



Domestic Research & Evaluation

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS: Testing Phase for the Juvenile Drug Treatment Court (JDTC) Guidelines

Release Date:	September 29, 2017
Questions Due:	October 9, 2017
Intent to Propose Date:	October 10, 2017
Application Due Date:	October 20, 2017

SEPTEMBER 2017

Contents

	Page
Background	1
Program-Specific Information.....	1
Purpose.....	1
Category 1.....	2
Category 2.....	5
Deliverables	9
Eligibility Information.....	9
Proposal Process and Deadlines	9
Cancellations	10
Award Basis.....	10
Incurred Expenses	10
Mandatory Contractual Terms	10
Conflict of Interest Affidavit and Disclosure.....	10
Federal Funding Acknowledgement	10
Awards	11
Proposal Format.....	11
Cost Proposal.....	12
Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative	12
Application Formatting.....	13
Evaluation and Selection Criteria	13
Additional Requirements	13
Attachments	
Attachment A. Conflict of Interest and Certification	A-1
Attachment B. Federal Agency Requirements	B-1

Background

American Institutes for Research (AIR) is issuing this Request for Proposals on a competitive basis for work on an initiative that is funded under a cooperative agreement issued by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to support the development and testing of research-informed guidelines for juvenile drug treatment courts (JDTCs)¹ that promote effective practice and quality service delivery for juveniles with substance use disorders. The OJJDP cooperative agreement with AIR includes two phases: (1) to develop guidelines and (2) to test the guidelines. AIR has completed the first phase of working with OJJDP to develop guidelines for JDTCs that are evidence- and research-informed, have practical and operational application, and build upon previous knowledge and work. AIR is seeking qualified applicants to assist AIR with the second (testing) phase of the initiative, as further outlined in the Scope of Work.

Program-Specific Information

As an initial step in developing these guidelines, Tanner-Smith, Lipsey, and Wilson (2015) conducted a meta-analysis to synthesize the existing research evidence on juvenile drug treatment courts.² The authors synthesized results from 46 randomized and controlled quasi-experimental evaluation studies that reported on the effects of juvenile drug courts compared to traditional court processing. In particular, the authors considered recidivism (for delinquent offenses in general and for drug offenses specifically) and drug use outcomes. The results indicated that, overall, juvenile drug courts were not found to be categorically more or less effective than traditional court processing for reducing recidivism or drug use. Nonetheless, the great variability in effects across the various studies suggests that effective drug courts exist, but no distinctive characteristics of the more effective courts could be identified from the descriptive information provided in the generally low-quality research studies currently available. The lack of high-quality juvenile drug court evaluations identified in the systematic review highlights the need for more rigorous evaluations of juvenile drug courts in the field.

Purpose

AIR seeks to engage the services of third-party researchers to design and carry out research activities (i.e., design of measures, data collection, data analysis) as part of a larger strategy to evaluate the implementation of [the Juvenile Drug Treatment Court Guidelines](#). Data and information collected from the subawardee(s) will be provided to AIR so that the findings from this research may be integrated with findings from other studies funded by AIR in later solicitations. The overall results from the testing phase studies will inform potential modifications to the guidelines, as appropriate.

¹ For the purposes of this solicitation, the term “juvenile drug treatment court” means a specially designed court calendar or docket for youth with substance use or co-occurring substance use and mental health disorders. JDTCs participating in the evaluations described in this solicitation are expected to bring their current practices into alignment with the JDTC Guidelines and to work closely with OJJDP’s training and technical assistance providers in the alignment process.

² Tanner-Smith, E.E., Lipsey, M.W., and Wilson, D.B. 2015. *Meta-Analysis of Research on the Effectiveness of Juvenile Drug Courts*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University, Peabody Research Institute.

AIR seeks to make at least one subaward for third-party vendors to carry out the studies described in Category 1 and Category 2 below. Under Category 1, third-party researchers will conduct a randomized controlled comparative effectiveness trial examining the outcomes for youth served by JDTCs aligned with the guidelines compared with outcomes for youth served in traditional juvenile courts. Three JDTCs have been funded by OJJDP under a [solicitation](#) released earlier this year to take part in this study. Currently, efforts are underway to recruit up to 12 additional courts working on OJJDP-funded projects to participate in either the study described in Category 1 or the study described in Category 2.

