 312-558-6900).

The Institute is interested in supporting projects that implement the findings, recommendations, strategies, and action plans developed through the National Town Hall Meeting. In order to provide participants with sufficient time to plan such projects, a special funding cycle is establishing. Concept papers proposing projects to follow-up on the National Town Hall Meeting must be mailed by March 8, 1996. They will be reviewed by the Institute's Board of Directors on April 19-20, 1996. Applications based on these papers will be considered by the Board on July 26-27, 1996.

Previous SJI-supported projects that address these issues include: evaluation of an experimental community court in New York City; development of a manual for management of court interpretation services and materials for training and assisting court interpreters; development of interpreter certification tests in Russian and Hmong; development of touchscreen computer systems, videotapes, and written materials to assist pro se litigants; a demonstration of the use of volunteers to monitor guardianships; studies of effective and efficient methods for providing legal representation to indigent parties in criminal and family cases and the applicability of various dispute resolution procedures to

different cultural groups; guidelines for court-annexed day care systems; and development of a manual for implementing innovations in jury selection, use, and management; technical assistance and training to facilitate implementation of the Standards on Jury Management; development of a guide for making juries accessible to persons with disabilities.

b. *Education and Training for Judges and Other Key Court Personnel.* The Institute continues to be interested in supporting an array of projects to strengthen and broaden the availability of court education programs at the State, regional, and national levels. Accordingly, this category is divided into five subsections: (i) Development of Innovative Educational Programs; (ii) Curriculum Adaptation Projects; (iii) Judicial Education Technical Assistance; (iv) Conferences; and (v) Scholarships. All Institute-supported conferences and education and training seminars should be accessible to persons with disabilities in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

i. *Development of Innovative Educational Programs.* This category includes support for the development and testing of educational programs for judges or court personnel that address key substantive and administrative issues of concern to the nation's courts, or assist local courts or State court systems to develop or enhance their capacity to deliver quality continuing education. Programs may be designed for presentation at the local, State, regional, or national level. Ordinarily, court education programs should be based on some form of assessment of the needs of the target audience; include clearly stated learning objectives that delineate the new knowledge or skills that participants will acquire; incorporate adult education principles and varying teaching/learning methods; and result in the development of a curriculum as defined in section III.K.

The Institute is particularly interested in the development of education programs that:

- Offer or comprise a portion of a comprehensive course of study that includes seminars or materials for judges or court personnel at various stages of their careers;
- Include self-directed learning packages such as those using interactive computer-programs, videos, or other visual media supported by written materials or manuals, or distance-learning approaches that could help local courts in creating organization-wide continuing learning opportunities

and assist those who do not have ready access to classroom-centered programs;

- Are interdisciplinary or involve collaboration between the judicial and other branches of government or between courts within a metropolitan area or multi-State region;
- Develop judicial leadership abilities, improve teamwork within a court, and enhance service to the public by a court;
- Familiarize faculty with the effective use of technology in presenting information; or
- Incorporate the findings from SJI-supported demonstration, evaluation, or research projects.

ii. *Curriculum Adaptation Projects.*

(a) *Description of the Program.* The Board is reserving up to \$250,000 to provide support for adaptation and implementation of model curricula and/or model training programs previously developed with SJI support. The exact amount to be awarded for curriculum adaptation grants will depend on the number and quality of the applications submitted in this category and other categories of the Guideline.

The goal of the Curriculum Adaptation Program is to provide State and local courts with sufficient support to prepare and test a model curriculum, course module, national or regional conference program, or other model education program developed with SJI funds by any other State or national organization which has been modified to meet a State's or local jurisdiction's educational needs. Generally, it is anticipated that the adapted curriculum would become part of the grantee's ongoing education offerings, and that local instructors would receive the training needed to enable them to make future presentations of the curriculum. An illustrative list of the curricula that may be appropriate for the adaptation is contained in Appendix VI.

Only State or local courts may apply for Curriculum Adaptation funding. Grants to support adaptation of educational programs previously developed with SJI funds are limited to no more than \$20,000 each. As with other awards to State or local courts, cash or in-kind match must be provided equal to at least 50% of the grant amount requested.

(b) *Review Criteria.* Curriculum Adaptation grants will be awarded on the basis of criteria including: the goals and objectives of the proposed project; the need for outside funding to support the program; the likelihood of effective implementation; the appropriateness of the educational approach in achieving the project's educational objectives; the likelihood of effective implementation

and integration into the State's or local jurisdiction's ongoing educational programming; and expressions of interest by the judges and/or court personnel who would be directly involved in or affected by the project. In making implementation awards, the Institute will also consider factors such as the reasonableness of the amount requested, compliance with the statutory match requirements, diversity of subject matter, geographic diversity, the level of appropriations available in the current year, and the amount expected to be available in succeeding fiscal years.

(c) *Application Procedures.* In lieu of concept papers and formal applications, applicants for grants may submit, at any time, a detailed letter, and three photocopies. Although there is no prescribed form for the letter nor a minimum or maximum page limit, letters of application should include the following information to assure that each of the criteria for evaluating applications is addressed:

- *Project Description.* What are the project's goals and learning objectives? What is the title of the model curriculum to be tried? Who developed it? What program components would be implemented, and what benefits would be derived from this test? Why is this education program needed at the present time? Who will be responsible for adapting the model curriculum, and what types of modifications, if any, in length, format, and content are anticipated? Who will the participants be, how will they be recruited, and from where will they come (e.g., from across the State, from a single local jurisdiction, from a multi-State region)? How many participants are anticipated?

- *Need for Funding.* Why cannot State or local resources fully support the modification and presentation of the model curriculum? What is the potential for replicating or integrating the program in the future using State or local funds, once it has been successfully adapted and tested?

- *Likelihood of Implementation.* What is the proposed timeline for modifying and presenting the program? Who would serve as faculty and how were they selected? How will the presentation of the program be evaluated and by whom? (Ordinarily, an outside evaluation is not necessary; however, the results of any participant evaluation should be included in the final report.) What measures will be taken to facilitate subsequent presentations of the adapted program?

- *Expressions of Interest by Judges and/or Court Personnel.* Does the proposed program have the support of

the court system leadership, and of judges, court managers, and judicial education personnel who are expected to attend? (This may be demonstrated by attaching letters of support.)

- *Budget and Matching State Contribution.* Applicants should attach a copy of budget Form E (see Appendix IV) and a budget narrative (see Section VII.B) that describes the basis for the computation of all project-related costs and the source of the match offered.

- Local courts should attach a concurrence signed by the Chief Justice of the State or his or her designee. (See Form B, Appendix V.)

Letters of application may be submitted at any time. However, applicants should allow at least 90 days between the date of submission and the date of the proposed program to allow sufficient time for needed planning. The Board of Directors has delegated its authority to approve Curriculum Adaptation grants to its Judicial Education Committee. The committee anticipates acting upon applications within 45 days after receipt. Formal grant awards will be made only after committee approval and negotiation of the final terms of the grant.

(d) *Grantee Responsibilities.* A recipient of a Curriculum Adaptation grant must:

- (1) Comply with the same quarterly reporting requirements as other Institute grantees (see Section X.L., *infra*);

- (2) Include in each grant product a prominent acknowledgment that support was received from the Institute, along with the "SJI" logo, and a disclaimer paragraph based on the example provided in section X.Q. of the Guideline; and

- (3) Submit two copies of the manuals, handbooks, or conference packets developed under the grant at the conclusion of the grant period, along with a final report that includes evaluation results and explains how it intends to replicate the program in the future.

Applicants seeking other types of funding for developing and testing educational programs must comply with the requirements for concept papers and applications set forth in Sections VI and VII or the requirements for renewal applications set forth in Section IX.

iii. *Judicial Education Technical Assistance.* Unlike the preceding categories which support the development and delivery of court education programs, "Technical Assistance" refers to services which will support the acquisition of adult education and other expertise needed to prepare individual courses or multi-course curricula, or develop and

administer comprehensive ongoing judicial education programs for judges and court personnel. Projects in this category should focus on the needs of the States, and applicants should demonstrate their ability to work effectively with State judicial educators.

The Institute is currently funding the following judicial education technical assistance projects: the Judicial Education Reference Information and Technology Transfer Project (JERITT), which collects and disseminates information, and provides technical assistance on continuing education programs for judges and court personnel; the Judicial Education/Adult Education Project (JEAEP), which provides expert assistance on the application of adult and continuing education theory and practices to court education programs; the Leadership Institute in Judicial Education, which offers an annual training program and follow-up assistance to State judicial education leadership teams to help them develop improved approaches to court education; and NASJE NEWS, a newsletter of the National Association of State Judicial Educators.

iv. *Conferences.* This category includes support for regional or national conferences on topics of major concern to the State judiciary and court personnel. Applicants are encouraged to consider the use of videoconferencing and other technologies to increase participation and limit travel expenses in planning and presenting conferences. Applicants also are reminded that conference sites should be accessible to persons with disabilities in accordance with the Americans With Disabilities Act. In planning a conference, applicants should provide for a written, video, or other product that would widely disseminate the information, findings, and any recommendations resulting from the conference.

v. *Scholarships for Judges and Court Personnel.* The Institute is reserving up to \$250,000 to support a scholarship program for State court judges and court managers.

(a) *Program Description/Scholarship Amounts.* The purposes of the Institute scholarship program are to: enhance the knowledge, skills, and abilities of judges and court managers; enable State court judges and court managers to attend out-of-State educational programs sponsored by national and State providers that they could not otherwise attend because of limited State, local and personal budgets; and provide States, judicial educators, and the Institute with evaluative information on a range of judicial and court-related education programs.

Scholarships will be granted to individuals only for the purpose of attending an out-of-State educational program within the United States. The annual or midyear meeting of a State or national organization of which the applicant is a member does not qualify as an out-of-State educational program for scholarship purposes, even though it may include workshops or other training sessions.

A scholarship may cover the cost of tuition and travel up to a maximum total of \$1,500 per scholarship. (Transportation expenses include round-trip coach airfare or train fare.) Recipients who drive to the site of the program may receive \$.30/mile up to the amount of the advanced purchase round-trip airfare between their home and the program site. Funds to pay tuition and transportation expenses in excess of \$1,500, and other costs of attending the program such as lodging, meals, materials, and local transportation (including rental cars) at the site of the education program, must be obtained from other sources or be borne by the scholarship recipient.

Scholarship recipients are encouraged to check with their tax advisor to determine whether the scholarship constitutes taxable income under Federal and State law.

(b) *Eligibility Requirements.* Because of the limited amount of funds available, scholarships can be awarded only to full-time judges of State or local trial and appellate courts; to full-time professional, State or local court personnel with management responsibilities; and to supervisory and management probation personnel in judicial branch probation offices. Senior judges, part-time judges, quasi-judicial hearing officers, State administrative law judges, staff attorneys, law clerks, line staff, law enforcement officers, and other executive branch personnel will not be eligible to receive a scholarship.

(c) *Application Procedures.* Judges and court managers interested in receiving a scholarship must submit the Institute's Judicial Education Scholarship Application Form (Form S1, see Appendix III). Applications must be submitted by:

November 1, 1995, for programs beginning between January 12, and April 12, 1996;

February 1, 1996, for programs beginning between April 13 and July 12, 1996;

April 15, 1996, for programs beginning between July 13 and September 30, 1996; and

July 15, 1996, for programs beginning between October 1, and December 31, 1996.

No exceptions or extensions will be granted.

(d) *Concurrence Requirement.* All scholarship applicants must obtain the written concurrence of the Chief Justice of his or her State's Supreme Court (or the Chief Justice's designee) on the Institute's Judicial Education Scholarship Concurrence form (Form S2, see Appendix III). Court managers, other than elected clerks of court, also should submit a letter of support from their supervisor. The Concurrence form (Form S2) may accompany the application or be sent separately. However, the original signed Concurrence form must be received by the Institute within two weeks after the appropriate application mailing deadline (i.e. by November 15, 1995, or February 15, April 30, or July 30, 1996). No application will be reviewed if a signed Concurrence has not been received by the required date.

(e) *Review Procedures/Selection Criteria.* The Board of Directors has delegated the authority to approve or deny scholarships to its Judicial Education Committee. The Institute intends to notify each applicant whose scholarship has been approved within 60 days after the relevant application deadline. The Committee will reserve sufficient funds each quarter to assure the availability of scholarships throughout the year.

The factors that the Institute will consider in selecting scholarship recipients are:

- The applicant's need for training in the particular course subject and how the applicant would apply the information/skills gained
- The benefits to the applicant's court or the State's court system that would be derived from the applicant's participation in the specific educational program, including a description of current legal, procedural, administrative, or other problems affecting the State's courts, related to topics to be addressed at the educational program (in addition to submission of a signed Form S2);
- The absence of educational programs in the applicant's State addressing the particular topic;
- How the applicant will disseminate the knowledge gained (e.g., by developing/teaching a course or providing inservice training for judges or court personnel at the State or local level);
- The length of time that the applicant intends to serve as a judge or court manager, assuming reelection or reappointment, where applicable;

- The likelihood that the applicant would be able to attend the program without a scholarship;
- The unavailability of State or local funds to cover the costs of attending the program;
- The quality of the educational program to be attended as demonstrated by the sponsoring organization's experience in judicial education, evaluations by participants or other professionals in the field, or prior SJI support for this or other programs sponsored by the organization;
- Geographic balance;
- The balance of scholarships among types of applicants and courts;
- The balance of scholarships among educational programs; and
- The level of appropriations available to the Institute in the current year and the amount expected to be available in succeeding fiscal years.

(f) *Responsibilities of Scholarship Recipients.* In order to receive the funds authorized by a scholarship award, recipients must submit a Scholarship Payment Voucher (Form S3) together with a tuition statement from the program sponsor, and a transportation fare receipt (or statement of the driving mileage to and from the recipient's home to the site of the educational program). Recipients also must submit to the Institute a certificate of attendance at the program and an evaluation of the educational program they attended. A copy of the evaluation also must be sent to the Chief Justice of their State.

A State or a local jurisdiction may impose additional requirements on scholarship recipients that are consistent with SJI's criteria and requirements, e.g., a requirement to serve as faculty on the subject at a State- or locally- sponsored judicial education program.

c. *Dispute Resolution and the Courts.* This category includes education, research, evaluation, and demonstration projects addressing and expanding upon the findings and recommendations developed at the National Symposium on Court-Connected Dispute Resolution Research, conducted in Orlando in October 1993. The Institute is interested in projects that enhance the courts' ability to compare findings among research studies; address the nature and operation of ADR programs within the context of the court system as a whole; and compare dispute resolution processes to attorney settlement as well as trial. Among the topics of greatest interest are:

i. The structure of court-connected dispute resolution programs including such issues as the appropriate timing for

referrals to dispute resolution services and the effects of implementing such referrals at various stages during litigation; the effect of different referral methods including any differences in outcome between voluntary and mandatory referrals; cultural issues including the nature of conflict in various cultural communities, different culturally-based perceptions of the ADR process, and the effect of the differences on outcomes; and the assessment of approaches that provide rural courts and other underserved areas with adequate court-connected dispute resolution services.

ii. The selection, qualifications and training of court-connected neutrals including evaluation of the effectiveness of different selection procedures; assessment of the effectiveness of different models of dispute resolution training and of various methods and criteria for determining; when people should be eliminated from the training process; and evaluation of methods courts can use to maintain and improve neutrals' skills and remove ineffective neutrals from the pool.

iii. Innovative uses of court-connected dispute resolution for resolving complex and multi-party cases including land-use litigation.

Applicants should be aware that the Institute will not provide operational support for on-going ADR programs or start-up costs of new but non-innovative ADR programs. Courts also should be advised that it is preferable for the applicant to support operational costs of a new innovative program, with Institute funds targeted to support related technical assistance, training, and evaluation needs.

In previous funding cycles, grants have been awarded to support evaluation of the use of mediation in civil, domestic relations, juvenile, probate, medical malpractice, appellate, and minor criminal cases. SJI grants also have supported assessments of the impact of early neutral evaluation of motor vehicle cases, the impact of private judging on State courts, multi-door courthouse programs, arbitration of civil cases, screening and intake procedures for mediation, the relationship between mediator qualifications and outcomes, and trial and appellate level civil settlement programs. In addition, SJI has supported the creation of a national ADR resource center; the preparation of a consumer guide to choosing a mediator; the development of training programs for judges; the testing of Statewide and trial court based ADR monitoring/evaluation systems and implementation manuals; the promulgation of principles and

policies for court-connected neutrals; and technical assistance on implementation of multi-door courthouse programs, development of standards for court-annexed mediation programs, examination of the applicability of various dispute resolution procedures to different cultural groups, and creation of a national database of court-connected dispute resolution programs.

d. *Court Financing, Planning, and Management.* The Institute is interested in supporting activities that would enable courts to institutionalize long-range strategic planning processes, integrate and evaluate the long-term effects of complementary innovative management approaches, and test effective techniques for securing and managing the resources required to fully meet the responsibilities of the judicial branch. Among the types of projects that fall within this category are those to:

i. Institutionalize long-range planning approaches in individual States and local jurisdictions, including development of an ongoing internal capacity to conduct environmental scanning, trends analysis, and benchmarking;

ii. Evaluate the long-term effects of innovative management approaches, such as total quality management, designed to complement, enhance, or support use of a long-range strategic planning process. This includes the ongoing, internal application of internal and external user evaluations of the quality of court services, and use of judicial performance evaluations as a means for assuring continuous improvement of court performance. Also included is the assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of privatizing court activities;

iii. Develop, present and evaluate the training necessary to enable judges and court staff to participate productively in the implementation or institutionalization of innovative management approaches other than total quality management, including training to enhance the ability of courts to develop effective plans for coping with natural or other disasters; and

iv. Develop and implement the ideas, issues, and recommendations arising from the National Interbranch Conference on Funding the State Courts held in Minneapolis on September 28–October 1, 1995, including the development, implementation, and evaluation of mechanisms for linking assessments of effectiveness such as the Trial Court Performance Standards to fiscal planning and budgeting, including service efforts and accomplishments approaches (SEA), performance audits,

and performance budgeting, and the testing of innovative programs and procedures for providing clear and open communications between the judicial and legislative branches of government.

In order to provide participants with sufficient time to plan such projects, a special funding cycle is established. Concept papers proposing projects to follow-up on the National Interbranch Conference on Funding the State Courts must be mailed by March 8, 1996. They will be reviewed by the Institute's Board of Directors on April 19-20, 1996. Applications based on these papers will be considered by the Board on July 26-27, 1996.

v. Develop accurate comparative information on retirement and other benefits offered to judges in each State.

The Institute has supported futures commissions in seven States. Because the Board of Directors believes that a sufficient variety of commission models now exists, the Institute will not support the development or implementation of any State futures commissions in FY 1996.

The Institute also has supported planning, futures, and innovative management projects including: national and Statewide "future and the courts" conferences and training; development of curricula, guidebooks and a video on visioning, and a long-range planning guide for trial courts; the provision of technical assistance to courts conducting futures and long-range planning activities, including development of a court futures network on Internet; a test of the feasibility of implementing the Trial Court Performance Standards in four States; the development of Appellate Court Performance Standards; and the application of total quality management principles to court operations, as well as the development of a TQM guidebook and training materials for trial courts.

e. *Children and Families in Court.* This category includes education, evaluation, technical assistance, and research projects to identify and inform judges of innovative, appropriate, and effective approaches for handling cases involving children and families. The Institute is particularly interested in projects to:

i. Assist the courts in addressing the special needs of children in cases involving family violence including the development and testing of innovative protocols, procedures, educational programs, and other measures for improving the capacity of courts to:

- Adjudicate child custody cases in which family violence may be involved;
- Determine and address the service needs of children exposed to family

violence including the short- and long-term effects on children of exposure to family violence and the methods for mitigating those effects when issuing projection, custody, visitation, or other orders;

- Adjudicate and monitor child abuse and neglect litigation and reconcile the need to protect the child with the requirement to make reasonable efforts to maintain or reunite the family.

ii. Enhance the fairness and effectiveness of the process used to file, hear, and dispose of cases involving family violence, including projects to:

- Determine when it may be appropriate to refer a case involving family violence for mediation, and what procedures and safeguards should be employed;

- Assess the impact of family violence coordinating councils in improving the procedures and practices used by and the services available to courts in family violence cases, in order to identify techniques and procedures for improving their operation and effectiveness;

- Evaluate the effectiveness of the innovative programs, procedures, and strategies used by courts to improve their responsiveness to the needs of victims of family violence, and the fair and effective adjudication and disposition of cases involving family violence.

iii. Improve the effectiveness and operating efficiency of juvenile and family courts, including projects to:

- Develop information for judges and court staff on, and appropriate special procedures for determining release, protecting witnesses, adjudicating, and developing dispositions in cases involving gang members;

- Assess the role and effectiveness of courts with jurisdiction over juveniles and families in light of the upcoming 100th anniversary of the establishment of the first juvenile court, and identify the changes that may be needed as these courts enter the 21st century.

- Define the roles, enhance the training, and assure the effective use of guardians ad litem;

- Develop and test educational materials and curricula to assist judges in determining the best interest of a child when an adoption is contested;

- Improve the capacity of courts, regardless of structure, to expeditiously coordinate multiple cases involving members of the same family, and obtain and appropriately use social and psychological information gathered in one case involving a family member in a case involving another family member; and

- Improve the handling of the criminal and civil aspects of interstate and international parental child abductions.

In previous funding cycles, the Institute supported a national and a State symposium on courts, children, and the family; the development of protocols and a benchbook on the questioning of child witnesses; the preparation of educational materials on making reasonable efforts to preserve families, adjudicating allegations of child sexual abuse when custody is in dispute, child victimization, handling child abuse and neglect cases when parental substance abuse is involved, and on children as the silent victims of spousal abuse; and examinations of supervised visitation programs, effective court responses when domestic violence and custody disputes coincide, and foster care review procedures.

The Institute has also supported a national and several State conferences on family violence and the courts, as well as projects supporting the action plans developed at those conferences; preparation of descriptions of innovative court practices in family violence cases; evaluations of the use of court-ordered treatment for domestic violence offenders, alternatives to adjudication in child abuse and neglect cases, and the use of a court-enforced treatment program for batterers who are also substance abusers; the exploration of the policy issues related to the mediation of domestic relations cases involving allegations of family violence; the preparation of educational materials for judges on family violence issues; and the testing of videotapes and other educational programs for the parties in divorce actions and their children.

Finally, the Institute has supported a national symposium on enhancing coordination of cases involving the same family that are being heard in different courts; examinations to document the nature and extent of the coordination problem and demonstrations of innovative approaches for improving intra-court coordination; technical assistance to States considering establishment of a family court; development of a State-based training program for guardians ad litem; examinations of the authority of the juvenile court to enforce treatment orders and the role of juvenile court judges; and development of innovative approaches for coordinating services for children and youth.

f. *Application of Technology.* This category includes the testing of innovative applications of technology to improve the operation of court management systems and judicial

practices at both the trial and appellate court levels.

The Institute seeks to support local experiments with promising but untested applications of technology in the courts that include a structured evaluation of the impact of the technology in terms of costs, benefits, and staff workload, and an educational component to assure that the staff is appropriately informed regarding the purpose and use of the new technology. In this context, "untested" refers to novel applications of technology developed for the private sector and other fields that have not previously been applied to the courts.

The Institute is particularly interested in supporting efforts to determine what benefits and problems may occur as a result of courts entering the "information superhighway," including projects to establish standards for judicial electronic data interchange (EDI); and local, Statewide, and/or interstate demonstrations of the courts' use of EDI (i.e., the exchange of documents or data in a computerized format that enables courts to process or perform work electronically on the documents received) beyond simple image transfer (facsimile or computer-imaging). In addition, the Institute is interested in demonstrations and evaluation of the effective use of management information systems to monitor, assess, and predict evolving court needs; and innovative information system links between courts and criminal justice, social service, and treatment agencies; as well as evaluations of innovative technologies highlighted at the Fourth National Conference on Court Technology held in Nashville in October 1994.

Ordinarily, the Institute will not provide support for the purchase of equipment or software in order to implement a technology that has been thoroughly tested in other jurisdictions such as the establishment of videolinks between courts and jails, the use of optical imaging for recordkeeping, and the creation of an automated management information system. (See section XI.H.2.b. regarding other limits on the use of grant funds to purchase equipment and software.)

In previous funding cycles, grants have been awarded to support:

Demonstration and evaluation of communications technology, e.g., interactive computerized information systems to assist pro se litigants; the use of FAX technology by courts; a multi-user "system for judicial interchange" designed to link disparate automated information systems and share court information among judicial system

offices throughout a State without replacement of the various hardware and software environments which support individual courts; a computerized voice information system permitting parties to access by telephone information pertaining to their cases; an automated public information directory of courthouse facilities and services; an automated appellate court bulletin board; and a computer-integrated courtroom that provides full access to the judicial system for hearing-impaired jurors, witnesses, crime victims, litigants, attorneys, and judges.

Demonstration and evaluation of records technology, including: the development of a court management information display system; the integration of bar-coding technology with an existing automated case management system; an on-bench automated system for generating and processing court orders; an automated judicial education management system; testing of a document management system for small courts that uses imaging technology, and of automated telephone docketing for circuit-riding judges; and evaluation of the use of automated teller machines for paying jurors.

Court technology assistance services, e.g., circulation of a court technology bulletin designed to inform judges and court managers about the latest developments in court-related technologies; creation of a court technology laboratory to provide judges and court managers with the opportunity to test automated court-related systems; enhancement of a data base documenting automated systems currently in use in courts across the country; establishment of a technical information service to respond to specific inquiries concerning court-related technologies; development of court automation performance standards; and an assessment of programs that allow public access to electronically stored court information.

Grants also provided support for national court technology conferences; preparation of guidelines on privacy and public access to electronic court information and on court access to the information superhighway; the testing of a computerized citizen intake and referral service; development of an "analytical judicial desktop system" to assist judges in making sentencing decisions; implementation and evaluation of a Statewide automated integrated case docketing and record-keeping system; a prototype computerized benchbook using hypertext technology; and computer

simulation models to assist State courts in evaluating potential strategies for improving civil caseflow.

g. *Resolution of Current Evidentiary Issues.* This category includes educational programs and other projects to assist judges in deciding questions regarding:

- The admissibility of new forms of demonstrative evidence, including computer simulations;
- The admissibility of testimony based on recovered memory, and the admissibility of expert testimony about memory recovery;
- The appropriate use of expert testimony regarding the application of rape shield laws and other limits on the introduction of evidence or the cross-examination of witnesses;
- The appropriate use of expert testimony in criminal cases concerning the impact on culpability of the prior victimization of the defendant; and
- Other complex evidentiary issues.

In previous funding cycles, the Institute has supported the development of a computer-assisted training program on evidentiary problems for juvenile and family court judges; training on medical/legal and scientific evidence issues; regional seminars on evidentiary questions; production of a videotape and other materials on scientific evidence; presentation of a workshop on the use of DNA evidence in criminal proceedings; and preparation of a benchbook for judges on the credibility, competence, and courtroom treatment of child witnesses as well as protocols for questioning child victims of crime.

h. *Substance Abuse.* On December 2-5, 1995, the Institute is supporting a National Symposium on the Implementation and Operation of Drug Courts. The Symposium, which will be held in Portland, Oregon, is designed to facilitate interchange among judges and court personnel, criminal justice practitioners, and substance abuse treatment professionals regarding the legal, philosophical, and operational issues related to designing, implementing, operating, and evaluating court-enforced substance abuse treatment programs. (For further information regarding the Symposium, please contact Caroline Cooper, Justice Programs Office, The American University, 4400 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Brandywine-Suite 660, Washington, DC 20016-8159, 202-885-2875.)

The Institute is interested in supporting projects that address the issues, findings, and recommendations resulting from the Symposium, including, but not limited to:

- The development and testing of educational programs for judges and court personnel concerning the management of treatment-based drug court programs;

- The examination of the judicial ethics concerns that may be involved in operating a treatment-based drug court program;

- The preparation of measures, forms, and other tools for self-evaluation of a treatment-based drug court program;

- The development and testing of innovative information systems to facilitate the efficient sharing of information between the court and the agencies and services involved in the operation of an effective treatment-based drug court program; and

- The evaluation of the applicability of court-enforced treatment programs to substance abuse-related cases involving juveniles and cases requiring treatment services in addition to substance abuse treatment (e.g., spousal abuse, child abuse, or mental health cases).

Concept papers proposing projects that fall within this category must be mailed by March 8, 1996.

The Institute will not fund projects focused on developing additional assessment tools, establishing court-enforced treatment programs for adult substance abusers, or providing support for basic court or treatment services.

The Institute is currently supporting the presentation of a National Symposium on the Implementation and Operation of Court-Enforced Drug Treatment Programs. In previous funding cycles, the Institute has sponsored a National Conference on Substance Abuse and the Courts, and State efforts to implement the plans developed at that Conference. It has also supported projects to evaluate: court-enforced treatment programs initiated by the Dade County, Florida, Pulaski County, Arkansas, and New York City courts; special court-ordered programs for women offenders, and other court-based alcohol and drug assessment programs; replicate the Dade County program in non-urban sites; assess the impact of legislation and court decisions dealing with drug-affected infants, and strategies for coping with increasing caseload pressures; develop a benchbook and other educational materials to assist judges in child abuse and neglect cases involving parental substance abuse and in developing appropriate sentences for pregnant substance abusers; test the use of a dual diagnostic treatment model for domestic violence cases in which substance abuse was a factor; and present local and regional educational programs for

judges and other court personnel on substance abuse and its treatment.

The Institute and the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) also are supporting two technical assistance projects: one by the National Center for State Courts to assist courts in implementing the plans developed at the National Conference; and the other by the American University Court Technical Assistance Project to identify successful drug case management strategies, conduct seminars on drug case management, and develop a guidebook for implementing drug case processing initiatives. In addition, the Institute and the Department of Health and Human Services' Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT) have extended an inter-agency agreement to conduct regional training programs for State judges and legislators on substance abuse treatment.

i. *Eliminating Race and Ethnic Bias in the Courts.* The Institute supported a National Conference on Eliminating Race and Ethnic Bias in the Courts that was held in March, 1995 in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Court teams from every State and nearly every Territory attended the Conference and prepared an action plan to address the bias-related issues of greatest concern in their jurisdiction.

The Institute has previously announced a special funding cycle for projects to assist in implementing the State action plans developed at the Conference. Concept papers submitted for this special cycle must be mailed by October 6, 1995. Interested jurisdictions unable to meet this deadline may submit concept papers for projects to implement State action plans as part of the Institute's regular funding cycle. (The deadline for submitting these papers is November 28, 1995.)

In addition, the Institute is interested in national, regional, and State education, demonstration, technical assistance, research, and evaluation projects addressing the non-State specific issues discussed during the Conference.

In previous funding cycles, the Institute has supported several projects to prepare and test curricula and other materials for judges, court personnel, and judicial education faculty on diversity and related issues; and provide information regarding the American justice system for non-English speakers, and improve the quality of court interpreting.

j. *Responding Effectively to the Court-Related Needs of Mentally Disabled Persons.* This category includes education, demonstration, research, evaluation, and technical assistance

projects to assist courts in more effectively meeting the legal and service needs of persons with mental retardation or a mental illness in civil, criminal, family, juvenile, and probate proceedings. The Institute is particularly interested in the development of educational curricula and materials for judges and court personnel to improve their understanding of mental illness and mental retardation; the treatment and habilitation methods available to assist persons who have a mental illness or mental retardation inside and outside the courtroom, and how to access those services; the differing standards and burdens of proof applicable in civil commitment, guardianship, competency, and other proceedings in which the capacity to make knowing and voluntary decisions is at issue; and how indigent mentally ill or mentally retarded persons interface with public treatment, medical, social, and criminal justice agencies and draw on the services provided by those agencies.

In previous funding cycles, the Institute has supported national and State conferences on the court-related needs of persons who are elderly or disabled; the development and testing of effective programs for monitoring guardianships; and the preparation and testing of educational curricula on guardianship and court-related issues concerning mental retardation.

k. *Improving the Courts' Response to Gender-Related Crimes of Violence.* This category includes the development, testing, presentation, and dissemination of education programs for State, local, and Tribal court judges and court personnel on:

- The nature and incidence of stalking and other gender-related crimes of violence (e.g., rape, sexual assault, spousal abuse), and their impact on the victim and society;

- Sentencing decision-making in cases involving gender-related crimes of violence;

- The nature and impact of stereotypes applied to victims of gender-related crimes of violence;

- The use of self-defense and provocation defenses by alleged victims of gender-related violence accused of assaulting or killing their alleged abusers; and

- The effective use and enforcement of protective orders and the implications of mutual orders of protection.

Institute funds may not be used to provide operational support to programs offering direct services or compensation to victims of crimes.

In previous funding cycles, the Institute supported a national conference on family violence and the courts, and follow-up conferences and technical assistance in several States; development of curricula for judges on handling stranger and non-stranger rape and sexual assault cases and on family violence; evaluation of the effectiveness of court-ordered treatment for family violence offenders; a demonstration of ways to improve court processing of injunctions for protection and a study of ways to improve the effectiveness of civil protection orders for family violence victims; an examination of state-of-the-art court practices for handling family violence cases and of ways to improve access to rural courts for victims of family violence; and preparation of an analysis of the issues related to the use of expert testimony in criminal cases involving domestic violence.

1. *The Relationship Between State and Federal Courts.* This category includes education, research, demonstration, and evaluation projects designed to facilitate appropriate and effective communication, cooperation, and coordination between State and Federal courts. The Institute is particularly interested in innovative education, evaluation, demonstration, technical assistance, and research projects that:

i. Build upon the findings and recommendations made at the Institute-supported National Conference on the Management of Mass Tort Cases held in November, 1994. (A summary of the recommendations and findings from the conference was published in the Winter 1995 issue of *SJI NEWS*.)

ii. Develop and test curricula and other educational materials to:

- Illustrate effective methods being used at the trial court, State, and Circuit levels to coordinate cases and administrative activities; and
- Conduct regional conferences replicating the 1992 National Conference on State/Federal Judicial Relationships.

iii. Develop and test new approaches to:

- Handle capital habeas corpus cases fairly and efficiently;
- Coordinate related State and Federal criminal cases;
- Coordinate cases that may be brought under the Violence Against Women Act;
- Exchange information and coordinate calendars among State and Federal courts; and
- Share jury pools, alternative dispute resolution programs, and court services.

In previous funding cycles, the Institute has supported national and

regional conferences on State-Federal judicial relationships, a national conference on mass tort litigation, and the Chief Justices' Special Committee on Mass Tort Litigation. In addition, the Institute has supported projects developing judicial impact statement procedures for national legislation affecting State courts, and projects examining methods of State and Federal court cooperation; procedures for facilitating certification of questions of law; the impact on the State courts of diversity cases and cases brought under section 1983; the procedures used in Federal habeas corpus review of State court criminal cases; the factors that motivate litigants to select Federal or State courts; and the mechanisms for transferring cases between Federal and State courts, as well as the methods for effectively consolidating, deciding, and managing complex litigation. The Institute has also supported a test of assigning specialized law clerks to trial courts hearing capital cases in order to improve the fairness and efficiency of death penalty litigation at the trial level, a clearinghouse of information on State constitutional law decisions, educational programs for State judges on coordination of Federal bankruptcy cases with State litigation, and a seminar examining the implications of the "Federalization" of crime.

m. *Improving the Security of Courthouses, Judges, Jurors, and Witnesses.* This category includes education, demonstration, technical assistance, research, and evaluation projects to:

- Develop or refine policies, practices, procedures, and curricula designed to prevent incidents that endanger the lives of judges, court personnel, jurors, witnesses, and other members of the public in or near the courthouse;
- Prepare and test checklists, protocols, and other tools that courts can use to assess security;
- Assess innovative technology and procedures that can protect the safety of those who do business with and work in the courts without compromising the fairness of court proceedings or individual privacy; and
- Disseminate information on effective methods for determining and improving court security.

Grant funds will not be available solely to hire additional security personnel, purchase security equipment, or support the operational costs of a court security program.

In previous grant cycles, the Institute supported development of a curriculum to train court security personnel and a demonstration of the sharing of court

security personnel between rural counties.

C. *Single Jurisdiction Projects*

The Board will consider supporting a limited number of projects submitted by State or local courts that address the needs of only the applicant State or local jurisdiction. It has established two categories of Single Jurisdiction Projects:

1. Projects Addressing a Critical Need of a Single State or Local Jurisdiction

a. *Description of the Program.* The Board will set aside up to \$600,000 to support projects submitted by State or local courts that address the needs of only the applicant State or local jurisdiction. A project under this section may address any of the topics included in the Special Interest Categories or Statutory Program Areas, and may, but need not, seek to implement the findings and recommendations of Institute-supported research, evaluation, or demonstration programs. Concept papers for single jurisdiction projects may be submitted by a State court system, an appellate court, or a limited or general jurisdiction trial court. All awards under this category are subject to the matching requirements set forth in section X.B.1.

b. *Application Procedures.* Concept papers and applications requesting funds for projects under this section must meet the requirements of sections VI. ("Concept Paper Submission Requirements for New Projects") and VII. ("Application Requirements"), respectively, and must demonstrate that:

- i. The proposed project is essential to meeting a critical need of the jurisdiction; and
- ii. The need cannot be met solely with State and local resources within the foreseeable future.

2. Technical Assistance Grants

a. *Description of the Program.* The Board will set aside up to \$600,000 of Fiscal Year 1996 funds (in addition to any technical assistance funds remaining from Fiscal Year 1995) to support the provision of technical assistance to State and local courts. The exact amount to be awarded for these grants will depend on the number and quality of the applications submitted in this category and other categories of the Guideline. It is anticipated, however, that at least \$150,000 will be available each quarter to support Technical Assistance grants. The program is designed to provide State and local courts with sufficient support to obtain technical assistance to diagnose a problem, develop a response to that

problem, and initiate implementation of any needed changes.

Technical Assistance grants are limited to no more than \$30,000 each, and may cover the cost of obtaining the services of expert consultants, travel by a team of officials from one court to examine a practice, program, or facility in another jurisdiction that the applicant court is interested in replicating, or both. Technical assistance grant funds ordinarily may not be used to support production of a videotape. Normally, the technical assistance must be completed within 12 months after the start-date of the grant.

The Technical Assistance grant program described in this section should not be confused with the Judicial Education Technical Assistance projects described in Section II.B.2.b.iii.

b. *Eligibility for Technical Assistance Grants.* Only a State or local court may apply for a Technical Assistance grant. As with other awards to State or local courts, cash or in-kind match must be provided equal to at least 50% of the grant amount.

c. *Review Criteria.* Technical Assistance grants will be awarded on the basis of criteria including: Whether the assistance would address a critical need of the court; the soundness of the technical assistance approach to the problem; the qualifications of the consultant(s) to be hired, or the specific criteria that will be used to select the consultant(s); commitment on the part of the court to act on the consultant's recommendations; and the reasonableness of the proposed budget. The Institute also will consider factors such as the level and nature of the match that would be provided, diversity of subject matter, geographic diversity, and the level of appropriations available to the Institute in the current year and the amount expected to be available in succeeding fiscal years.

The Board has delegated its authority to approve these grants to its Technical Assistance Committee.

d. *Application Procedures.* In lieu of concept papers and formal applications, applicants for Technical Assistance grants may submit, at any time, an original and three copies of a detailed letter describing the proposed project and addressing the issues listed below. Letters from an individual trial or appellate court must be signed by the presiding judge or manager of that court. Letters from the State court system must be signed by the Chief Justice or State Court Administrator.

Although there is no prescribed form for the letter nor a minimum or maximum page limit, letters of application should include the

following information to assure that each of the criteria is addressed:

i. *Need for Funding.* What is the critical need facing the court? How will the proposed technical assistance help the court to meet this critical need? Why cannot State or local resources fully support the costs of the required consultant services?

ii. *Project Description.* What tasks would the consultant be expected to perform and how would they be accomplished? Who (organization or individual) would be hired to provide the assistance and how was this consultant selected? If a consultant has not yet been identified, what procedures and criteria would be used to select the consultant? (Applicants are expected to follow their jurisdiction's normal procedures for procuring consultant services.) What is the time frame for completion of the technical assistance? How would the court oversee the project and provide guidance to the consultant?