Applicants under this solicitation should anticipate that the Category 1 evaluation will include three or more JDTCs, and the Category 2 evaluation will involve up to 12 JDTCs. The final counts will be determined by the time of the award under this solicitation. AIR expects to make separate awards under each category or one award in which the researchers will conduct both Category 1 and Category 2 studies. Applicants should be explicit whether they are bidding for Category 1, Category 2, or both studies.

Applicants should note that the Category 1 and Category 2 studies are intended to address very similar research questions, and as such if two separate awards are made, AIR will expect the two evaluation teams to work collaboratively with one another so that, to the greatest extent possible, consistency will be maintained in the measures that are used. In addition, as these studies are key elements in the initiative to develop and test the JDTC Guidelines, AIR expects that the evaluation teams will work collaboratively with AIR, OJJDP, and the training and technical assistance providers.

Category 1

AIR has established the following parameters of the evaluation, to which any recipient of an award under this solicitation (referred to here as the evaluation team) will be expected to abide:

- The purpose of the proposed study is to evaluate the comparative effectiveness of juvenile court programs, namely JDTCs implementing the JDTC Guidelines compared with traditional juvenile courts serving youth with substance use disorders. Within the context of this study, the evaluation team will also examine whether (and how) the guidelines appear to be associated with more positive JDTC outcomes.
- The primary research question for this study is whether youth with substance use disorders experience more positive outcomes if assigned to a JDTC rather than to a traditional (i.e., non-JDTC) juvenile court program. Additional research questions to be addressed include the following:
 - Are different interpretations of the guidelines by the courts associated with better outcomes?
 - Are there certain guidelines that, if present, are associated with better outcomes?
 - Are there guidelines that, if absent, do not seem to be associated with worse outcomes (i.e., they are not necessary)?
 - The guidelines are organized under seven broad objectives. Do some objectives have a stronger association with outcomes than others?

- Is the “counterfactual” of various guidelines correlated with worse outcomes? (For example, one of the guidelines is that not only should service providers use evidence-based practices, but also the staff need to be trained on such practices and fidelity to model is important. What happens in the case where the service provider is using an evidence-based practice but implementation is poor? Is that better, the same, or worse than not using evidence-based treatments at all?)
- The study design is expected to be a multisite, randomized controlled comparative effectiveness trial, to ensure a high quality of research evidence (i.e., scientifically rigorous) while still allowing for the study of courts in real-world settings.
- Regarding enrollment and randomization, youth will be assigned randomly to one of two types of courts in a single court jurisdiction: a traditional juvenile court or a JDTC. In some cases, it will be acceptable if the “jurisdiction” is a collaboration of more than one juvenile court agency in which each individual agency has both a juvenile court and JDTC available. The JDTC would be established already and would need to agree to implement the new JDTC Guidelines. Staffing and external partners that are shared between the JDTC and non-JDTC juvenile court will be taken into account to reduce potential contamination.
- On the basis of expected effect sizes and statistical power, AIR anticipates that the jurisdictions would commit to recruit at least 150 eligible youth over the course of a 2-year period, with approximately half being assigned to a JDTC condition and the other half assigned to traditional processing. The eligibility criteria for participants would need to be consistent with the criteria outlined in the guidelines (i.e., eligible youth would be older than 14 years of age, have a substance use disorder, be assessed at medium to high risk for reoffending) and consistent with federal funding requirements (i.e., eligible youth must not have a violent offense).
- The study will collect a mixture of descriptive, implementation, process, and outcome measures. AIR anticipates that the descriptive, implementation, and process measures will include:
 - Background information on each youth (e.g., demographic characteristics, prior history, details from risk assessments, documentation of substance use disorder)
 - Outcomes for each youth, as shown in the next section
 - For the JDTC, documentation of the implementation of each guideline
 - For each youth, documentation of participation throughout the court process
- AIR anticipates that the outcome measures will examine impact and potential mediators and moderators of impact. This is anticipated to include:
 - Recidivism and substance use
 - Indicators of academic (grades, attendance/truancy) and mental well-being (mental health symptomatology) and relationship with parents and peers
 - Equity data that examine outcomes for all genders; racial and ethnic groups; and youth who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, intersex, and gender nonconforming (LGBTQI–GNC) and Two-Spirit