If the consultant has been identified, a letter from that individual or organization documenting interest in and availability for the project, as well as the consultant's ability to complete the assignment within the proposed time period and for the proposed cost, should accompany the applicant's letter. The consultant must agree to submit a detailed written report to the court and the Institute upon completion of the technical assistance.

iii. *Likelihood of Implementation.* What steps have been/will be taken to facilitate implementation of the consultant's recommendations upon completion of the technical assistance? For example, if the support or cooperation of specific court officials or committees, other agencies, funding bodies, organizations, or a court other than the applicant will be needed to adopt the changes recommended by the consultant and approved by the court, how will they be involved in the review of the recommendations and development of the implementation plan?

iv. *Budget and Matching State Contribution.* A completed Form E, "Preliminary Budget" (see Appendix IV to the Grant Guideline), must be included with the applicant's letter requesting technical assistance. Please note that the estimated cost of the technical assistance services should be broken down into the categories listed on the budget form rather than aggregated under the Consultant/Contractual category. The budget narrative should provide the basis for all project-related costs, including the basis for determining the estimated consultant costs (e.g., number of days

per task times the requested daily consultant rate). In addition, the budget should provide for submission of two copies of the consultant's final report to the Institute.

v. *Support for the Project from the State Supreme Court or its Designated Agency or Council.* Written concurrence on the need for the technical assistance must be submitted. This concurrence may be a copy of SJI Form B (see Appendix V.) signed by the Chief Justice of the State Supreme Court or the Chief Justice's designee, or a letter from the State Chief Justice or designee. The concurrence may be submitted with the applicant's letter or under separate cover prior to consideration of the application. The concurrence also must specify whether the State Supreme Court would receive, administer, and account for the grant funds, if awarded, or would designate the local court or a specified agency or council to receive the funds directly.

Letters of application may be submitted at any time; however, all of the letters received during a calendar quarter will be considered at one time. Applicants submitting letters between September 30, 1995, and January 12, 1996 will be notified of the Board's decision by March 29, 1996; those submitting letters between January 13 and March 15, 1996 will be notified by May 31, 1996. Notification of the Board's decisions concerning letters received between March 16 and June 16, 1996 will be made by August 31, 1996 and applicants submitting letters between June 17 and September 30, 1996, will be notified by November 29, 1996.

If the support or cooperation of agencies, funding bodies, organizations, or courts other than the applicant, would be needed in order for the consultant to perform the required tasks, written assurances of such support or cooperation must accompany the application letter. Support letters also may be submitted under separate cover; however, to ensure that there is sufficient time to bring them to the attention of the Board's Technical Assistance Committee, letters sent under separate cover must be received not less than two weeks prior to the Board meeting at which the technical assistance requests will be considered (i.e., by November 16, 1995; February 14, 1996; April 4, 1996; and July 11, 1996).

e. *Grantee Responsibilities.* Technical Assistance grant recipients are subject to the same quarterly reporting requirements as other Institute grantees. At the conclusion of the grant period, a Technical Assistance grant recipient

must complete a Technical Assistance Evaluation Form. The grantee also must submit to the Institute two copies of a final report that explains how it intends to act on the consultant's recommendations as well as two copies of the consultant's written report.

III. Definitions

The following definitions apply for the purposes of this guideline:

A. Institute

The State Justice Institute.

B. State Supreme Court

The highest appellate court in a State, or, for the purposes of the Institute program, a constitutionally or legislatively established judicial council that acts in place of that court. In States having more than one court with final appellate authority, State Supreme Court shall mean that court which also has administrative responsibility for the State's judicial system. State Supreme Court also includes the office of the court or council, if any, it designates to perform the functions described in this Guideline.

C. Designated Agency or Council

The office or judicial body which is authorized under State law or by delegation from the State Supreme Court to approve applications for funds and to receive, administer, and be accountable for those funds.

D. Grantee

The organization, entity, or individual to which an award of Institute funds is made. For a grant based on an application from a State or local court, grantee refers to the State Supreme Court or its designee.

E. Subgrantee

A State or local court which receives Institute funds through the State Supreme Court.

F. Match

The portion of project costs not borne by the Institute. Match includes both in-kind and cash contributions. Cash match is the direct outlay of funds by the grantee to support the project. In-kind match consists of contributions of time, services, space, supplies, etc., made to the project by the grantee or others (e.g., advisory board members) working directly on the project. Under normal circumstances, allowable match may be incurred only during the project period. When appropriate, and with the prior written permission of the Institute, match may be incurred from the date of the Institute Board of Directors'

approval of an award. Match does not include project-related income such as tuition or revenue from the sale of grant products, or the time of participants attending an education program. Amounts contributed as cash or in-kind match may not be recovered through the sale of grant products during or following the grant period.

G. Continuation Grant

A grant of no more than 24 months to permit completion of activities initiated under an existing Institute grant or enhancement of the programs or services produced or established during the prior grant period.

H. On-going Support Grant

A grant of up to 36 months to support a project that is national in scope and that provides the State courts with services, programs or products for which there is a continuing important need.

I. Package Grant

A single grant that supports two or more closely-related projects which logically should be viewed as a whole or would require substantial duplication of effort if administered separately. Closely-related projects may include those addressing interrelated topics, or those requiring the services of all or some of the same key staff persons, or the core elements of a multifaceted program. Each of the components of a package grant must operate within the same project period.

J. Human Subjects

Individuals who are participants in an experimental procedure or who are asked to provide information about themselves, their attitudes, feelings, opinions and/or experiences through an interview, questionnaire, or other data collection technique(s).

K. Curriculum

The materials needed to replicate an education or training program developed with grant funds including, but not limited to: the learning objectives; the presentation methods; a sample agenda or schedule; an outline of presentations and other instructors' notes; copies of overhead transparencies or other visual aids; exercises, case studies, hypotheticals, quizzes and other materials for involving the participants; background materials for participants; evaluation forms; and suggestions for replicating the program including possible faculty or the preferred qualifications or experience of those selected as faculty.

L. Products

Tangible materials resulting from funded projects including, but not limited to: curricula; monographs; reports; books; articles; manuals; handbooks; benchbooks; guidelines; videotapes; audiotapes; and computer software.

IV. Eligibility for Award

In awarding funds to accomplish these objectives and purposes, the Institute has been authorized by Congress to award grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts to State and local courts and their agencies (42 U.S.C. 10705(b)(1)(A)); national nonprofit organizations controlled by, operating in conjunction with, and serving the judicial branches of State governments (42 U.S.C. 10705(b)(1)(B)); and national nonprofit organizations for the education and training of judges and support personnel of the judicial branch of State governments (42 U.S.C. 10705(b)(1)(C)).

An applicant will be considered a national education and training applicant under section 10705(b)(1)(C) if: (1) The principal purpose or activity of the applicant is to provide education and training to State and local judges and court personnel; and (2) the applicant demonstrates a record of substantial experience in the field of judicial education and training.

The Institute also is authorized to make awards to other nonprofit organizations with expertise in judicial administration, institutions of higher education, individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, and private agencies with expertise in judicial administration, provided that the objectives of the relevant program area(s) can be served better. In making this judgment, the Institute will consider the likely replicability of the projects' methodology and results in other jurisdictions. For-profit organizations are also eligible for grants and cooperative agreements; however, they must waive their fees.

The Institute may also make awards to Federal, State or local agencies and institutions other than courts for services that cannot be adequately provided through nongovernmental arrangements.

In addition, the Institute may enter into inter-agency agreements with other public or private funders to support projects consistent with the purpose of the State Justice Institute Act.

Finally, the Institute may award grants to non-profit organizations, Tribal courts, or Tribal governments to support the development, testing, presentation,

or dissemination of educational programs and materials for Tribal court judges and Tribal court personnel on the issues listed in section 40412 of the Violence Against Women Act (Title IV, Violent Crime and Law Enforcement Act, P.L. 103-322). (See section II.A.20.)

Each application for funding from a State or local court must be approved, consistent with State law, by the State's Supreme Court or its designated agency or council. The latter shall receive all Institute funds awarded to such courts and be responsible for assuring proper administration of Institute funds, in accordance with section XI.B.2. of this Guideline. A list of persons to contact in each State regarding approval of applications from State and local courts and administration of Institute grants to those courts is contained in Appendix I.

V. Types of Projects and Grants; Size of Awards

A. Types of Projects

Except as expressly provided in section II.B.2.b. and II.C. above, the Institute has placed no limitation on the overall number of awards or the number of awards in each special interest category. The general types of projects are:

1. Education and training;
2. Research and evaluation;
3. Demonstration; and
4. Technical assistance.

B. Types of Grants

The Institute has established the following types of grants:

1. New grants (See sections VI. and VII.).
2. Continuation grants (See sections III.H. and IX.A.).
3. On-going Support grants (See sections III.I. and IX.B.).
4. Package grants (See sections III.J., VI.A.2.b., VI.A.3.b., and VII.).
5. Technical Assistance grants (See section II.C.2.).
6. Curriculum Adaptation grants (See section II.B.2.b.i.i.).
7. Scholarships (See section II.B.2.b.v.).

C. Maximum Size of Awards

1. Except as specified below, concept papers and applications for new projects other than national conferences, and applications for continuation grants may request funding in amounts up to \$300,000, although new and continuation awards in excess of \$200,000 are likely to be rare and to be made, if at all, only for highly promising proposals that will have a significant impact nationally.

2. Applications for on-going support grants may request funding in amounts

up to \$600,000, except as provided in paragraph V.C.3. At the discretion of the Board, the funds for on-going support grants may be awarded either entirely from the Institute's appropriations for the fiscal year of the award or from the Institute's appropriations for successive fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year of the award. When funds to support the full amount of an on-going support grant are not awarded from the appropriations for the fiscal year of award, funds to support any subsequent years of the grant will be made available upon (1) the satisfactory performance of the project as reflected in the quarterly Progress Reports required to be filed and grant monitoring, and (2) the availability of appropriations for that fiscal year.

3. An application for a package grant may request funding in an amount up to a total of \$750,000 per year.

4. Applications for technical assistance grants may request funding in amounts up to \$30,000.

5. Applications for curriculum adaptation grants may request funding in amounts up to \$20,000.

6. Applications for scholarships may request funding in amounts up to \$1,500.

D. Length of Grant Periods

1. Grant periods for all new and continuation projects ordinarily will not exceed 24 months.

2. Grant periods for on-going support grants ordinarily will not exceed 36 months.

3. Grant periods for technical assistance grants and curriculum adaptation grants ordinarily will not exceed 12 months.

VI. Concept Paper Submission Requirements for New Projects

Concept papers are an extremely important part of the application process because they enable the Institute to learn the program areas of primary interest to the courts and to explore innovative ideas, without imposing heavy burdens on prospective applicants. The use of concept papers also permits the Institute to better project the nature and amount of grant awards. This requirement and the submission deadlines for concept papers and applications may be waived by the Executive Director for good cause (e.g., the proposed project could provide a significant benefit to the State courts or the opportunity to conduct the project did not arise until after the deadline).

A. Format and Content

All concept papers must include a cover sheet, a program narrative, and a

preliminary budget, regardless of whether the applicant is proposing a single project or a "package" of projects, or whether the applicant is requesting accelerated award of a grant of less than \$40,000.

1. The Cover Sheet

The cover sheet for all concept papers must contain:

- a. A title describing the proposed project;
- b. The name and address of the court, organization or individual submitting the paper;
- c. The name, title, address (if different from that in b.), and telephone number of a contact person(s) who can provide further information about the paper;
- d. The letter of the Special Interest Category (see section II.B.2.) or the number of the statutory Program Area (see section II.A.) that the proposed project addresses most directly; and
- e. The estimated length of the proposed project.

Applicants requesting the Board to waive the application requirement and approve a grant of less than \$40,000 based on the concept paper, should add APPLICATION WAIVER REQUESTED to the information on the cover page.

2. The Program Narrative

a. *Concept Papers Proposing a Single Project.* The program narrative of a concept paper describing a single project should be no longer than necessary, but *in no case should exceed eight (8) double-spaced pages on 8½ by 11 inch paper. Margins must not be less than 1 inch and type no smaller than 12 point and 12 cpi must be used.* The narrative should describe:

i. *Why is this project needed and how will it benefit State courts?* If the project is to be conducted in a specific location(s), applicants should discuss the particular needs of the project site(s) to be addressed by the project, why those needs are not being met through the use of existing materials, programs, procedures, services or other resources, and the benefits that would be realized by the proposed site(s).

If the project is not site-specific, applicants should discuss the problems that the proposed project will address, why existing materials, programs, procedures, services or other resources do not adequately resolve those problems, and the benefits that would be realized from the project by State courts generally.

ii. *What will be done if a grant is awarded?* Applicants should include a summary description of the project to be conducted and the approach to be taken, including the anticipated length of the

grant period. Applicants requesting a waiver of the application requirement for a grant of less than \$40,000 should explain the proposed methods for conducting the project as fully as space allows, and include a detailed task schedule as an attachment to the concept paper.

iii. *How will the effects and quality of the project be determined?* Applicants should include a summary description of how the project will be evaluated, including the evaluation criteria.

iv. *How will others find out about the project and be able to use the results?* Applicants should describe the products that will result, the degree to which they will be applicable to courts across the nation, and the manner in which the products and results of the project will be disseminated.

b. *Concept Papers Requesting a Package Grant Covering More Than One Project.* The program narrative of a concept paper requesting a package grant (see definition in section III.I.) should be no longer than necessary, but in no case should exceed 15 double-spaced pages on 8½ by 11 inch paper. Margins must not be less than 1 inch, and type no smaller than 12-point and 12 cpi must be used.

In addition to addressing the issues listed in paragraph VI.A.2.a., the program narrative of a package grant concept paper must describe briefly each component project, as well as how its inclusion enhances the entire package; and explain:

- i. How are the proposed projects related?
- ii. How would their operation and administration be enhanced if they were funded as a package rather than as individual projects? and
- iii. What disadvantages, if any, would accrue by considering or funding them separately?

3. The Budget

a. *Concept Papers Proposing a Single Project.* A preliminary budget must be attached to the narrative that includes the estimates and information specified on Form E included in Appendix IV of this Guideline.

b. *Concept Papers Requesting a Package Grant Covering More Than One Project.* A separate preliminary budget for each component project of the package, as well as a combined budget that reflects the costs of the entire package, must be attached to the narrative. Each project budget must be identified by the title that corresponds to the narrative description of the project in the program narrative and a letter of the alphabet (i.e. A, B, C). Each of these budgets must include the

estimates and information specified on Form E included in Appendix IV of this Guideline.

c. *Concept Papers Requesting Accelerated Award of a Grant of Less than \$40,000.* Applicants requesting a waiver of the application requirement and approval of a grant based on a concept paper under section VI.C., must attach to Form E (see Appendix IV) a budget narrative explaining the basis for each of the items listed, and whether the costs would be paid from grant funds or through a matching contribution or other sources. The budget narrative is not counted against the eight-page limit for the program narrative.

4. Letters of Cooperation or Support

The Institute encourages concept paper applicants to attach letters of cooperation and support from the courts and related agencies that will be involved in or directly affected by the proposed project. Letters of support also may be sent under separate cover. However, in order to ensure that there is sufficient time to bring them to the Board's attention, support letters sent under separate cover must be received no later than January 12, 1996.

5. Page Limits

a. The Institute will not accept concept papers with program narratives exceeding the limits set in sections VI.A.2.a. and b. The page limit does not include the cover page, budget form, the budget narrative if required under section VI.A.3.c., the task schedule if required under section VI.A.2.a.ii., and any letters of cooperation or endorsements. Additional material should not be attached unless it is essential to impart a clear understanding of the project.

b. Applicants submitting more than one concept paper may include material that would be identical in each concept paper in a cover letter, and incorporate that material by reference in each paper. The incorporated material will be counted against the eight-page limit for each paper. A copy of the cover letter should be attached to each copy of each concept paper.

6. Sample Concept Papers

Sample concept papers from previous funding cycles are available from the Institute upon request.

B. Selection Criteria

1. All concept papers will be evaluated by the staff on the basis of the following criteria:

- a. The demonstration of need for the project;

b. The soundness and innovativeness of the approach described;

c. The benefits to be derived from the project;

d. The reasonableness of the proposed budget;

e. The proposed project's relationship to one of the "Special Interest" categories set forth in section II.B; and

f. The degree to which the findings, procedures, training, technology, or other results of the project can be transferred to other jurisdictions.

2. "Single jurisdiction" concept papers submitted pursuant to section II.C. will be rated on the proposed project's relation to one of the "Special Interest" categories set forth in section II.B., and on the special requirements listed in section II.C.1.

3. In determining which concept papers will be selected for development into full applications, the Institute will also consider the availability of financial assistance from other sources for the project; the amount and nature (cash or in-kind) of the applicant's anticipated match; whether the applicant is a State court, a national court support or education organization, a non-court unit of government, or another type of entity eligible to receive grants under the Institute's enabling legislation (see 42 U.S.C. 10705(b) (as amended) and section IV above); the extent to which the proposed project would also benefit the Federal courts or help the State courts enforce Federal constitutional and legislative requirements, and the level of appropriations available to the Institute in the current year and the amount expected to be available in succeeding fiscal years.

C. Review Process

Concept papers will be reviewed competitively by the Board of Directors. Institute staff will prepare a narrative summary and a rating sheet assigning points for each relevant selection criterion for those concept papers which fall within the scope of the Institute's funding program and merit serious consideration by the Board. Staff will also prepare a list of those papers that, in the judgment of the Executive Director, propose projects that lie outside the scope of the Institute's funding program or are not likely to merit serious consideration by the Board. The narrative summaries, rating sheets, and list of non-reviewed papers will be presented to the Board for their review. Committees of the Board will review concept paper summaries within assigned program areas and prepare recommendations for the full Board. The full Board of Directors will then

decide which concept paper applicants should be invited to submit formal applications for funding.

The decision to invite an application is solely that of the Board of Directors. With regard to concept papers requesting a package grant, the Board retains discretion to invite an application including all, none, or selected portions of the package for possible funding.

The Board may waive the application requirement and approve a grant based on a concept paper for a project requiring less than \$40,000, when the need for and benefits of the project are clear, and the methodology and budget require little additional explanation. Because the Institute's experience has been that projects to conduct empirical research or program evaluation ordinarily require a more thorough explanation of the methodology to be used than can be provided within the space limitations of a concept paper, the Board is unlikely to waive the application requirement for such projects.

D. Submission Requirements

An original and three copies of all concept papers submitted for consideration in Fiscal Year 1996 must be sent by first class or overnight mail or by courier no later than November 28, 1995, except for concept papers proposing to implement an action plan developed during the National Conference on Eliminating Race and Ethnic Bias in the Courts which must be sent by October 6, 1995 (see section II.B.2.i.) and concept papers proposing projects that follow up on the National Town Hall Meeting Video Conference, the National Interbranch Conference on Funding the State Courts, or the National Symposium on the Implementation and Operation of Drug Courts which must be sent by March 8, 1996 (see sections II.B.2.a., d., and h.). A postmark or courier receipt will constitute evidence of the submission date. All envelopes containing concept papers should be marked CONCEPT PAPER and should be sent to: State Justice Institute, 1650 King Street, Suite 600, Alexandria, Virginia 22314.

It is preferable for letters of cooperation and support to be appended to the concept paper when it is submitted. If support letters are sent under separate cover, they must be received no later than January 12, 1996 in order to ensure that there is sufficient time to bring them to the Board's attention.

The Institute will send written notice to all persons submitting concept papers of the Board's decisions regarding their

papers and of the key issues and questions that arose during the review process. A decision by the Board not to invite an application may not be appealed, but does not prohibit resubmission of the concept paper or a revision thereof in a subsequent round of funding. The Institute will also notify the designated State contact listed in the Appendix when the Board invites applications that are based on concept papers which are submitted by courts within their State or which specify a participating site within their State.

Receipt of each concept paper will be acknowledged in writing. Extensions of the deadline for submission of concept papers will not be granted.

VII. Application Requirements For New Projects

Except as specified in section VI., a formal application for a new project is to be submitted only upon invitation of the Board following review of a concept paper. An application for Institute funding support must include an application form; budget forms (with appropriate documentation); a project abstract and program narrative; a disclosure of lobbying form, when applicable; and certain certifications and assurances. These documents are described below.

A. Forms

1. Application Form (FORM A)

The application form requests basic information regarding the proposed project, the applicant, and the total amount of funding support requested from the Institute. It also requires the signature of an individual authorized to certify on behalf of the applicant that the information contained in the application is true and complete, that submission of the application has been authorized by the applicant, and that if funding for the proposed project is approved, the applicant will comply with the requirements and conditions of the award, including the assurances set forth in Form D.

2. Certificate of State Approval (FORM B)

An application from a State or local court must include a copy of FORM B signed by the State's Chief Justice or Chief Judge, the director of the designated agency, or the head of the designated council. The signature denotes that the proposed project has been approved by the State's highest court or the agency or council it has designated. It denotes further that if funding for the project is approved by the Institute, the court or the specified

designee will receive, administer, and be accountable for the awarded funds.

3. Budget Forms (FORM C or C1)

Applicants may submit the proposed project budget either in the tabular format of FORM C or in the spreadsheet format of FORM C1. Applicants requesting more than \$100,000 are strongly encouraged to use the spreadsheet format. If the proposed project period is for more than a year, a separate form should be submitted for each year or portion of a year for which grant support is requested.

In addition to FORM C or C1, applicants must provide a detailed budget narrative providing an explanation of the basis for the estimates in each budget category. (See section VII.D.)

Applications for a package grant must include a separate budget and budget narrative for each project included in the proposed package, as well as a combined budget that reflects the total costs of the entire package.

If funds from other sources are required to conduct the project, either as match or to support other aspects of the project, the source, current status of the request, and anticipated decision date must be provided.

4. Assurances (FORM D)

This form lists the statutory, regulatory, and policy requirements and conditions with which recipients of Institute funds must comply.

5. Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

This form requires applicants other than units of State or local government to disclose whether they, or another entity that is part of the same organization as the applicant, have advocated a position before Congress on any issue, and to identify the specific subjects of their lobbying efforts. (See section X.D.)

B. Project Abstract

The abstract should highlight the purposes, goals, methods and anticipated benefits of the proposed project. It should not exceed one single-spaced page on 8½ by 11 inch paper.

C. Program Narrative

The program narrative for an application proposing a single project should not exceed 25 double-spaced pages on 8½ by 11 inch paper. The program narrative for an application requesting a package grant for more than one project should not exceed 40 double-spaced pages on 8½ by 11 inch paper. Margins must not be less than 1 inch, and type no smaller than 12-point

and 12 cpi must be used. The page limit does not include the forms, the abstract, the budget narrative, and any appendices containing resumes and letters of cooperation or endorsement. Additional background material should be attached only if it is essential to impart a clear understanding of the proposed project. Numerous and lengthy appendices are strongly discouraged.

The program narrative should address the following topics:

1. Project Objectives

The applicant should include a clear, concise statement of what the proposed project is intended to accomplish. In stating the objectives of the project, applicants should focus on the overall programmatic objective (e.g., to enhance understanding and skills regarding a specific subject, or to determine how a certain procedure affects the court and litigants) rather than on operational objectives (e.g., provide training for 32 judges and court managers, or review data from 300 cases).

2. Program Areas to be Covered

The applicant should include a statement which lists the program areas set forth in the State Justice Institute Act, and, if appropriate, the Institute's Special Interest program categories that are addressed by the proposed projects.

3. Need for the Project

If the project is to be conducted in a specific location(s), the applicant should include a discussion of the particular needs of the project site(s) to be addressed by the project and why those needs are not being met through the use of existing materials, programs, procedures, services or other resources.

If the project is not site specific, the applicant should include a discussion of the problems that the proposed project will address, and why existing materials, programs, procedures, services or other resources do not adequately resolve those problems. The discussion should include specific references to the relevant literature and to the experience in the field.

An application requesting a package grant to support more than one project also must describe how the proposed projects in the package are related; how their operation and administration would be enhanced if they were funded as a package rather than as individual projects; and what disadvantages, if any, would accrue by considering or funding them separately.

4. Tasks, Methods and Evaluation

a. *Tasks and Methods.* The applicant should delineate the tasks to be performed in achieving the project objectives and the methods to be used for accomplishing each task. For example:

i. *For research and evaluation projects,* the applicant should include the data sources, data collection strategies, variables to be examined, and analytic procedures to be used for conducting the research or evaluation and ensuring the validity and general applicability of the results. For projects involving human subjects, the discussion of methods should address the procedures for obtaining respondents' informed consent, ensuring the respondents' privacy and freedom from risk or harm, and the protection of others who are not the subjects of research but would be affected by the research. If the potential exists for risk or harm to the human subjects, a discussion should be included that explains the value of the proposed research and the methods to be used to minimize or eliminate such risk.

ii. *For education and training projects,* the applicant should include the adult education techniques to be used in designing and presenting the program, including the teaching/learning objectives of the educational design, the teaching methods to be used, and the opportunities for structured interaction among the participants; how faculty will be recruited, selected, and trained; the proposed number and length of the conferences, courses, seminars or workshops to be conducted; the materials to be provided and how they will be developed; and the cost to participants.

iii. *For demonstration projects,* the applicant should include the demonstration sites and the reasons they were selected, or if the sites have not been chosen, how they will be identified and their cooperation obtained; and how the program or procedures will be implemented and monitored.

iv. *For technical assistance projects,* the applicant should explain the types of assistance that will be provided; the particular issues and problems for which assistance will be provided; how requests will be obtained and the type of assistance determined; how suitable providers will be selected and briefed; how reports will be reviewed; and the cost to recipients.

An application requesting a package grant for more than one project must describe separately the tasks associated

with each project in the proposed package. Each project must be identified by a separate letter of the alphabet (i.e., A, B, C) and a descriptive title.

b. *Evaluation.* Every project design must include an evaluation plan to determine whether the project met its objectives. The evaluation should be designed to provide an objective and independent assessment of the effectiveness or usefulness of the training or services provided; the impact of the procedures, technology or services tested; or the validity and applicability of the research conducted. In addition, where appropriate, the evaluation process should be designed to provide on-going or periodic feedback on the effectiveness or utility of particular programs, educational offerings, or achievements which can then be further refined as a result of the evaluation process. The plan should present the qualifications of the evaluator(s); describe the criteria, related to the project's programmatic objectives, that will be used to evaluate the project's effectiveness; explain how the evaluation will be conducted, including the specific data collection and analysis techniques to be used; discuss why this approach is appropriate; and present a schedule for completion of the evaluation within the proposed project period.

The evaluation plan should be appropriate to the type of project proposed. For example:

i. An evaluation approach suited to may *research* projects is a review by an advisory panel of the research methodology, data collection instruments, preliminary analyses, and products as they are drafted. The panel should be comprised of independent researchers and practitioners representing the perspectives affected by the proposed project.

ii. The most valuable approaches to evaluating *educational or training* programs will serve to reinforce the participants' learning experience while providing useful feedback on the impact of the program and possible areas for improvement. One appropriate evaluation approach is to assess the acquisition of new knowledge, skills, attitudes or understanding through participant feedback on the seminar or training event. Such feedback might include a self-assessment on what was learned along with the participant's response to the quality and effectiveness of faculty presentations, the format of sessions, the value or usefulness of the material presented and other relevant factors. Another appropriate approach would be to use an independent observer who might request verbal as

well as written responses from participants in the program. When an education project involves the development of curricular materials an advisory panel of relevant experts can be coupled with a test of the curriculum to obtain the reactions of participants and faculty as indicated above.

iii. The evaluation plan for a *demonstration* project should encompass an assessment of program effectiveness (e.g., how well did it work?); user satisfaction, if appropriate; the cost-effectiveness of the program; a process analysis of the program (e.g., was the program implemented as designed? did it provide the services intended to the targeted population?); the impact of the program (e.g., what effect did the program have on the court? what benefits resulted from the program?); and the replicability of the program or components of the program.

iv. For *technical assistance* projects, applicants should explain how the quality, timeliness, and impact of the assistance provided will be determined, and should develop a mechanism for feedback from both the users and providers of the technical assistance.

v. Evaluation plans involving *human subjects* should include a discussion of the procedures for obtaining respondents' informed consent, ensuring the respondents' privacy and freedom from risk or harm, and the protection of others who are not the subjects of evaluation but would be affected by it. Other than the provision of confidentiality to respondents, human subjects protection issues ordinarily are not applicable to participants evaluating an education program.

vi. The evaluation plan in a package grant application should address the issues listed above for the particular types of projects included in the package, assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the individual components as well as the benefits and limitations of the projects as a package.

5. Project Management

The applicant should present a detailed management plan including the starting and completion date for each task; the time commitments to the project of key staff and their responsibilities regarding each project task; and the procedures that will be used to ensure that all tasks are performed on time, within budget, and at the highest level of quality. In preparing the project time line, Gantt Chart, or schedule, applicants should make certain that all project activities, including publication or reproduction of project products and their initial

dissemination will occur within the proposed project period. The management plan must also provide for the submission of Quarterly Progress and Financial Reports within 30 days after the close of each calendar quarter (i.e., no later than January 30, April 30, July 30, and October 30).

Package grant applications must include a management plan for each project included in the package with the same project title and alphabetic identifier describing the project in the program narrative, as well as a plan embracing the package as a whole.

6. Products

The application should contain a description of the products to be developed by the project (e.g., training curricula and materials, videotapes, articles, manuals, or handbooks), including when they will be submitted to the Institute.

a. Dissemination Plan. The application must explain how and to whom the products will be disseminated; describe how they will benefit the State courts including how they can be used by judges and court personnel; identify development, production, and dissemination costs covered by the project budget; and present the basis on which products and services developed or provided under the grant will be offered to the courts community and the public at large (i.e. whether products will be distributed at no cost to recipients, or if costs are involved, the reason for charging recipients and the estimated price of the product). (See section X.V.) Ordinarily, applicants should schedule all product preparation and distribution activities within the project period. Applicants also must submit a diskette containing a one-page abstract summarizing the products resulting from a project in Word, WordPerfect or ASCII. The abstract should include the grant number and the name of a contact person together with that individual's address, telephone number, and e-mail address (if applicable).

Package grant applications must discuss these issues with regard to the products that would result from each of the projects included in the package.

A copy of each product must be sent to the library established in each State to collect the materials developed with Institute support. (A list of these libraries is contained in Appendix II.) To facilitate their use, all videotaped products should be distributed in VHS format.

Twenty copies of all project products, must be submitted to the Institute. A mastercopy of each videotape, in

addition to 20 copies of each videotape product, must also be provided to the Institute.

b. Types of Products. The type of products to be prepared depend on the nature of the project. For example, in most instances, the products of a research, evaluation, or demonstration project should include an article summarizing the project findings that is publishable in a journal serving the courts community nationally, an executive summary that will be disseminated to the project's primary audience, or both. Applicants proposing to conduct empirical research or evaluation projects with national import should describe how they will make their data available for secondary analysis after the grant period. (See section X.W.)

The curricula and other products developed by education and training projects should be designed for use outside the classroom so that they may be used again by original participants and others in the course of their duties.

c. Institute Review. Applicants must provide for submitting a final draft of written grant product(s) to the Institute for review and approval at least 30 days before the product(s) are submitted for publication or reproduction. For products in a videotape or CD-ROM format, applicants must provide for incremental Institute review of the product at the treatment, script, rough-cut, and final stages of development, or their equivalents. No grant funds may be obligated for publication or reproduction of a final grant product without the written approval of the Institute.

d. Acknowledgment, Disclaimer, and Logo. Applicants must also provide for including in all project products a prominent acknowledgment that support was received from the Institute and a disclaimer paragraph based on the example provided in section X.Q. of the Guideline. The "SJI" logo must appear on the front cover of a written product, or in the opening frames of a video product, unless the Institute approves another placement.

7. Applicant Status

An applicant that is not a State or local court and has not received a grant from the Institute within the past two years should include a statement indicating whether it is either a national nonprofit organization controlled by, operating in conjunction with, and serving the judicial branches of State governments; or a national nonprofit organization for the education and training of State court judges and support personnel. See section IV. If the

applicant is a nonjudicial unit of Federal, State, or local government, it must explain whether the proposed services could be adequately provided by nongovernmental entities.

8. Staff Capability

The applicant should include a summary of the training and experience of the key staff members and consultants that qualify them for conducting and managing the proposed project. Resumes of identified staff should be attached to the application. If one or more key staff members and consultants are not known at the time of the application, a description of the criteria that will be used to select persons for these positions should be included.

9. Organizational Capacity

Applicants that have not received a grant from the Institute within the past two years should include a statement describing the capacity of the applicant to administer grant funds including the financial systems used to monitor project expenditures (and income, if any), and a summary of the applicant's past experience in administering grants, as well as any resources or capabilities that the applicant has that will particularly assist in the successful completion of the project.

If the applicant is a non-profit organization (other than a university), it must also provide documentation of its 501(c) tax exempt status as determined by the Internal Revenue Service and a copy of a current certified audit report. For purposes of this requirement, "current" means no earlier than two years prior to the current calendar year. If a current audit report is not available, the Institute will require the organization to complete a financial capability questionnaire which must be signed by a Certified Public Accountant. Other applicants may be required to provide a current audit report, a financial capability questionnaire, or both, if specifically requested to do so by the Institute.

Unless requested otherwise, an applicant that has received a grant from the Institute within the past two years should describe only the changes in its organizational capacity, tax status, or financial capability that may affect its capacity to administer a grant.

10. Statement of Lobbying Activities

Non-governmental applicants must submit the Institute's Disclosure of Lobbying Activities Form that requires them to state whether they, or another entity that is a part of the same organization as the applicant, have

advocated a position before Congress on any issue, and identifies the specific subjects of their lobbying efforts.

11. Letters of Support for the Project

If the cooperation of courts, organizations, agencies, or individuals other than the applicant is required to conduct the project, the applicant should attach written assurances of cooperation and availability to the application, or send them under separate cover. In order to ensure that there is sufficient time to bring them to the Board's attention, letters of support sent under separate cover must be received at least four weeks before the meeting of the Board of Directors at which the application will be considered (i.e., no later than November 2, 1995, February 1, 1996, March 21, 1996, June 28, 1996, or August 22, 1996, respectively).

D. Budget Narrative

The budget narrative should provide the basis for the computation of all project-related costs. An application for a package grant for more than one project must include a separate budget narrative for each project component, with the same alphabetic identifier and project title used to describe each component project in the program narrative. Additional background or schedules may be attached if they are essential to obtaining a clear understanding of the proposed budget. Numerous and lengthy appendices are strongly discouraged.

The budget narrative should cover the costs of all components of the project and clearly identify costs attributable to the project evaluation. Under OMB grant guidelines incorporated by reference in this Guideline, grant funds may not be used to pay for coffee breaks during seminars or meetings, or to purchase alcoholic beverages.

1. Justification of Personnel Compensation

The applicant should set forth the percentages of time to be devoted by the individuals who will serve as the staff of the proposed project, the annual salary of each of those persons, and the number of work days per year used for calculating the percentages of time or daily rate of those individuals. The applicant should explain any deviations from current rates or established written organization policies. If grant funds are requested to pay the salary and related costs for a current employee of a court or other unit of government, the applicant should explain why this would not constitute a supplantation of State or local funds in violation of 42

U.S.C. 10706 (d)(1). An acceptable explanation may be that the position to be filled is a new one established in conjunction with the project or that the grant funds will be supporting only the portion of the employee's time that will be dedicated to new or additional duties related to the project.

2. Fringe Benefit Computation

The applicant should provide a description of the fringe benefits provided to employees. If percentages are used, the authority for such use should be presented as well as a description of the elements included in the determination of the percentage rate.

3. Consultant/Contractual Services and Honoraria

The applicant should describe the tasks each consultant will perform, the estimated total amount to be paid to each consultant, the basis for compensation rates (e.g., number of days x the daily consultant rates), and the method for selection. Rates for consultant services must be set in accordance with section XI.H.2.c. Honorarium payments must be justified in the same manner as other consultant payments.

4. Travel

Transportation costs and per diem rates must comply with the policies of the applicant organization. If the applicant does not have an established travel policy, then travel rates shall be consistent with those established by the Institute or the Federal Government. (A copy of the Institute's travel policy is available upon request.) The budget narrative should include an explanation of the rate used, including the components of the per diem rate and the basis for the estimated transportation expenses. The purpose for travel should also be included in the narrative.

5. Equipment

Grant funds may be used to purchase only the equipment that is necessary to demonstrate a new technological application in a court, or that is otherwise essential to accomplishing the objectives of the project. Equipment purchases to support basic court operations ordinarily will not be approved. The applicant should describe the equipment to be purchased or leased and explain why the acquisition of that equipment is essential to accomplish the project's goals and objectives. The narrative should clearly identify which equipment is to be leased and which is to be purchased. The method of procurement should also be described.

Purchases for automatic data processing equipment must comply with section XI.H.2.b.

6. Supplies

The applicant should provide a general description of the supplies necessary to accomplish the goals and objectives of the grant. In addition, the applicant should provide the basis for the amount requested for this expenditure category.

17. Construction

Construction expenses are prohibited except for the limited purposes set forth in section X.H.2. Any allowable construction or renovation expense should be described in detail in the budget narrative.

8. Telephone

Applicants should include anticipated telephone charges, distinguishing between monthly charges and long distance charges in the budget narrative. Also, applicants should provide the basis used in developing the monthly and long distance estimates.

9. Postage

Anticipated postage costs for project-related mailings should be described in the budget narrative. The cost of special mailings, such as for a survey or for announcing a workshop, should be distinguished from routine operational mailing costs. The bases for all postage estimates should be included in the justification material.

10. Printing/Photocopying

Anticipated costs for printing or photocopying should be included in the budget narrative. Applicants should provide the details underlying these estimates in support of the request.

11. Indirect Costs

Applicants should describe the indirect cost rates applicable to the grant in detail. If costs often included within an indirect cost rate are charged directly (e.g., a percentage of the time of senior managers to supervise product activities), the applicant should specify that these costs are not included within their approved indirect cost rate. These rates must be established in accordance with section XI.H.4. If the applicant has an indirect cost rate or allocation plan approved by any Federal granting agency, a copy of the approved rate agreement should be attached to the application.

12. Match

The applicant should describe the source of any matching contribution and

the nature of the match provided. Any additional contributions to the project should be described in this section of the budget narrative as well. If in-kind match is to be provided, the applicant should describe how the amount and value of the time, services or materials actually contributed will be documented sufficiently clearly to permit them to be included in an audit of the grant. Applicants should be aware that the time spent by participants in education courses does not qualify as in-kind match. (Samples of forms used by current grantees to track in-kind match are available from the Institute upon request.)

Applicants that do not contemplate making matching contributions continuously throughout the course of the project or on a task-by-task basis must provide a schedule within 30 days after the beginning of the project period indicating at what points during the project period the matching contributions will be made. (See sections III.F., VIII.B., X.B. and XI.D.1.)

E. Submission Requirements

1. An application package containing the application, an original signature on FORM A (and on FORM B, if the application is from a State or local court, or on the Disclosure of Lobbying Form if the applicant is not a unit of State or local government), and four photocopies of the application package must be sent by first class or overnight mail, or by courier no later than May 8, 1996. A postmark or courier receipt will constitute evidence of the submission date. Please mark APPLICATION on all application package envelopes and send to: State Justice Institute, 1650 King Street, Suite 600, Alexandria, Virginia 22314.

Receipt of each proposal will be acknowledged in writing. Extensions of the deadline for receipt of applications will not be granted. See section VII.C.11. for receipt deadlines for letters of support.

2. Applicants invited to submit more than one application may include material that would be identical in each application in a cover letter, and incorporate that material by reference in each application. The incorporated material will be counted against the 25-page (or in the case of package grant applications, the 40-page) limit for the program narrative. A copy of the cover letter should be attached to each copy of each application.

VIII. Application Review Procedures

A. Preliminary Inquiries

The Institute staff will answer inquiries concerning application procedures. The staff contact will be named in the Institute's letter inviting submission of a formal application.

B. Selection Criteria

1. All applications will be rated on the basis of the criteria set forth below. The Institute will accord the greatest weight to the following criteria:

- a. The soundness of the methodology;
- b. The appropriateness of the proposed evaluation design;
- c. The qualifications of the project's staff;
- d. The applicant's management plan and organizational capabilities;
- e. The reasonableness of the proposed budget;
- f. The demonstration of need for the project;
- g. The products and benefits resulting from the project;
- h. The demonstration of cooperation and support of other agencies that may be affected by the project;
- i. The proposed project's relationship to one of the "Special Interest" categories set forth in section II.B.; and
- j. The degree to which the findings, procedures, training, technology, or other results of the project can be transferred to other jurisdictions.

2. "Single jurisdiction" applications submitted pursuant to section II.C.1. will also be rated on the proposed project's relation to one of the "Special Interest" categories set forth in section II.B. and on the special requirements listed in section II.C.1.b.

3. In determining which applicants to fund, the Institute will also consider whether the applicant is a State court, a national court support or education organization, a non-court unit of government, or other type of entity eligible to receive grants under the Institute's enabling legislation (see 42 U.S.C. 10705(6) (as amended) and Section IV above); the availability of financial assistance from other sources for the project; the amount and nature (cash or in-kind) of the applicant's match; the extent to which the proposed project would also benefit the Federal courts or help State courts enforce Federal constitutional and legislative requirements; and the level of appropriations available to the Institute in the current year and the amount expected to be available in succeeding fiscal years.

C. Review and Approval Process

Applications will be reviewed competitively by the Board of Directors.

The Institute staff will prepare a narrative summary of each application, and a rating sheet assigning points for each relevant selection criterion. When necessary, applications may also be reviewed by outside experts. Committees of the Board will review applications within assigned program categories and prepare recommendations to the full Board. The full Board of Directors will then decide which applications to approve for a grant. The decision to award a grant is solely that of the Board of Directors.

Awards approved by the Board will be signed by the Chairman of the Board on behalf of the Institute.