- Proximal outcomes that might mediate the effects of the JDTC on the more distal outcomes identified above, such as the stages-of-change model (e.g., do youth move from precontemplation or contemplation stages to later ones); various attitude changes about antisocial behavior; drug use; and delinquent peers
- Other potential mediating variables, based on the theory of change for JDTCs
- The quantitative outcome data analysis will compare the outcomes of youth participants in the JDTC programs with those who are processed through traditional juvenile courts. The study will involve up to four separate court agencies or collaboratives serving eligible youth randomly assigned to the JDTC (i.e., treatment) condition. Consequently, the study design parameters are those of a two-level, multisite, cluster randomized trial. In this case, participants (Level 1) are clustered within court agencies (Level 2). The nested structure of the data will necessitate the use of statistical techniques (e.g., multilevel modeling, cluster robust standard errors) that will account for interdependencies within the data.
- Data collection should consist of a combination of administrative data and document collection and surveys developed for the study. It is expected that the evaluation team will work with the court’s research liaison at each site to ensure that systems are in place to capture the data, as indicated here. This may include enhancing the capacity of the local data management system or the provision of a database for the purposes of this study. The evaluation team shall be responsible for ensuring data integrity so that valid and reliable data are collected.
- The evaluation team shall comply with all federal human subjects and privacy protections, including but not limited to securing informed consent from all participants. The evaluation team also shall be responsible for securing approval from AIR’s Institutional Review Board (IRB).
- The evaluation team will participate with a research advisory group of representatives of key stakeholder groups involved at all levels of JDTC programs, including court administrators; judges; other court personnel (e.g., probation officers, prosecutors, and public defenders); treatment program staff; parents/guardians; and youth. As was true during the development of the guidelines, AIR will convene the research advisory group to provide oversight and input on the plans for and the results of the evaluation. Federal agencies and staff will also be engaged and consulted.
- Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be expected to prepare for submission to the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) all data sets that result in whole or in part from the work funded by the award, along with associated files and any documentation necessary for future efforts by others to reproduce the project’s findings and/or to extend the scientific value of the data set through secondary analysis.

The period from November 1, 2017, to March 31, 2018, is designated as a planning and start-up phase before the start of the evaluation on April 1, 2018. The evaluation team shall plan to use that period for planning for the evaluation. Milestones during the planning phase include:

- Submission of Preparation Plan by December 1, 2017, for the evaluation that lays out plans and timelines for working with the sites to get ready for the study, and the development of instruments and protocols
 - First draft of Evaluation Plan due to AIR by January 22, 2018
- Final version of Evaluation Plan delivered to AIR by March 1, 2018
 - Final distribution of study materials, final steps in IRB approval, preparation of instruments for administration before April 1, 2018
- The evaluation team shall provide training to the sites on the research activities before April 1, 2018.

In their proposals to OJJDP, the funded sites will have provided a plan (to be provided to the evaluation team) for each of the following:

- Work with the researchers to enroll and randomly assign about 150 eligible youth (as defined above) to JDTCs and nonspecialized juvenile courts over a 2-year period. For planning purposes, this process will likely operate differently depending on whether the applicant is a single jurisdiction or a collaboration of jurisdictions:
 - If the proposed jurisdiction or site includes one JDTC and one nonspecialized juvenile court, approximately half of the eligible youth (75) will be assigned randomly to JDTC under this initiative and the other half will be assigned randomly to the nonspecialized juvenile court.
 - If the proposed applicant is a collaboration of jurisdictions, then each jurisdiction will function as above with approximately half of the eligible youth randomly assigned to either JDTCs or nonspecialized juvenile courts within that jurisdiction (not across jurisdictions). The total number of youth across the jurisdictions should still equal at least 150, but each jurisdiction may serve different numbers of youth.
- Work with the researchers to secure informed consent for research participation of all individuals involved and protect their private and identifiable information.
- Participate in the data collection components of an evaluation, which includes:
 - Designating at least one person in the participating site who will be responsible for working with the evaluators and helping with data collection. This person could also serve other roles, such as being a coordinator for the initiative.
 - Completing staff surveys, collecting program materials, completing practice assessments, and facilitating access to administrative data.
 - Making available to the researchers data on the reoffending and recidivism outcomes for each participant in all participating courts.