D. Return Policy

Unless a specific request is made, unsuccessful applications will not be returned. Applicants are advised that Institute records are subject to the provisions of the Federal Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552.

E. Notification of Board Decision

The Institute will send written notice to applicants concerning all Board decisions to approve or deny their respective applications and the key issues and questions that arose during the review process. A decision by the Board to deny an application may not be appealed, but does not prohibit resubmission of a concept paper based on that application in a subsequent round of funding. The Institute will also notify the designated State contact listed in Appendix I when grants are approved by the Board to support projects that will be conducted by or involve courts in their State.

F. Response to Notification of Approval

Applicants have 30 days from the date of the latter notifying them that the Board has approved their application to respond to any revisions requested by the Board. If the requested revisions (or a reasonable schedule for submitting such revisions) have not been submitted to the Institute within 30 days after notification, the approval will be automatically rescinded and the application presented to the Board for reconsideration.

IX. Renewal Funding Procedures and Requirements

The Institute recognizes two types of renewal funding as described below—"continuation grants" and "on-going support grants." The award of an initial grant to support a project does not constitute a commitment by the Institute to renew funding. The Board of Directors anticipates allocating no more

than \$3 million of available FY 1996 grant funds for renewal grants.

A. Continuation Grants

1. Purpose and Scope

Continuation grants are intended to support projects with a limited duration that involve the same type of activities as the previous project. They are intended to enhance the specific program or service produced or established during the prior grant period. They may be used, for example, when a project is divided into two or more sequential phases, for secondary analysis of data obtained in an Institute-supported research project, or for more extensive testing of an innovative technology, procedure, or program developed with SJI grant support.

In order for a project to be considered for continuation funding, the grantee must have completed the project tasks and met all grant requirements and conditions in a timely manner, absent extenuating circumstances or prior Institute approval of changes to the project design. Continuation grants are not intended to provide support for a project for which the grantee has underestimated the amount of time or funds needed to accomplish the project tasks.

A continuation grant may be awarded for either a single project or for more than one project as a package grant (see sections III.J., V.C.1 and 3; and V.D.1 and 3.).

2. Application Procedures—Letters of Intent

In lieu of a concept paper, a grantee seeking a continuation grant must inform the Institute, by letter, of its intent to submit an application for such funding as soon as the need for renewal funding becomes apparent but not less than 120 days before the end of the current grant period.

a. A letter of intent must be no more than 3 single-spaced pages on 8½ by 11 inch paper and must contain a concise but thorough explanation of the need for continuation; an estimate of the funds to be requested; and a brief description of anticipated changes in scope, focus or audience of the project.

b. Letters of intent will not be reviewed competitively. Institute staff will review the proposed activities for the next project period and, within 30 days of receiving a letter of intent, inform the grantee of specific issues to be addressed in the continuation application and the date by which the application for a continuation grant must be submitted.

3. Application Format

An application for a continuation grant must include an application form, budget forms (with appropriate documentation), a project abstract conforming to the format set forth in section VII.B., a program narrative, a budget narrative, a disclosure of lobbying form (from applicants other than units of State or local government), and certain certifications and assurances.

The program narrative should conform to the length and format requirements set forth in section VII.C. However, rather than the topics listed in section VII.C., the program narrative of an application for a continuation grant should include:

a. *Project Objectives.* The applicant should clearly and concisely state what the continuation project is intended to accomplish.

b. *Need for Continuation.* The applicant should explain why continuation of the project is necessary to achieve the goals of the project, and how the continuation will benefit the participating courts or the courts community generally. That is, to what extent will the original goals and objectives of the project be unfulfilled if the project is not continued, and conversely, how will the findings or results of the project be enhanced by continuing the project?

A continuation application requesting a package grant to support more than one project should explain, in addition, how the proposed projects are related; how their operation and administration would be enhanced by the grant; the advantages of funding the projects as package rather than individually; and the disadvantages, if any, that would accrue by considering or funding them separately.

c. *Report of Current Project Activities.* The applicant should discuss the status of all activities conducted during the previous project period. Applicants should identify any activities that were not completed, and explain why. A continuation application requesting a package grant must describe separately the activities undertaken in each of the projects included within the proposed package.

d. *Evaluation Findings.* The applicant should present the key findings, impact, or recommendations resulting from the evaluation of the project, if they are available, and how they will be addressed during the proposed continuation. If the findings are not yet available, applicants should provide the date by which they will be submitted to the Institute. Ordinarily, the Board will

not consider an application for continuation funding until the Institute has received the evaluator's report.

e. *Tasks, Methods, Staff and Grantee Capability.* The applicant should fully describe any changes in the tasks to be performed, the methods to be used, the products of the project, and how and to whom those products will be disseminated, as well as any changes in the assigned staff or the grantee's organizational capacity. Applicants should include, in addition, the criteria and methods by which the proposed continuation project would be evaluated.

A continuation application for a package grant must address these issues separately for each project included in the proposed package, using the same alphabetic identifiers and project titles as in the original application.

f. *Task Schedule.* The applicant should present a detailed task schedule and timeline for the next project period. A continuation application for a package grant should include a separate task schedule and timeline for each project included in the proposed package, as well as a schedule and timeline that covers the package of projects as a whole. The same alphabetic identifiers and project titles used in the original application should be used to identify the component projects in the renewal application.

g. *Other Sources of Support.* The applicant should indicate why other sources of support are inadequate, inappropriate or unavailable.

4. Budget and Budget Narrative

The applicant should provide a complete budget and budget narrative conforming to the requirements set forth in paragraph VII.D. Changes in the funding level requested should be discussed in terms of corresponding increases or decreases in the scope of activities or services to be rendered.

A continuation application for a package grant must include a separate budget narrative identified alphabetically (i.e., A, B, C) and by project title for each project component.

5. References to Previously Submitted Material

An application for a continuation grant should not repeat information contained in a previously approved application or other previously submitted materials, but should provide specific references to such materials where appropriate.

6. Submission Requirements, Review and Approval Process, and Notification of Decision

The submission requirements set forth in section VII.E., other than the deadline for mailing, apply to applications for a continuation grant. Such applications will be rated on the selection criteria set forth in section VIII.B. The key findings and recommendations resulting from an evaluation of the project and the proposed response to those findings and recommendations will also be considered. The review and approval process, return policy, and notification procedures are the same as those for new projects set forth in sections VIII.C.–VIII.E.

B. On-going Support Grants

1. Purpose and Scope

On-going support grants are intended to support projects that are national in scope and that provide the State courts with services, programs or products for which there is a continuing important need. An on-going support grant may also be used to fund longitudinal research that directly benefits the State courts. On-going support grants are subject to the limits on size and duration set forth in V.C.2. and V.D.2. A project is eligible for consideration for an on-going support grant if:

- a. The project is supported by and has been evaluated under a grant from the Institute;
- b. The project is national in scope and provides a significant benefit to the State courts;
- c. There is a continuing important need for the services, programs or products provided by the project as indicated by the level of use and support by members of the court community;
- d. The project is accomplishing its objectives in an effective and efficient manner; and
- e. It is likely that the service or program provided by the project would be curtailed or significantly reduced without Institute support.

Each project supported by an on-going support grant must include an evaluation component assessing its effectiveness and operation throughout the grant period. The evaluation should be independent, but may be designed collaboratively by the evaluator and the grantee. The design should call for regular feedback from the evaluator to the grantee throughout the project period concerning recommendations for mid-course corrections or improvement of the project, as well as periodic reports to the Institute at relevant points in the project.

An interim evaluation report must be submitted 18 months into the grant period. The decision to obligate Institute funds to support the third year of the project will be based on the interim evaluation findings and the applicant's response to any deficiencies noted in the report.

A final evaluation assessing the effectiveness, operation of, and continuing need for the project must be submitted 90 days before the end of the 3-year project period.

In addition, a detailed annual task schedule must be submitted not later than 45 days before the end of the first and second years of the grant period, along with an explanation of any necessary revisions in the projected costs for the remainder of the project period. (See also section IX.B.3.h.)

2. Application Procedures—Letters of Intent

The Board will consider awarding an on-going support grant for a period of up to 36 months. The total amount of the grant will be fixed at the time of the initial award. Funds ordinarily will be made available in annual increments as specified in section V.C.2.

In lieu of a concept paper, a grantee seeking an on-going support grant must inform the Institute, by letter, of its intent to submit an application for such funding as soon as the need for renewal funding becomes apparent but no less than 120 days before the end of the current grant period. The letter of intent should be in the same format as that prescribed for continuation grants in section IX.A.2.a.

3. Application Procedures and Format

An application for an on-going support grant must include an application form, budget forms (with appropriate documentation), a project abstract conforming to the format set forth in section VII.B., a program narrative, a budget narrative, and certain certifications and assurances.

The program narrative should conform to the length and format requirements set forth in section VII.C. However, rather than the topics listed in section VII.C., the program narrative of applications for on-going support grants should address:

- a. *Description of Need for and Benefits of the Project.* The applicant should provide a detailed discussion of the benefits provided by the project to the State courts around the country, including the degree to which State courts, State court judges, or State court managers and personnel are using the services or programs provided by the project.

An application for on-going support of a package grant should explain, in addition, how the proposed projects are related; how their operation and administration would be enhanced by the grant; the advantages of funding the projects as a package rather than individually; and the disadvantages, if any, that would accrue by considering or funding them separately.

b. *Demonstration of Court Support.* The applicant should demonstrate support for the continuation of the project from the courts community.

c. *Report on Current Project Activities.* The applicant should discuss the extent to which the project has met its goals and objectives, identify any activities that have not been completed, and explain why. An application for on-going support of a package grant must describe separately the activities undertaken in each of the projects included within the proposed package.

d. *Evaluation Findings.* The applicant should attach a copy of the final evaluation report regarding the effectiveness, impact, and operation of the project, specify the key findings or recommendations resulting from the evaluation, and explain how they will be addressed during the proposed renewal period. Ordinarily, the Board will not consider an application for on-going support until the Institute has received the evaluator's report.

e. *Objectives, Tasks, Methods, Staff and Grantee Capability.* The applicant should describe fully any changes in the objectives; tasks to be performed; the methods to be used; the products of the project; how and to whom those products will be disseminated; the assigned staff; and the grantee's organizational capacity.

An application for on-going support of a package grant must address these issues separately for each project included in the proposed package, using the same alphabetic identifiers and project titles as in the original application.

f. *Task Schedule.* The applicant should present a general schedule for the full proposed project period and a detailed task schedule for the first year of the proposed new project period. An application for on-going support of a package grant should include a separate task schedule and timeline for each project included in the proposed package, as well as a schedule and timeline that covers the package of projects as a whole. The same alphabetic identifiers and project titles used in the original application should be used to identify the component projects in the renewal application.

g. *Other Sources of Support.* The applicant should indicate why other sources of support are inadequate, inappropriate or unavailable.

4. Budget and Budget Narrative

The applicant should provide a complete three-year budget and budget narrative conforming to the requirements set forth in paragraph VII.D. Changes in the funding level requested should be discussed in terms of corresponding increases or decreases in the scope of activities or services to be rendered. A complete budget narrative should be provided for each year, or portion of a year, for which grant support is requested. Changes in the funding level requested should be discussed in terms of corresponding increases or decreases in the scope of activities or services to be rendered. The budget should provide for realistic cost-of-living and staff salary increases over the course of the requested project period. Applicants should be aware that the Institute is unlikely to approve a supplemental budget increase for an on-going support grant in the absence of well-documented, unanticipated factors that clearly justify the requested increase.

A continuation application for a package grant must include a separate budget narrative identified alphabetically (i.e. A, B, C) and by project title for each project component.

5. References to Previously Submitted Material

An application for an on-going support grant should not repeat information contained in a previously approved application or other previously submitted materials, but should provide specific references to such materials where appropriate.

6. Submission Requirements, Review and Approval Process, and Notification of Decision

The submission requirements set forth in section VII.E., other than the deadline for mailing, apply to applications for an on-going support grant. Such applications will be rated on the selection criteria set forth in section VIII.B. The key findings and recommendations resulting from an evaluation of the project and the proposed response to those findings and recommendations will also be considered. The review and approval process, return policy, and notification procedures are the same as those for new projects set forth in sections VIII.C.–VIII.E.

X. Compliance Requirements

The State Justice Institute Act contains limitations and conditions on grants, contracts and cooperative agreements of which applicants and recipients should be aware. In addition to eligibility requirements which must be met to be considered for an award from the Institute, all applicants should be aware of and all recipients will be responsible for ensuring compliance with the following:

A. State and Local Court Systems

Each application for funding from a State or local court must be approved, consistent with State law, by the State's Supreme Court, or its designated agency or council. The Supreme Court or its designee shall receive, administer, and be accountable for all funds awarded on the basis of such an application. 42 U.S.C. 10705(b)(4). Appendix I to this Guideline lists the person to contact in each State regarding the administration of Institute grants to State and local courts.

B. Matching Requirements

1. All awards to courts or other units of State or local government (not including publicly supported institutions of higher education) require a match from private or public sources of not less than 50% of the total amount of the Institute's award. For example, if the total cost of a project is anticipated to be \$150,000, a State court or executive branch agency may request up to \$100,000 from the Institute to implement the project. The remaining \$50,000 (50% of the \$100,000 requested from SJI) must be provided as a match. A cash match, non-cash match, or both may be provided, but the Institute will give preference to those applicants who provide a cash match to the Institute's award. (For a further definition of match, see section III.F.)

The requirement to provide match may be waived in exceptionally rare circumstances upon approval of the Chief Justice of the highest court in the State and a majority of the Board of Directors. 42 U.S.C. 10705(d).

2. Other eligible recipients of Institute funds are not required to provide a match, but are encouraged to contribute to meeting the costs of the project. In instances where match is proposed, the grantee is responsible for ensuring that the total amount proposed is actually contributed. If a proposed contribution is not fully met, the Institute may reduce the award amount accordingly, in order to maintain the ratio originally provided for in the award agreement (see sections VIII.B. above and XI.D.).

C. Conflict of Interest

Personnel and other officials connected with Institute-funded programs shall adhere to the following requirements:

1. No official or employee of a recipient court or organization shall participate personally through decision, approval, disapproval, recommendation, the rendering of advice, investigation, or otherwise in any proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, grant, cooperative agreement, claim, controversy, or other particular matter in which Institute funds are used, where to his/her knowledge he/she or his/her immediate family, partners, organization other than a public agency in which he/she is serving as officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee or any person or organization with whom he/she is negotiating or has any arrangement concerning prospective employment, has a financial interest.

2. In the use of Institute project funds, an official or employee of a recipient court or organization shall avoid any action which might result in or create the appearance of:

- a. Using an official position for private gain; or
- b. Affecting adversely the confidence of the public in the integrity of the Institute program.

3. Requests for proposals or invitations for bids issued by a recipient of Institute funds or a subgrantee or subcontractor will provide notice to prospective bidders that the contractors who develop or draft specifications, requirements, statements of the work and/or requests for proposals for a proposed procurement will be excluded from bidding on or submitting a proposal to compete for the award of such procurement.

D. Lobbying

Funds awarded to recipients by the Institute shall not be used, indirectly or directly, to influence Executive orders or similar promulgations by Federal, State or local agencies, or to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by Federal, State or local legislative bodies, 42 U.S.C. 10706(a).

It is the policy of the Board of Directors to award funds only to support applications submitted by organizations that would carry out the objectives of their applications in an unbiased manner. Consistent with this policy and the provisions of 42 U.S.C. 10706, the Institute will not knowingly award a grant to an applicant that has, directly or through an entity that is part of the same organization as the applicant,

advocated a position before Congress on the specific subject matter of the application.

E. Political Activities

No recipient shall contribute or make available Institute funds, program personnel, or equipment to any political party or association, or the campaign of any candidate for public or party office. Recipients are also prohibited from using funds in advocating or opposing any ballot measure, initiative, or referendum. Finally, officers and employees of recipients shall not intentionally identify the Institute or recipients with any partisan or nonpartisan political activity associated with a political party or association, or the campaign of any candidate for public or party office. 42 U.S.C. 10706(a).

F. Advocacy

No funds made available by the Institute may be used to support or conduct training programs for the purpose of advocating particular nonjudicial public policies or encouraging nonjudicial political activities. 42 U.S.C. 10706(b).

G. Prohibition Against Litigation Support

No funds made available by the Institute may be used directly or indirectly to support legal assistance to parties in litigation, including cases involving capital punishment.

H. Supplantation and Construction

To ensure that funds are used to supplement and improve the operation of State courts, rather than to support basic court services, funds shall not be used for the following purposes:

1. To supplant State or local funds supporting a program or activity (such as paying the salary of court employees who would be performing their normal duties as part of the project, or paying rent for space which is part of the court's normal operations);
2. To construct court facilities or structures, except to remodel existing facilities or to demonstrate new architectural or technological techniques, or to provide temporary facilities for new personnel or for personnel involved in a demonstration or experimental program; or
3. Solely to purchase equipment.

I. Confidentiality of Information

Except as provided by Federal law other than the State Justice Institute Act, no recipient of financial assistance from SJI may use or reveal any research or statistical information furnished under

the Act by any person and identifiable to any specific private person for any purpose other than the purpose for which the information was obtained. Such information and copies thereof shall be immune from legal process, and shall not, without the consent of the person furnishing such information, be admitted as evidence or used for any purpose in any action, suit, or other judicial, legislative, or administrative proceedings.

J. Human Research Protection

All research involving human subjects shall be conducted with the informed consent of those subjects and in a manner that will ensure their privacy and freedom from risk or harm and the protection of persons who are not subjects of the research but would be affected by it, unless such procedures and safeguards would make the research impractical. In such instances, the Institute must approve procedures designed by the grantee to provide human subjects with relevant information about the research after their involvement and to minimize or eliminate risk or harm to those subjects due to their participation.

K. Nondiscrimination

No person may, on the basis of race, sex, national origin, disability, color, or creed be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity supported by Institute funds. Recipients of Institute funds must immediately take any measures necessary to effectuate this provision.

L. Reporting Requirements

Recipients of Institute funds, other than scholarships awarded under section II.B.2.b.v., shall submit Quarterly Progress and Financial Reports within 30 days of the close of each calendar quarter (that is, no later than January 30, April 30, July 30, and October 30). Two copies of each report must be sent. The Quarterly Progress Reports shall include a narrative description of project activities during the calendar quarter, the relationship between those activities and the task schedule and objectives set forth in the approved application or an approved adjustment thereto, any significant problem areas that have developed and how they will be resolved, and the activities scheduled during the next reporting period.

The quarterly financial status report shall be submitted in accordance with section XI.G.2. of this Guideline. A final project progress report and financial

status report shall be submitted within 90 days after the end of the grant period in accordance with section XI.K.2. of this Guideline.

M. Audit

Each recipient must provide for an annual fiscal audit which shall include an opinion on whether the financial statements of the grantee present fairly its financial position and financial operations are in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. (See section XI.J. of the Guideline for the requirements of such audits.)

N. Suspension of Funding

After providing a recipient reasonable notice and opportunity to submit written documentation demonstrating why fund termination or suspension should not occur, the Institute may terminate or suspend funding of a project that fails to comply substantially with the Act, Institute Guideline, or the terms and conditions of the award. 42 U.S.C. 10708(a).

O. Title to Property

At the conclusion of the project, title to all expendable and nonexpendable personal property purchased with Institute funds shall vest in the recipient court, organization, or individual that purchased the property if certification is made to the Institute that the property will continue to be used for the authorized purposes of the Institute-funded project or other purposes consistent with the State Justice Institute Act, as approved by the Institute. If such certification is not made or the Institute disapproves such certification, title to all such property with an aggregate or individual value of \$1,000 or more shall vest in the Institute, which will direct the disposition of the property.

P. Original Material

All products prepared as the result of Institute-supported projects must be originally-developed material unless otherwise specified in the award documents. Material not originally developed that is included in such products must be properly identified, whether the material is in a verbatim or extensive paraphrase format.

Q. Acknowledgment and Disclaimer

Recipients of Institute funds shall acknowledge prominently on all products developed with grant funds that support was received from the Institute. The "SJI" logo must appear on the front cover of a written product, or in the opening frames of a video

product, unless another placement is approved in writing by the Institute. This includes final products printed or otherwise reproduced during the grant period, as well as reprintings or reproductions of those materials following the end of the grant period. A camera-ready logo sheet is available from the Institute upon request.

Recipients also shall display the following disclaimer on all grant products:

"This [document, film, videotape, etc.] was developed under [grant/cooperative agreement, number SJI-(insert number)] from the State Justice Institute. The points of view expressed are those of the [author(s), filmmaker(s), etc.] and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the State Justice Institute."

R. Institute Approval of Grant Products

No grant funds may be obligated for publication or reproduction of a final product developed with grant funds without the written approval of the Institute. Grantees shall submit a final draft of each written product to the Institute for review and approval. These drafts shall be submitted at least 30 days before the product is scheduled to be sent for publication or reproduction to permit Institute review and incorporation of any appropriate changes agreed upon by the grantee and the Institute. Grantees shall provide for timely reviews by the Institute of videotape or CD-ROM products at the treatment, script, rough cut, and final stages of development or their equivalents, prior to initiating the next stage of product development.

S. Distribution of Grant Products

In addition to the distribution specified in the grant application, grantees shall send:

1. Twenty copies of each final product developed with grant funds to the Institute, unless the product was developed under either a curriculum adaptation or a technical assistance grant, in which case submission of 2 copies is required.
2. A mastercopy of each videotape produced with grant funds to the Institute.
3. A one-page abstract to the Institute summarizing the products produced during the project for posting on the Internet together with a diskette containing the abstract in Word, WordPerfect, or ASCII. The abstract should include the grant number, a contact name, address, telephone numbers, and e-mail address (if applicable).
4. One copy of each final product developed with grant funds to the

library established in each State to collect materials prepared with Institute support. (A list of these libraries is contained in Appendix II. Labels for these libraries are available from the Institute upon request.) Recipients of curriculum adaptation and technical assistance grants are not required to submit final products to State libraries.

T. Copyrights

Except as otherwise provided in the terms and conditions of an Institute award, a recipient is free to copyright any books, publications, or other copyrightable materials developed in the course of an Institute-supported project, but the Institute shall reserve a royalty-free, nonexclusive and irrevocable right to reproduce, publish, or otherwise use, and to authorize others to use, the materials for purposes consistent with the State Justice Institute Act.

U. Inventions and Patents

If any patentable items, patent rights, processes, or inventions are produced in the course of Institute-sponsored work, such fact shall be promptly and fully reported to the Institute. Unless there is a prior agreement between the grantee and the Institute on disposition of such items, the Institute shall determine whether protection of the invention or discovery shall be sought. The Institute will also determine how the rights in the invention or discovery, including rights under any patent issued thereon, shall be allocated and administered in order to protect the public interest consistent with "Government Patent Policy" (President's Memorandum for Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, February 18, 1983, and statement of Government Patent Policy).

V. Charges for Grant-Related Products/ Recovery of Costs

When Institute funds fully cover the cost of developing, producing, and disseminating a product (e.g., a report, curriculum, videotape or software), the product should be distributed to the field without charge. When Institute funds only partially cover the development, production, or dissemination costs, the grantee may, with the Institute's prior written approval, recover its costs for developing, producing, and disseminating the material to those requesting it, to the extent that those costs were not covered by Institute funds or grantee matching contributions.

Applicants should disclose their intent to sell grant-related products in both the concept paper and the

application. Grantees must obtain the written, prior approval of the Institute of their plans to recover project costs through the sale of grant products.

Written requests to recover costs ordinarily should be received during the grant period and should specify the nature and extent of the costs to be recouped, the reason that such costs were not budgeted (if the rationale was not disclosed in the approved application), the number of copies to be sold, the intended audience for the products to be sold, and the proposed sale price. If the product is to be sold for more than \$25.00, the written request also should include a detailed itemization of costs that will be recovered and a certification that the costs were not supported by either Institute grant funds or grantee matching contributions.

In the event that the sale of grant products results in revenues that exceed the costs to develop, produce, and disseminate the product, the revenue must continue to be used for the authorized purposes of the Institute-funded project or other purposes consistent with the State Justice Institute Act that have been approved by the Institute. See sections III.F. and XI.F. for requirements regarding project-related income realized during the project period.

W. Availability of Research Data for Secondary Analysis

Upon request, grantees must make available for secondary analysis a diskette(s) or data tape(s) containing research and evaluation data collected under an Institute grant and the accompanying code manual. Grantees may recover the actual cost of duplicating and mailing or otherwise transmitting the data set and manual from the person or organization requesting the data. Grantees may provide the requested data set in the format in which it was created and analyzed.

X. Approval of Key Staff

If the qualifications of an employee or consultant assigned to a key project staff position are not described in the application or if there is a change of a person assigned to such a position, a recipient shall submit a description of the qualifications of the newly assigned person to the Institute. Prior written approval of the qualifications of the new person assigned to a key staff position must be received from the Institute before the salary or consulting fee of that person and associated costs may be paid or reimbursed from grant funds.

XI. Financial Requirements

A. Accounting Systems and Financial Records

All grantees, subgrantees, contractors, and other organizations directly or indirectly receiving Institute funds are required to establish and maintain accounting systems and financial records to accurately account for funds they receive. These records shall include total program costs, including Institute funds, State and local matching shares, and any other fund sources included in the approved project budget.

1. Purpose

The purpose of this section is to establish accounting system requirements and to offer guidance on procedures which will assist all grantees/subgrantees in:

- a. Complying with the statutory requirements for the awarding, disbursement, and accounting of funds;
- b. Complying with regulatory requirements of the Institute for financial management and disposition of funds;
- c. Generating financial data which can be used in the planning, management and control of programs; and
- d. Facilitating an effective audit of funded programs and projects.

2. References

Except where inconsistent with specific provisions of this Guideline, the following regulations, directives and reports are applicable to Institute grants and cooperative agreements under the same terms and conditions that apply to Federal grantees. These materials supplement the requirements of this section for accounting systems and financial recordkeeping and provide additional guidance on how these requirements may be satisfied. (Circulars may be obtained from OMB by calling 202-395-7250.)

- a. *Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-21*, Cost Principles for Educational Institutions.
- b. *Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-87*, Cost Principles for State and Local Governments.
- c. *Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-88 (revised)*, Indirect Cost Rates, Audit and Audit Follow-up at Educational Institutions.
- d. *Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-102*, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants-in-Aid to State and Local Governments.
- e. *Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-110*, Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals and other Non-Profit Organizations.

f. *Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-128*, Audits of State and Local Governments.

g. *Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-122*, Cost Principles for Non-profit Organizations.

h. *Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133*, Audits of Institutions of Higher Education and Other Non-profit Institutions.

B. Supervision and Monitoring Responsibilities

1. Grantee Responsibilities

All grantees receiving direct awards from the Institute are responsible for the management and fiscal control of all funds. Responsibilities include accounting for receipts and expenditures, maintaining adequate financial records and refunding expenditures disallowed by audits.

2. Responsibilities of State Supreme Court

Each application for funding from a State or local court must be approved, consistent with State law, by the State's Supreme Court, or its designated agency or council.

The State Supreme Court or its designee shall receive all Institute funds awarded to such courts; shall be responsible for assuring proper administration of Institute funds; and shall be responsible for all aspects of the project, including proper accounting and financial recordkeeping by the subgrantee. These responsibilities include:

- a. *Reviewing Financial Operations.* The State Supreme Court or its designee should be familiar with, and periodically monitor, its subgrantees' financial operations, records system and procedures. Particular attention should be directed to the maintenance of current financial data.
- b. *Recording Financial Activities.* The subgrantee's grant award or contract obligation, as well as cash advances and other financial activities, should be recorded in the financial records of the State Supreme Court or its designee in summary form. Subgrantee expenditures should be recorded on the books of the State Supreme Court OR evidenced by report forms duly filed by the subgrantee. Non-Institute contributions applied to projects by subgrantees should likewise be recorded, as should any project income resulting from program operations.
- c. *Budgeting and Budget Review.* The State Supreme Court or its designee should ensure that each subgrantee prepares an adequate budget as the basis for its award commitment. The detail of each project budget should be

maintained on file by the State Supreme Court.

d. *Accounting for Non-Institute Contributions.* The State Supreme Court or its designee will ensure, in those instances where subgrantees are required to furnish non-Institute matching funds, that the requirements and limitations of this guideline are applied to such funds.

e. *Audit Requirement.* The State Supreme Court or its designee is required to ensure that subgrantees have met the necessary audit requirements as set forth by the Institute (see sections X.M. and XI.J).

f. *Reporting Irregularities.* The State Supreme Court, its designees, and its subgrantees are responsible for promptly reporting to the Institute the nature and circumstances surrounding any financial irregularities discovered.

C. Accounting System

The grantee is responsible for establishing and maintaining an adequate system of accounting and internal controls for itself and for ensuring that an adequate system exists for each of its subgrantees and contractors. An acceptable and adequate accounting system is considered to be one which:

1. Properly accounts for receipt of funds under each grant awarded and the expenditure of funds for each grant by category of expenditure (including matching contributions and project income);

2. Assures that expended funds are applied to the appropriate budget category included within the approved grant;

3. Presents and classifies historical costs of the grant as required for budgetary and evaluation purposes;

4. Provides cost and property controls to assure optimal use of grant funds;

5. Is integrated with a system of internal controls adequate to safeguard the funds and assets covered, check the accuracy and reliability of the accounting data, promote operational efficiency, and assure conformance with any general or special conditions of the grant;

6. Meets the prescribed requirements for periodic financial reporting of operations; and

7. Provides financial data for planning, control, measurement and evaluation of direct and indirect costs.

D. Total Cost Budgeting and Accounting

Accounting for all funds awarded by the Institute shall be structured and executed on a "total project cost" basis. That is, total project costs, including Institute funds, State and local matching

shares, and any other fund sources included in the approved project budget shall be the foundation for fiscal administration and accounting. Grant applications and financial reports require budget and cost estimates on the basis of total costs.

1. Timing of Matching Contributions

Matching contributions need not be applied at the exact time of the obligation of Institute funds. However, the full matching share must be obligated during the award period, except that with the prior written permission of the Institute, contributions made following approval of the grant by the Institute's Board but before the beginning of the grant may be counted as match. Grantees that do not contemplate making matching contributions continuously throughout the course of a project or on a task-by-task basis, are required to submit a schedule within 30 days after the beginning of the project period indicating at what points during the project period the matching contributions will be made. In instances where a proposed cash match is not fully met, the Institute may reduce the award amount accordingly, in order to maintain the ratio originally provided for in the award agreement.

2. Records for Match

All grantees must maintain records which clearly show the source, amount, and timing of all matching contributions. In addition, if a project has included, within its approved budget, contributions which exceed the required matching portion, the grantee must maintain records of those contributions in the same manner as it does the Institute funds and required matching shares. For all grants made to State and local courts, the State Supreme Court has primary responsibility for grantee/subgrantee compliance with the requirements of this section. (See section XI.B.2.)

E. Maintenance and Retention of Records

All financial records, supporting documents, statistical records and all other records pertinent to grants, subgrants, cooperative agreements or contracts under grants shall be retained by each organization participating in a project for at least three years for purposes of examination and audit. State Supreme Courts may impose record retention and maintenance requirements in addition to those prescribed in this chapter.

1. Coverage

The retention requirement extends to books of original entry, source documents supporting accounting transactions, the general ledger, subsidiary ledgers, personnel and payroll records, canceled checks, and related documents and records. Source documents include copies of all grant and subgrant awards, applications, and required grantee/subgrantee financial and narrative reports. Personnel and payroll records shall include the time and attendance reports for all individuals reimbursed under a grant, subgrant or contract, whether they are employed full-time or part-time. Time and effort reports will be required for consultants.

2. Retention Period

The three-year retention period starts from the date of the submission of the final expenditure report or, for grants which are renewed annually, from the date of submission of the annual expenditure report.

3. Maintenance

Grantees and subgrantees are expected to see that records of different fiscal years are separately identified and maintained so that requested information can be readily located. Grantees and subgrantees are also obligated to protect records adequately against fire or other damage. When records are stored away from the grantee's/subgrantee's principal office, a written index of the location of stored records should be on hand, and ready access should be assured.

4. Access

Grantees and subgrantees must give any authorized representative of the Institute access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, and documents related to an Institute grant.

F. Project-Related Income

Records of the receipt and disposition of project-related income must be maintained by the grantee in the same manner as required for the project funds that gave rise to the income. The policies governing the disposition of the various types of project-related income are listed below.

1. Interest

A State and any agency or instrumentality of a State including State institutions of higher education and State hospitals, shall not be held accountable for interest earned on advances of project funds. When funds are awarded to subgrantees through a State, that subgrantees are not held

accountable for interest earned on advances of project funds. Local units of government and nonprofit organizations that are direct grantees must refund any interest earned. Grantees shall order their affairs so as to ensure minimum balances in their respective grant cash accounts.

2. Royalties

The grantee/subgrantee may retain all royalties received from copyrights or other works developed under projects or from patents and inventions, unless the terms and conditions of the project provide otherwise.

3. Registration and Tuition Fees

Registration and tuition fees shall be used to pay project-related costs not covered by the grant, or to reduce the amount of grant funds needed to support the project. Registration and tuition fees may be used for other purposes only with the prior written approval of the Institute. Estimates of registration and tuition fees, and any expenses to be offset by the fees, should be included in the application budget forms and narrative.

4. Income from the Sale of Grant Products

When grant funds fully cover the cost of producing and disseminating a limited number of copies of a product, the grantee may, with the written prior approval of the Institute, sell additional copies reproduced at its expense only at a price intended to recover actual reproduction and distribution costs that were not covered by Institute grant funds or grantee matching contributions to the project. When grant funds only partially cover the costs of developing, producing and disseminating a product, the grantee may, with the written prior approval of the Institute, recover costs for developing, reproducing, and disseminating the material to the extent that those costs were not covered by Institute grant funds or grantee matching contributions. If the grantee recovered its costs in this manner, then amounts expended by the grantee to develop, produce, and disseminate the material may not be considered match.

If the sale of products occurs during the project period, the costs and income generated by the sales must be reported on the Quarterly Financial Status Reports and documented in an auditable manner. Whenever possible, the intent to sell a product should be disclosed in the concept paper and application or reported to the Institute in writing once a decision to sell products has been made. The grantee must request approval to recover its product

development, reproduction, and dissemination costs as specified in section X.V.

5. Other

Other project income shall be treated in accordance with disposition instructions set forth in the project's terms and conditions.

G. Payments and Financial Reporting Requirements

1. Payment of Grant Funds

The procedures and regulations set forth below are applicable to all Institute grant funds and grantees.

a. *Request for Advance or Reimbursement of Funds.* Grantees will receive funds on a "Check-Issued" basis. Upon receipt, review, and approval of a Request for Advance or Reimbursement by the Institute, a check will be issued directly to the grantee or its designated fiscal agent. A request must be limited to the grantee's immediate cash needs. The Request for Advance or Reimbursement, along with the instructions for its preparation, will be included in the official Institute award package.

Payment requests for projects within a package grant may be submitted at the same time, but must be identified by component project. The alphabetic project identifier (A, B, C, etc.) should be appended to the grant number in Block 5 of the Request for Advance or Reimbursement. (See Recommendations to Grantees in the Introduction for further guidance.)

b. *Continuation and On-Going Support Awards.* For purposes of submitting Requests for Advance or Reimbursement, recipients of continuation and on-going support grants should treat each grant as a new project and number their requests accordingly (i.e. on a grant rather than a project basis). For example, the first request for payment from a continuation grant or each year of an on-going support would be number 1, the second number 2, etc. (See Recommendations to Grantees in the Introduction for further guidance.)

c. *Termination of Advance and Reimbursement Funding.* When a grantee organization receiving cash advances from the Institute:

i. Demonstrates an unwillingness or inability to attain program or project goals, or to establish procedures that will minimize the time elapsing between cash advances and disbursements, or cannot adhere to guideline requirements or special conditions;

ii. Engages in the improper award and administration of subgrants or contracts; or

iii. Is unable to submit reliable and/ or timely reports;

the Institute may terminate advance financing and require the grantee organization to finance its operations with its own working capital. Payments to the grantee shall then be made by check to reimburse the grantee for actual cash disbursements. In the event the grantee continues to be deficient, the Institute reserves the right to suspend reimbursement payments until the deficiencies are corrected.

d. *Principle of Minimum Cash on Hand.* Recipient organizations should request funds based upon immediate disbursement requirements. Grantees should time their requests to ensure that cash on hand is the minimum needed for disbursements to be made immediately or within a few days. Idle funds in the hands of subgrantees will impair the goals of good cash management.

2. Financial Reporting

a. *General Requirements.* In order to obtain financial information concerning the use of funds, the Institute requires that grantees/subgrantees of these funds submit timely reports for review.

Three copies of the Financial Status Report are required from all grantees, other than recipients of scholarships under section II.B.2.b.v., for each active quarter on a calendar-quarter basis. This report is due within 30 days after the close of the calendar quarter. It is designed to provide financial information relating to Institute funds, State and local matching shares, and any other fund sources included in the approved project budget. The report contains information on obligations as well as outlays. A copy of the Financial Status Report, along with instructions for its preparation, will be included in the official Institute Award package. In circumstances where an organization requests substantial payments for a project prior to the completion of a given quarter, the Institute may request a brief summary of the amount requested, by object class, in support of the Request for Advance or Reimbursement.

b. *Additional Requirements for Renewal Grants.* Grantees receiving a continuation or on-going support grant should number their quarterly Financial Status Reports on a grant rather than a project basis. For example, the first quarterly report for a continuation grant or each year of an on-going support award should be number 1, the second number 2, etc.

c. *Additional Requirements for Package Grants.* Grantees receiving a package grant must submit a quarterly financial report summarizing the financial activity for the entire package and separate reports for each project within the package. On the separate reports for the component projects, the alphabetic project identifier (A, B, C, etc.) must be appended to the grant number in Block 5 of the Financial Status Report.

3. Consequences of Non-Compliance With Submission Requirements

Failure of the grantee organization to submit required financial and program reports may result in a suspension of grant payments or revocation of the grant award.

H. Allowability of Costs

1. General

Except as may be otherwise provided in the conditions of a particular grant, cost allowability shall be determined in accordance with the principles set forth in *OMB Circulars A-87, Cost Principles for State and Local Governments; A-21, Cost Principles Applicable to Grants and Contracts with Educational Institutions; and A-122, Cost Principles for Non-Profit Organizations.* No costs may be recovered to liquidate obligations which are incurred after the approved grant period. Copies of these circulars may be obtained from OMB by calling (202) 395-7250.

2. Costs Requiring Prior Approval

a. *Preagreement Costs.* The written prior approval of the Institute is required for costs which are considered necessary to the project but occur prior to the award date of the grant.

b. *Equipment.* Grant funds may be used to purchase or lease only that equipment which is essential to accomplishing the goals and objectives of the project. The written prior approval of the Institute is required when the amount of automated data processing (ADP) equipment to be purchased or leased exceeds \$10,000 or the software to be purchased exceeds \$3,000.

c. *Consultants.* The written prior approval of the Institute is required when the rate of compensation to be paid a consultant exceeds \$300 a day.

3. Travel Costs

Transportation and per diem rates must comply with the policies of the applicant organization. If the applicant does not have an established written travel policy, then travel rates shall be consistent with those established by the Institute or the Federal Government.

Institute funds shall not be used to cover the transportation or per diem costs of a member of a national organization to attend an annual or other regular meeting of that organization.

4. Indirect Costs

These are costs of an organization that are not readily assignable to a particular project, but are necessary to the operation of the organization and the performance of the project. The cost of operating and maintaining facilities, depreciation, and administrative salaries are examples of the types of costs that are usually treated as indirect costs. It is the policy of the Institute that all costs should be budgeted directly; however, if a recipient has an indirect cost rate approved by a Federal agency as set forth below, the Institute will accept that rate.

a. *Approved Plan Available.*

i. The Institute will accept an indirect cost rate or allocation plan approved for a grantee during the preceding two years by any Federal granting agency on the basis of allocation methods substantially in accord with those set forth in the applicable cost circulars. A copy of the approved rate agreement must be submitted to the Institute.

ii. Where flat rates are accepted in lieu of actual indirect costs, grantees may not also charge expenses normally included in overhead pools, e.g., accounting services, legal services, building occupancy and maintenance, etc., as direct costs.

iii. Organizations with an approved indirect cost rate, utilizing total direct costs as the base, usually exclude contracts under grants from any overhead recovery. The negotiated agreement will stipulate that contracts are excluded from the base for overhead recovery.

b. *Establishment of Indirect Cost Rates.* In order to be reimbursed for indirect costs, a grantee or organization must first establish an appropriate indirect cost rate. To do this, the grantee must prepare an indirect cost rate proposal and submit it to the Institute. The proposal must be submitted within three months after the start of the grant period to assure recovery of the full amount of allowable indirect costs, and it must be developed in accordance with principles and procedures appropriate to the type of grantee institution involved as specified in the applicable OMB Circular. Copies of OMB Circulars may be obtained directly from OMB by calling (202) 395-7250.

c. *No Approved Plan.* If an indirect cost proposal for recovery of actual indirect costs is not submitted to the

Institute within three months after the start of the grant period, indirect costs will be irrevocably disallowed for all months prior to the month that the indirect cost proposal is received. This policy is effective for all grant awards.

I. Procedure and Property Management Standards

1. Procurement Standards

For State and local governments, the Institute is adopting the standards set forth in Attachment O of *OMB Circular A-102.* Institutions of higher education, hospitals, and other non-profit organizations will be governed by the standards set forth in Attachment O of *OMB Circular A-110.*

2. Property Management Standards

The property management standards as prescribed in Attachment N of *OMB Circulars A-102 and A-110* shall be applicable to all grantees and subgrantees of Institute funds except as provided in section X.O.

All grantees/subgrantees are required to be prudent in the acquisition and management of property with grant funds. If suitable property required for the successful execution of projects is already available within the grantee or subgrantee organization, expenditures of grant funds for the acquisition of new property will be considered unnecessary.

J. Audit Requirements

1. Implementation

Each non-scholarship grantee (including a State or local court receiving a subgrant from the State Supreme Court) shall provide for an annual fiscal audit. The audit may be of the entire grantee organization (e.g., a university) or of the specific project funded by the Institute. Audits conducted in accordance with the Single Audit Act of 1984 and OMB Circular A-128, or OMB Circular A-133 will satisfy the requirement for an annual fiscal audit. The audit shall be conducted by an independent Certified Public Accountant, or a State or local agency authorized to audit government agencies.

Grantees who receive funds from a Federal agency and who satisfy audit requirements of the cognizant Federal agency, should submit a copy of the audit report prepared for that Federal agency to the Institute in order to satisfy the provisions of this section. Cognizant Federal agencies do not send reports to the Institute. Therefore, each grantee must send this report directly to the Institute.

2. Resolution and Clearance of Audit Reports

Timely action on recommendations by responsible management officials is an integral part of the effectiveness of an audit. Each grant recipient shall have policies and procedures for acting on audit recommendations by designating officials responsible for: follow-up, maintaining a record of the actions taken on recommendations and time schedules, responding to and acting on audit recommendations, and submitting periodic reports to the Institute on recommendations and actions taken.

3. Consequences of Non-Resolution of Audit Issues

It is the general policy of the State Justice Institute not to make new grant awards to an applicant having an unresolved audit report involving Institute awards. Failure of the grantee organization to resolve audit questions may also result in the suspension of payments for active Institute grants to that organization.

K. Close-Out of Grants

1. Definition

Close-out is a process by which the Institute determines that all applicable administrative and financial actions and all required work of the grant have been completed by both the grantee and the Institute.

2. Grantee Close-Out Requirements

Within 90 days after the end of the date of the grant or any approved extension thereof (revised end date), the following documents must be submitted to the Institute by the grantee other than a recipient of a scholarship under section II.B.2.b.v. These reporting requirements apply at the conclusion of any non-scholarship grant, even when the project will receive renewal funding through a continuation or on-going support grant.

a. *Financial Status Report.* The final report of expenditures must have no unliquidated obligations and must indicate the exact balance of unobligated funds. Any unobligated/unexpended funds will be deobligated from the award by the Institute. Final payment requests for obligations incurred during the award period must be submitted to the Institute prior to the end of the 90-day close-out period.

Grantees of a check-issued basis, who have drawn down funds in excess of their obligations/expenditures, must return any unused funds as soon as it is determined that the funds are not required. In no case should any unused funds remain with the grantee beyond

the submission date of the final financial status report.

b. *Final Progress Report.* This report should describe the project activities during the final calendar quarter of the project and the close-out period, including to whom project products have been disseminated; provide a summary of activities during the entire project; specify whether all the objectives set forth in the approved application or an approved adjustment thereto have been met and, if any of the objectives have not been met, explain the reasons therefor; and discuss what, if anything, could have been done differently that might have enhanced the impact of the project or improved its operation.

3. Extension of Close-Out Period

Upon the written request of the grantee, the Institute may extend the close-out period to assure completion of the Grantee's close-out requirements. Requests for an extension must be submitted at least 14 days before the end of the close-out period and must explain why the extension is necessary and what steps will be taken to assure that all the grantee's responsibilities will be met by the end of the extension period.

XII. Grant Adjustments

All requests for program or budget adjustments requiring Institute approval must be submitted in a timely manner by the project director. All requests for changes from the approved application will be carefully reviewed for both consistency with this Guideline and the enhancement of grant goals and objectives.

A. Grant Adjustments Requiring Prior Written Approval

There are several types of grant adjustments which require the prior written approval of the Institute. Examples of these adjustments include:

1. Budget revisions among direct cost categories which, individually or in the aggregate, exceed or are expected to exceed five percent of the approved original budget or the most recently approved revised budget. For the purposes of this section, the Institute will view budget revisions cumulatively.

a. For package grants, reallocations among budget categories of an individual project within the package that total less than five percent of the approved budget for that project do not require a grant adjustment. However, transfers of funds between projects included in the package require prior written approval by the Institute.

b. For continuation and on-going support grants, funds from the original award may be used during the renewal grant period and funds awarded by a continuation or on-going support grant may be used to cover project-related expenditures incurred during the original award period, with the prior written approval of the Institute.

2. A change in the scope of work to be performed or the objectives of the project (see section XII.D.).

3. A change in the project site.

4. A change in the project period, such as an extension of the grant period and/or extension of the final financial or progress report deadline (see section XII.E.).

5. Satisfaction of special conditions, if required.

6. A change in or temporary absence of the project director (see sections XII.F. and G.).

7. The assignment of an employee or consultant to a key staff position whose qualifications were not described in the application, or a change of a person assigned to a key project staff position (see section X.X.).

8. A change in the name of the grantee organization.

9. A transfer or contracting out of grant-supported activities (see section XII.H.).

10. A transfer of the grant to another recipient.

11. Preagreement costs, the purchase of automated data processing equipment and software, and consultant rates, as specified in section XI.H.2.

12. A change in the nature or number of the products to be prepared or the manner in which a product would be distributed.

B. Request for Grant Adjustments

All grantees and subgrantees must promptly notify the SJI program managers, in writing, of events or proposed changes which may require an adjustment to the approved application. In requesting an adjustment, the grantee must set forth the reasons and basis for the proposed adjustment and any other information the SJI program managers determine would help the Institute's review.

C. Notification of Approval/Disapproval

If the request is approved, the grantee will be sent a Grant Adjustment signed by the Executive Director or his designee. If the request is denied, the grantee will be sent a written explanation of the reasons for the denial.

D. Changes in the Scope of the Grant

A grantee/subgrantee may make minor changes in methodology,

approach, or other aspects of the grant to expedite achievement of the grant's objectives with subsequent notification of the SJI program manager. Major changes in scope, duration, training methodology, or other significant areas must be approved in advance by the Institute.

E. Date Changes

A request to change or extend the grant period must be made at least 30 days in advance of the end date of the grant. A revised task plan should accompany requests for a no-cost extension of the grant period, along with a revised budget if shifts among budget categories will be needed. A request to change or extend the deadline for the final financial report or final progress report must be made at least 14 days in advance of the report deadline (see section XI.K.3.).

F. Temporary Absence of the Project Director

Whenever absence of the project director is expected to exceed a continuous period of one month, the plans for the conduct of the project director's duties during such absence must be approved in advance by the Institute. This information must be provided in a letter signed by an authorized representative of the grantee/subgrantee at least 30 days before the departure of the project director, or as soon as it is known that the project director will be absent. The grant may be terminated if arrangements are not approved in advance by the Institute.

G. Withdrawal of/Change in Project Director

If the project director relinquishes or expects to relinquish active direction of the project, the Institute must be notified immediately. In such cases, if the grantee/subgrantee wishes to terminate the project, the Institute will forward procedural instructions upon notification of such intent. If the grantee wishes to continue the project under the direction of another individual, a statement of the candidate's qualifications should be sent to the Institute for review and approval. The grant may be terminated if the qualifications of the proposed individual are not approved in advance by the Institute.

H. Transferring or Contracting Out of Grant-Supported Activities

A principal activity of the grant-supported project shall not be transferred or contracted out to another organization without specific prior approval by the Institute. All such

arrangements should be formalized in a contract or other written agreement between the parties involved. Copies of the proposed contract or agreement must be submitted for prior approval at the earliest possible time. The contract or agreement must state, at a minimum, the activities to be performed, the time schedule, the policies and procedures to be followed, the dollar limitation of the agreement, and the cost principles to be followed in determining what costs, both direct and indirect, are to be allowed. The contract or other written agreement must not affect the grantee's overall responsibility for the direction of the project and accountability to the Institute.

State Justice Institute Board of Directors

John F. Daffron, Jr., Chairman, Judge, Twelfth Judicial Circuit, Chesterfield, Virginia
 David A. Brock, Vice Chairman, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of New Hampshire, Concord, New Hampshire
 Janice L. Gradwohl, Secretary, Judge (ret.), County Courts, Lincoln, Nebraska
 Terrence B. Adamson, Esq., Executive Committee Member, Kaye, Scholer, Fierman, Hays, and Handler, Washington, DC
 Joseph F. Baca, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico
 Robert N. Baldwin, State Court Administrator, Supreme Court of Virginia, Richmond, Virginia
 Carlos R. Garza, Administrative Judge (ret.), Vienna, Virginia
 Keith McNamara, Esq., McNamara and McNamara, Columbus, Ohio
 Florence Murray, Justice, Rhode Island Supreme Court, Providence, Rhode Island
 Sandra A. O'Connor, State Attorney of Baltimore County, Towson, Maryland
 Janie L. Shores, Justice, Supreme Court of Alabama, Montgomery, Alabama
 David I. Tevelin, Executive Director (ex officio)

David I. Tevelin, *Executive Director.*

Appendix I

List of State Contacts Regarding Administration of Institute Grants to State and Local Courts

Mr. Oliver Gilmore, Administrative Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, 817 South Court Street, Montgomery, Alabama 36130, (205) 834-7990
 Mr. Arthur H. Snowden II, Administrative Director, Alaska Court System, 303 K Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501, (907) 264-0547
 Mr. David K. Byers, Administrative Director, Supreme Court of Arizona, 1501 West

Washington Street, Suite 411, Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3330, (602) 542-9301
 Mr. James D. Gingerich, Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, 625 Marshall, Little Rock, Arkansas 72201-1078, (501) 376-6655
 Mr. William C. Vickrey, State Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts, 303 Second Street, South Tower, San Francisco, California 94107, (415) 396-9100
 Mr. Steven V. Berson, State Court Administrator, Colorado Judicial Department, 1301 Pennsylvania Street, Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80203-2416, (303) 861-1111, ext. 585
 Ms. Faith P. Arkin, Director, External Affairs, Office of the Chief Court Administrator, Drawer N, Station A, Hartford, Connecticut 06106, (203) 566-8210
 Mr. Lowell Groundland, Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, Carvel State Office Building, 820 N. French Street, Wilmington, Delaware 19801, (302) 571-2480
 Mr. Ulysses Hammond, Executive Officer, Courts of the District of Columbia, 500 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, (202) 879-1700
 Mr. Kenneth Palmer, State Courts Administrator, Florida State Courts System, Supreme Court Building, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1900, (904) 922-5081
 Mr. Robert L. Doss, Jr., Director, Administrative Office of the Georgia Courts, The Judicial Council of Georgia, 244 Washington Street, S.W., Suite 500, Atlanta, Georgia 30334-5900, (404) 656-5171
 Mr. Perry C. Taitano, Administrative Director, Superior Court of Guam, Judiciary Building, 110 West O'Brien Drive, Agana, Guam 96920, 011 (671) 472-8961 through 8968
 Sharon Miyoshiro, Administrative Director of the Courts, Office of the Administrative Director, Post Office Box 2560, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813, (808) 539-4900
 Honorable Charles F. McDevitt, Chief Justice, Idaho Supreme Court, 451 West State Street, Boise, Idaho 83720, (208) 334-3464
 Mr. Robert E. Davison, Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, 840 S. Spring Street, Springfield, Illinois 62704, (312) 793-3250
 Mr. Bruce A. Kotzan, Executive Director, Supreme Court of Indiana, State House, Room 323, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204, (317) 232-2542
 Mr. William J. O'Brien, State Court Administrator, Supreme Court of Iowa, State House, Des Moines, Iowa 50319, (515) 281-5241
 Dr. Howard P. Schwartz, Judicial Administrator, Kansas Judicial Center, 301 West 10th Street, Topeka, Kansas 66612, (923) 296-4873
 Ms. Laura Stammel, Assistant Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, 100 Mill Creek Park, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601, (502) 564-2350
 Dr. Hugh M. Collins, Judicial Administrator, Supreme Court of Louisiana, 301 Loyola Avenue, Room 109, New Orleans, Louisiana 70112-1887, (504) 568-5747

- Mr. James T. Glessner, State Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts, P.O. Box 4820, Downtown Station, Portland, Maine 04112, (207) 822-0792
- Ms. Deborah A. Unitus, Assistant State Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts, Rowe Boulevard and Taylor Avenue, Annapolis, Maryland 21401, (301) 974-2141
- Honorable John J. Irwin, Jr., Chief Justice for Administration and Management, The Trial Court, Administrative Office of the Trial Court, Two Center Plaza, Suite 540, Boston, Massachusetts 02108, (617) 742-8575
- Ms. Marilyn K. Hall, State Court Administrator, Michigan Supreme Court, P.O. Box 30048, 611 West Ottawa Street, Lansing, Michigan 48909, (517) 373-0136
- Ms. Sue K. Dosal, State Court Administrator, Supreme Court of Minnesota, 230 State Capitol, St. Paul, Minnesota 55155, (617) 296-2474
- Honorable Leslie Johnson, Director, Center for Court Education and Continuing Studies, P.O. Box 879, Oxford, Mississippi 38677, (601) 232-5955
- Mr. Ron Larkin, State Court Administrator, 1105 R Southwest Blvd., Jefferson City, Missouri 65109, (314) 751-3585
- Mr. Patrick A. Chenovick, State Court Administrator, Montana Supreme Court, Justice Building, Room 315, 215 North Sanders, Helena, Montana 59620-3001, (406) 444-2621
- Mr. Joseph C. Steele, State Court Administrator, Supreme Court of Nebraska, State Capitol Building, Room 1220, Lincoln, Nebraska 68509, (404) 471-2643
- Mr. Donald J. Mello, Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts, Capitol Complex, Carson City, Nevada 89710, (702) 885-5076
- James A. Brickner, Acting State Court Administrator, Supreme Court of New Hampshire, Frank Rowe Kenison Building, Concord, New Hampshire 03301, (603) 271-2419
- Mr. Robert Lipscher, Administrative Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, CN-037, RJH Justice Complex, Trenton, New Jersey 08625, (609) 984-0275
- Honorable E. Leo Milonas, Chief Administrative Judge, Office of Court Administration, 270 Broadway, New York, New York 10007, (212) 587-2004
- Ms. Deborah Kanter, State Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts, Supreme Court of New Mexico, Supreme Court Building, Room 25, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503, (505) 827-4800
- Mr. James C. Drennan, Administrative Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, P.O. Box 2448, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602, (919) 733-7106/7107
- Mr. Keith E. Nelson, State Court Administrator, Supreme Court of North Dakota, State Capitol Building, Bismarck, North Dakota 58505, (701) 224-4216
- Mr. Stephan W. Stover, Administrative Director of the Courts, Supreme Court of Ohio, State Office Tower, 30 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43266-0419, (614) 466-2653
- Mr. Howard W. Conyers Administrative Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, 1925 N. Stiles, Suite 305, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105, (405) 521-2450
- Ms. Kingsley Click, Acting State Court Administrator, Supreme Court of Oregon, Supreme Court Building, Salem, Oregon 97310, (503) 986-5500
- Mr. Thomas B. Darr, Director for Legislative Affairs, Communications and Administration, 5035 Ritter Road, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania 17055, (717) 795-2000
- Dr. Robert C. Harrall, State Court Administrator, Supreme Court of Rhode Island, 250 Benefit Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02903, (401) 277-3266
- Mr. Louis L. Rosen, Director, South Carolina Court Administration, P.O. Box 50447, Columbia, South Carolina 29250, (803) 734-1800
- Honorable Robert A. Miller, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of South Dakota, 500 East Capitol Avenue, Pierre, South Dakota 57501, (605) 773-4885
- Mr. Charles E. Ferrell, Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Tennessee, Supreme Court Building, Room 422, Nashville, Tennessee 37219, (615) 741-2687
- Administrative Director, Office of Court Administration of the Texas Judicial System, P.O. Box 12066, Austin, Texas 78711, (512) 463-1625
- Mr. Ronald W. Gibson, State Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts, 230 South 500 East, Salt Lake City, Utah 84102, (801) 533-6371
- Mr. Thomas J. Lehner, Court Administrator, Supreme Court of Vermont, 111 State Street, Montpelier, Vermont 05602, (802) 828-3281
- Ms. Viola E. Smith, Clerk of the Court/Administrator, Territorial Court of the Virgin Islands, P.O. Box 70, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00801, (809) 774-6680, ext. 248
- Mr. Robert N. Baldwin, Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Virginia, Administrative Offices, 100 North Ninth Street, 3rd Floor, Richmond, Virginia 23219, (804) 786-6455
- Ms. Mary C. McQueen, Administrator for the Courts, Supreme Court of Washington, Highways-Licensing Building, 6th Floor, 12th & Washington, Olympia, Washington 98504, (206) 753-5780
- Mr. Ted J. Philyaw, Administrative Director of the Courts, Administrative Office, 402-E State Capitol, Charleston, West Virginia 25305, (304) 348-0145
- Mr. J. Denis Moran, Director of State Courts, P.O. Box 1688, Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1688, (608) 266-6828
- Mr. Robert L. Duncan, Court Coordinator, Supreme Court Building, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002, (307) 777-7581
- Appendix II**
SJI Libraries, Designated Sites and Contacts (August 1995)
- State:* Alabama.
Location: Supreme Court Library.
Contact: Mr. William C. Younger, State Law Librarian, Alabama Supreme Court Bldg., 445 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Alabama 36130, (205) 242-4347.
- State:* Alaska.
Location: Anchorage Law Library.
Contact: Ms. Cynthia S. Petumenos, State Law Librarian, Alaska Court Libraries, 303 K Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501, (907) 264-0583.
State: Arizona.
Location: State Law Library.
Contact: Ms. Sharon Womack, Director, Department of Library & Archives, State Capitol, 1700 West Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, (602) 542-4035.
State: Arkansas.
Location: Administrative Office of the Courts.
Contact: Mr. James D. Gingerich, Director, Supreme Court of Arkansas, Administrative Office of the Courts, Justice Building, 625 Marshall, Little Rock, Arkansas 72201-1078, (501) 376-6655.
State: California.
Location: Administrative Office of the Courts.
Contact: Mr. William C. Vickrey, State Court Administrator, Administrative Office of the Courts, 303 Second Street, South Tower, San Francisco, California 94107, (415) 396-9100.
State: Colorado.
Location: Supreme Court Library.
Contact: Ms. Frances Campbell, Supreme Court Law Librarian, Colorado State Judicial Building, 2 East 14th Avenue, Denver, Colorado 80203, (303) 837-3720.
State: Connecticut.
Location: State Library.
Contact: Mr. Richard Akeroyd, State Librarian, 231 Capital Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut 06106, (203) 566-4301.
State: Delaware.
Location: Administrative Office of the Courts.
Contact: Mr. Michael E. McLaughlin, Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, Carvel State Office Building, 820 North French Street, 11th Floor, P.O. Box 8911, Wilmington, Delaware 19801, (302) 571-2480.
State: District of Columbia.
Location: Executive Office, District of Columbia Courts.
Contact: Mr. Ulysses Hammond, Executive Officer, Courts of the District of Columbia, 500 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, (202) 879-1700.
State: Florida.
Location: Administrative Office of the Courts.
Contact: Mr. Kenneth Palmer, State Court Administrator, Florida State Courts System, Supreme Court Building, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1900, (904) 488-8621.
State: Georgia.
Location: Administrative Office of the Courts.
Contact: Mr. Robert L. Doss, Jr., Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, The Judicial Council of Georgia, 244 Washington Street, S.W., Suite 550, Atlanta, Georgia 30334, (404) 656-5171.
State: Hawaii.
Location: Supreme Court Library.
Contact: Ms. Ann Koto, Acting Law Librarian, Supreme Court Law Library, P.O. Box 2560, Honolulu, Hawaii 96804, (808) 548-4605.

State: Idaho.
Location: AOC Judicial Education Library/
State
Law Library in Boise.

Contact: Ms. Laura Pershing, State Law Librarian, Idaho State Law Library, Supreme Court Building, 451 West State Street, Boise, Idaho 83720, (208) 334-3316.

State: Illinois.

Location: Supreme Court Library.

Contact: Ms. Brenda I. Larison, Supreme Court Library, Supreme Court Building, Springfield, Illinois 62701-1791, (217) 782-2424.

State: Indiana.

Location: Supreme Court Library.

Contact: Ms. Constance Matts, Supreme Court Librarian, Supreme Court Library, State House, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204, State House, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204, (317) 232-2557.

State: Iowa.

Location: Administrative Office of the Court.

Contact: Mr. Jerry K. Beatty, Executive Director, Judicial Education and Planning, Administrative Office of the Courts, State Capital Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319, (515) 281-8279.

State: Kansas.

Location: Supreme Court Library.

Contact: Mr. Fred Knecht, Law Librarian, Kansas Supreme Court Library, 301 West 10th Street, Topeka, Kansas 66613, (913) 296-3257.

State: Kentucky.

Location: State Law Library.

Contact: Ms. Sallie Howard, State Law Librarian, State Law Library, State Capital, Room 200-A, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601, (502) 564-4848.

State: Louisiana.

Location: State Law Library.

Contact: Ms. Carol Billings, Director, Louisiana Law Library, 301 Loyola Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70112, (504) 568-5705.

State: Maine.

Location: State Law and Legislative Reference Library.

Contact: Ms. Lynn E. Randall, State Law Librarian, State House Station 43, Augusta, Maine 04333, (207) 289-1600.

State: Maryland.

Location: State Law Library.

Contact: Mr. Michael S. Miller, Director, Maryland State Law Library, Court of Appeal Building, 361 Rowe Boulevard, Annapolis, Maryland 21401, (301) 974-3395.

State: Massachusetts.

Location: Middlesex Law Library.

Contact: Ms. Sandra Lindheimer, Librarian, Middlesex Law Library, Superior Court House, 40 Thorndike Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02141, (617) 494-4148.

State: Michigan.

Location: Michigan Judicial Institute.

Contact: Mr. Dennis W. Catlin, Executive Director, Michigan Judicial Institute, 222 Washington Square North, P.O. Box 30205, Lansing, Michigan 48909, (517) 334-7804.

State: Minnesota.

Location: State Law Library (Minnesota Judicial Center).

Contact: Mr. Marvin R. Anderson, State Law Librarian, Supreme Court of Minnesota, 25 Constitution Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota 55155, (612) 297-2084.

State: Mississippi.

Location: Mississippi Judicial College.

Contact: Mr. Rick D. Patt, Staff Attorney, Mississippi Judicial College, 6th Floor, 3825 Ridgewood, Jackson, Mississippi 39211, (601) 982-6590.

State: Montana.

Location: State Law Library.

Contact: Ms. Judith Meadows, State Law Librarian, State Law Library of Montana, Justice Building, 215 North Sanders, Helena, Montana 59620, (406) 444-3660.

State: Nebraska.

Location: Administrative Office of the Courts.

Contact: Mr. Joseph C. Steele, State Court Administrator, Supreme Court of Nebraska, Administrative Office of the Courts, P.O. Box 98910, Lincoln, Nebraska 68509-8910, (402) 471-3730.

State: Nevada.

Location: National Judicial College.

Contact: Dean V. Robert Paymat, National Judicial College, Judicial College Building, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada 89550, (702) 784-6747.

State: New Jersey.

Location: New Jersey State Library.

Contact: Mr. Robert L. Bland, Law Coordinator, State of New Jersey, Department of Education, State Library, 185 West State Street, CN520, Trenton, New Jersey 08625, (609) 292-6230.

State: New Mexico.

Location: Supreme Court Library.

Contact: Mr. Thaddeus Bejnar, Librarian, Supreme Court Library, Post Office Drawer L, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504, (505) 827-4850.

State: New York.

Location: Supreme Court Library.

Contact: Ms. Susan M. Wood, Esq., Principal Law Librarian, New York State Supreme Court Law Library, Onondaga County Court House, Syracuse, New York 13202, (315) 435-2063.

State: North Carolina.

Location: Supreme Court Library.

Contact: Ms. Louise Stafford, Librarian, North Carolina Supreme Court Library, P.O. Box 28006 (by courier) 500 Justice Building, 2 East Morgan Street, Raleigh, North Carolina 27601, (919) 733-3425.

State: North Dakota.

Location: Supreme Court Library.

Contact: Ms. Marcella Kramer, Assistant Law Librarian, Supreme Court Law Library, 600 East Boulevard Avenue, 2nd Floor, Judicial Wing, Bismarck, North Dakota 58505-0530, (701) 224-2229.

State: Northern Mariana Islands.

Location: Supreme Court of the Northern Mariana Islands.

Contact: Honorable Jose S. Dela Cruz, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the Northern Mariana Islands, P.O. Box 2165, Saipan, MP 96950, (607) 234-5275.

State: Ohio.

Location: Supreme Court Library.

Contact: Mr. Paul S. Fu, Law Librarian, Supreme Court Law Library, Supreme Court of Ohio, 30 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43266-0419, (614) 466-2044.

State: Oklahoma.

Location: Administrative Office of the Courts.

Contact: Mr. Howard W. Conyers, Director, Administrative Office of the Courts, 1915 North Stiles, Suite 305, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105, (405) 521-2450.

State: Oregon.

Location: Administrative Office of the Courts.

Contact: Mr. R. William Linden, Jr., State Court Administrator, Supreme Court of Oregon, Supreme Court Building, Salem, Oregon 97310, (503) 378-6046.

State: Pennsylvania.

Location: State Library of Pennsylvania.

Contact: Ms. Betty Lutz, Head, Acquisitions Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Technical Services, G46 Forum Building, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105, (717) 787-4440.

State: Puerto Rico.

Location: Office of Court Administration.

Contact: Mr. Alfredo Rivera-Mendoza, Esq., Director, Area of Planning and Management, Office of Court Administration, P.O. Box 917, Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00919.

State: Rhode Island.

Location: State Law Library.

Contact: Mr. Kendall F. Svengalis, Law Librarian, Licht Judicial Complex, 250 Benefit Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02903, (401) 277-3275.

State: South Carolina.

Location: Coleman Karesh Law Library

(University of South Carolina School of Law).

Contact: Mr. Bruce S. Johnson, Law Librarian, Associate Professor of Law, Coleman Karesh Law Library, U.S.C. Law Center, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina 29208, (803) 777-5944.

State: Tennessee.

Location: Tennessee State Law Library.

Contact: Ms. Donna C. Wair, Librarian, Tennessee State Law Library, Supreme Court Building, 401 Seventh Avenue N, Nashville, Tennessee 37243-0609, (615) 741-2016.

State: Texas.

Location: State Law Library.

Contact: Ms. Kay Schleuter, Director, State Law Library, P.O. Box 12367, Austin, Texas 78711, (512) 463-1722.

State: U.S. Virgin Islands.

Location: Library of the Territorial Court of the Virgin Islands (St. Thomas).

Contact: Librarian, The Library, Territorial Court of the Virgin Islands, Post Office Box 70, Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands 00804.

State: Utah.

Location: Utah State Judicial Administration Library.

Contact: Ms. Jennifer Bullock, Librarian, Utah State Judicial Administration Library, 230 South 500 East, Suite 300, Salt Lake City, Utah 84102, (801) 533-6371.

State: Vermont.

Location: Supreme Court of Vermont.

Contact: Mr. Thomas J. Lehner, Court Administrator, Supreme Court of Vermont, 111 State Street, c/o Pavilion Office Building, Montpelier, Vermont 05602, (802) 828-3278.

State: Virginia.

Location: Administrative Office of the Courts.

Contact: Mr. Robert N. Baldwin, Executive Secretary, Supreme Court of Virginia, Administrative Offices, 100 North Ninth Street, Third Floor, Richmond, Virginia 23219, (804) 786-6455.

State: Washington.

Location: Washington State Law Library.

Contact: Ms. Deborah Norwood, State Law Librarian, Washington State Law Library, Temple of Justice, Mail Stop AV-02, Olympia, Washington 98504-0502, (206) 357-2146.

State: West Virginia.

Location: Administrative Office of the Courts.

Contact: Mr. Richard H. Rosswurm, Deputy Administrative Director for Judicial Education, West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, State Capitol, Capitol E-400, Charleston, West Virginia 25305, (304) 348-0145.

State: Wisconsin.

Location: State Law Library.

Contact: Ms. Marcia Koslov, State Law Librarian, State Law Library, 310 E State Capitol, P.O. Box 7881, Madison, Wisconsin 53707, (608) 266-1424.

State: Wyoming.

Location: Wyoming State Law Library.

Contact: Ms. Kathy Carlson, Law Librarian, Wyoming State Law Library, Supreme Court Building, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002, (307) 777-7509.

National: American Judicature Society.

Contact: Ms. Clara Wells, Assistant for Information and Library Services, 25 East Washington Street, Suite 1600, Chicago, Illinois 60602, (312) 558-6900.

National: National Center for State Courts.

Contact: Ms. Peggy Rogers, Acquisitions/Serials Librarian, 300 Newport Avenue, Williamsburg, Virginia 23187-8798, (804) 253-2000.

National: Michigan State University.

Contact: Dr. John K. Hudzik, Project Director, Judicial Education, Reference, Information and Technical Transfer Project (JERITT), Michigan State University, 560 Baker Hall, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, (517) 353-8603.

(Form S1)

Appendix III

State Justice Institute—Scholarship Application

This application does not serve as a registration for the course. Please contact the education provider.

Applicant Information

1. Applicant Name: _____
(Last) (First) (M)

2. Position: _____

3. Name of Court: _____

4. Address: _____
Street/P.O. Box

City State Zip Code
Street/P.O. Box

City State Zip Code

5. Telephone No. _____

6. Congressional District: _____

Program Information

7. Course Name: _____

8. Course Dates: _____

9. Course Provider: _____

10. Location Offered: _____

Estimated Expenses

(Please note, scholarships are limited to tuition and transportation expenses to and from the site of the course up to a maximum of \$1,500.)

Tuition: \$ _____

Amount Requested: \$ _____

Transportation: \$ _____

(Airfare, trainfare, or if you plan to drive, an amount equal to the approximate distance and mileage rate.)

Additional Information

Please attach a current resume or professional summary, and answer the following questions. (You may attach additional pages if necessary.)

1. How will taking this course benefit you, your court, and the State's courts generally?

2. Is there any education or training currently available through your State on this topic?

3. How will you apply what you have learned? Please include any plans you may have to develop/teach a course on this topic in your jurisdiction/State, provide in-service training, or otherwise disseminate what you have learned to colleagues.

4. Are State or local funds available to support your attendance at the proposed course? If so, what amount(s) will be provided?

5. How long have you served as a judge or court manager?

6. How long do you anticipate serving as a judge or court manager, assuming reelection or reappointment?

7. How long has it been since you attended a non-mandatory continuing professional education program?

Statement of Applicant's Commitment

If a scholarship is awarded, I will submit an evaluation of the educational program to the State Justice Institute and to the Chief Justice of my State.

Signature _____

Date _____

Please return this form and Form S-2 to: State Justice Institute, 1650 King Street, Suite 600, Alexandria, Virginia 22314.

(Form S2)

State Justice Institute—Scholarship Application—Concurrence

I, _____

Name of Chief Justice (or Chief Justice's Designee)

have reviewed the application for a scholarship to attend the program entitled

prepared by, _____
Name of Applicant

and concur in its submission to the State Justice Institute. The applicant's participation in the program would benefit the State; the applicant's absence to attend the program would not present an undue hardship to the court; and receipt of a scholarship would not diminish the amount of funds made available by the State for judicial education.

Signature _____

Name _____

Title _____

Date _____

Form E

Appendix IV

State Justice Institute—Project Budget

Category	SJI funds	Cash match	In-kind match
Personnel	\$	\$	\$
Fringe Benefits	\$	\$	\$
Consultant/Contractual	\$	\$	\$
Travel	\$	\$	\$
Equipment	\$	\$	\$
Supplies	\$	\$	\$
Telephone	\$	\$	\$
Postage	\$	\$	\$
Printing/Photocopying	\$	\$	\$
Audit	\$	\$	\$
Other	\$	\$	\$

Category	SJI funds	Cash match	In-kind match
Indirect Costs (%)	\$	\$	\$
Total	\$	\$	\$
Project Total	\$		

Financial assistance has been or will be sought for this project from the following other sources:

* Concept papers requesting an accelerated award, Curriculum Adaptation grant requests, and Technical Assistance grant requests should be accompanied by a budget narrative explaining the basis for each line-item listed in the proposed budget.

Form B (Instructions on Reverse Side)

Appendix V

State Justice Institute—Certificate of State Approval

The _____
Name of State Supreme Court or Designated Agency or Council
has reviewed the application entitled _____

Prepared by _____
Name of Applicant

approves its submission to the State Justice Institute, and

[] agrees to receive and administer and be accountable for all funds awarded by the Institute pursuant to the application.

[] designates _____
Name of Trial or Appellate Court or Agency

as the entity to receive, administer, and be accountable for all funds awarded by the Institute pursuant to the application.

Signature _____

Name _____

Title _____

Date _____

Instructions—Form B

The State Justice Institute Act requires that: Each application for funding by a State or local court shall be approved, consistent with State law, by the State's Supreme Court, or its designated agency or council, which shall receive, administer, and be accountable for all funds awarded by the Institute to such courts. 42 U.S.C. 10705(b)(4).

Form B should be signed by the Chief Judge or Chief Justice of the State Supreme Court, or by the director of the designated or chair of the designated council. If the designated agency or council differs from the designee listed in Appendix I to the State Justice Institute Grant Guideline, evidence of the new or additional designation should be attached.

The term "State Supreme Court" refers to the court of last resort of a State. "Designated

agency or council" refers to the office or judicial body which is authorized under State law or by delegation from the State Supreme Court to approve applications for funds and to receive, administer and be accountable for those funds.

Appendix VI—Illustrative List of Model Curricula

The following list includes examples of curricula that have been developed with support from SJI, and that might be—or in some cases have been—successfully adapted for State-based education programs for judges and other court personnel. A list of all SJI-supported education projects is available from the Institute. Please also check with the JERITT project (517/353-8603) and with your State SJI-designated library (see Appendix II) for information on other curricula that may be appropriate for your State's needs.

"Manual for Judicial Writing Workshop for Trial Judges" (University of Georgia/Colorado Judicial Department: SJI-87-018/019)

"Judicial Education Curriculum: Teaching Guides on Court Security, and Jury Management and Impanelment" (Institute for Court Management/National Center for State Courts: SJI-88-053)

"Caseflow Management Principles and Practices" (Institute for Court Management/National Center for State Courts: SJI-87-056)

"Adjudication of Farm Credit Issues" (Rural Justice Center: SJI-87-059)

"A National Program for Reporting on the Courts and the Law" (American Judicature Society: SJI-88-014)

"Model Judicial Mediation Training Program" (American Arbitration Association: SJI-88-078)

"Domestic Violence: A Curriculum for Rural Courts" from "A Project to Improve Access to Rural Courts for Victims of Domestic Violence" (Rural Justice Center: SJI-88-081)

"Career Writing Program for Appellate Judges" (American Academy of Judicial Education: SJI-88-086-P92-1)

"Judges Media Relations Seminar" from "A Statewide Program for Improving Media and Judicial Relations" (Minnesota Supreme Court: SJI-89-024)

"Minding the Courts into the Twentieth Century" (Michigan Judicial Institute: SJI-89-029)

"Innovative Juvenile and Family Court Training" (Youth Law Center: SJI-87-060, SJI-89-039)

"Troubled Families, Troubled Judges" (Brandeis University: SJI-89-071)

"Judicial Settlement Manual" from "Judicial Settlement: Development of a New Course Module, Film, and Instructional Manual" (National Judicial College: SJI-89-089)

"Judicial Training Materials on Spousal Support"; "Family Violence: Effective Judicial Intervention"; "Judicial Training Materials on Child Custody and Visitation" from "Enhancing Gender Fairness in the State Courts" (Women Judges' Fund for Justice: SJI-89-062)

"Introduction to the Jurisprudence of Victims' Rights" from "Victim Rights and the Judiciary: A Training and Implementation Project" (National Organization for Victim Assistance: SJI-89-083)

"Fundamental Skills Training Curriculum for Juvenile Probation Officers" (National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges: SJI-90-017)

"Pre-Bench Training for New Judges" (American Judicature Society: SJI-90-028)

"A Manual for Workshops on Processing Felony Dispositions in Limited Jurisdiction Courts" (National Center for State Courts: SJI-90-052)

"The Crucial Nature of Attitudes and Values in Judicial Education" (National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges: SJI-90-058)

"Policy Alternatives and Current Court Practices in the Special Problem Areas of Jurisdiction Over the Family" from "Juvenile and Family Court Key Issues Curriculum Enhancement Project" (National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges: SJI-90-066)

"Gender Fairness Faculty Development Workshops" (National Judicial College: SJI-90-077)

"A Unified Orientation and Mentoring Program for New Judges of All Arizona Trial Courts" (Arizona Supreme Court: SJI-90-078)

"National Guardianship Monitoring Program" from "AARP Volunteers: A Resource for State Guardianship Services" (Association for the Advancement of Retired Persons: SJI-91-013)

"Medicine, Ethics, and the Law: Preconception to Birth" (Women Judges Fund for Justice: SJI-89-062, SJI-91-019)

"The Leadership Institute in Judicial Education" and "The Advanced Leadership Institute in Judicial Education" (Appalachian State University: SJI-91-021)

"Managing Trials Effectively: A Program for State Trial Judges" (National Center for State Courts/National Judicial College: SJI-87-066/067, SJI-89-054/055, SJI-91-025/026)

"Faculty Development Instructional Program" from "Curriculum Review" (National Judicial College: SJI-91-039)

"Legal Institute for Special and Limited Jurisdiction Judges" (National Judicial College: SJI-89-043, SJI-91-040)

"Managerial Budgeting in the Courts"; "Performance Appraisal in the Courts";

- "Managing Change in the Courts"; all three from "Broadening Educational Opportunities for Judges and Other Key Court Personnel" (Institute for Court Management/National Center for State Courts: SJI-91-043)
- "An Approach to Long-Range Strategic Planning in the Courts" (Center for Public Policy Studies: SJI-91-045)
- "Implementing the Court-Related Needs of Older People and Persons with Disabilities: An Instructional Guide" (National Judicial College: SJI-91-054)
- "National Judicial Response to Domestic Violence: Civil and Criminal Curricula" (Family Violence Prevention Fund: SJI-87-061, SJI-89-070, SJI-91-055)
- "Access to Justice: The Impartial Jury and the Justice System" and "When Justice is Up to You" from "Pre-Juror Education Project" (Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area: SJI-91-071)
- "Judicial Review of Administrative Agency Decisions" National Judicial College: SJI-91-080)
- "Strengthening Rural Courts of Limited Jurisdiction" and "Team Training for Judges and Clerks" from "Rural Limited Jurisdiction Court Curriculum Project (Rural Justice Center: SJI-90-014, SJI-91-082)
- "Medical/Legal Issues in Juvenile and Family Courts" (National Council for Juvenile and Family Court Judges: SJI-91-091)
- "Good Times, Bad Times: Drugs, Youth, and the Judiciary" (Professional Development and Training Center, Inc.: SJI-91-095)
- "Judicial Response to Stranger and Nonstranger Rape and Sexual Assault" (National Judicial Education Program to Promote Equality for Women and Men: SJI-92-003)
- "Interbranch Relations Workshop" (Ohio Judicial Conference: SJI-92-079)
- "Legal Institute for Non-Law Trained Judges" (Arizona Supreme Court: SJI-92-146)
- "New Employee Orientation Facilitators Guide" from "The Minnesota Comprehensive Curriculum Design and Training Program for Court Personnel" (Minnesota Supreme Court: SJI-92-155)
- "Magistrates Correspondence Course" (Alaska Court System: SJI-92-156)
- "Southwestern Judges' Conference on Environmental Law" (University of New Mexico: SJI-92-162)
- "Cultural Diversity Awareness in Nebraska Courts" from "Native American Alternatives to Incarceration Project" (Nebraska Urban Indian Health Coalition: SJI-93-028)
- "A Videotape Training Program in Ethics and Professional Conduct for Nonjudicial Court Personnel" (American Judicature Society: SJI-93-068)
- "Integrating Trial Management and Caseflow Management" (Justice Management Institute: SJI-93-214)
- "Civil and Criminal Procedural Innovations for Appellate Courts" (National Center for State Courts: SJI-94-002)
- "Comprehensive ADR Curriculum for Judges" (American Bar Association SJI-95-002)

[FR Doc. 95-21242 Filed 8-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-SC-P-M