Category 2

AIR has established the following parameters of the evaluation, to which any recipient of an award under this solicitation (referred to here as the evaluation team) will be expected to abide:

- The purpose of the proposed study is to evaluate the effectiveness of JDTCs implementing the JDTC Guidelines. Within the context of this study, the evaluation team will also examine whether (and how) the guidelines appear to be associated with more positive JDTC outcomes.
- The study design for Category 2 will not be a randomized controlled trial; rather, the study design for Category 2 will be a high-quality quasi-experimental design with a comparison group. This might include, for instance, a quasi-experimental design that uses propensity score matching or balancing procedures to compare outcomes for youth in JDTC(s) versus affiliated traditional juvenile courts serving youth with substance use disorders. Another eligible quasi-experimental design might alternatively use propensity score matching or balancing procedures to compare outcomes on cases from JDTC before and after the release of the JDTC Guidelines. Or the evaluation team may propose another quasi-experimental comparison group design.
- The primary research question for this study is whether youth with substance use disorders experience more positive outcomes if assigned to a JDTC rather than to a traditional (i.e., non-JDTC) juvenile court program. Additional research questions to be addressed include the following:
 - Are different interpretations of the guidelines by the courts associated with better outcomes?
 - Are there certain guidelines that, if present, are associated with better outcomes?
 - Are there guidelines that, if absent, do not seem to be associated with worse outcomes (i.e., they are not necessary)?
 - The guidelines are organized under seven broad objectives. Do some objectives have a stronger association with outcomes than others?
 - Is the “counterfactual” of various guidelines correlated with worse outcomes? (For example, one of the guidelines is that not only should service providers use evidence-based practices but also the staff need to be trained on such practices and fidelity to model is important. What happens in the case where the service provider is using an evidence-based practice but implementation is very poor? Is that better, the same, or worse than not using evidence-based treatments at all?)
- The study design is expected to be a scientifically rigorous, high-quality quasi-experiment to ensure a high quality of research evidence (i.e., scientifically rigorous) while still allowing for the study of courts in real-world settings.
- JDTC would be established already and would need to agree to implement the new JDTC Guidelines.
- On the basis of expected effect sizes and statistical power, AIR anticipates that the up to 12 jurisdictions would commit to provide data on at least 150 eligible youth over the course of a 2-year period, with at least one quarter being assigned to a JDTC program. The eligibility criteria for participants would need to be consistent with the criteria outlined in the guidelines (i.e., eligible youth would be older than 14 years of age, have a substance use disorder, and be assessed to be medium to high risk for reoffending) and

consistent with federal funding requirements (i.e., eligible youth must not have a violent offense).

- The study will collect a mixture of descriptive, implementation, process, and outcome measures. AIR anticipates that the descriptive, implementation, and process measures will include:
 - Background information on each youth (e.g., demographic characteristics, prior history, details from risk assessments, documentation of substance use disorder)
 - Outcomes for each youth, as shown in the next section
 - For JDTC, documentation of the implementation of each guideline
 - For each youth, documentation of participation throughout the court process
- AIR anticipates that the outcome measures will examine impact and potential mediators and moderators of impact. This is anticipated to include:
 - Recidivism and substance use
 - Indicators of academic (grades, attendance/truancy) and mental well-being (mental health symptomatology) and relationship with parents and peers
 - Equity data that examine outcomes for all genders; racial and ethnic groups; and youth who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, intersex, and gender nonconforming (LGBTQI–GNC) and Two-Spirit
 - Proximal outcomes that might mediate the effects of DTC on the more distal outcomes identified above, such as the stages-of-change model (e.g., do youth move from precontemplation or contemplation stages to later ones); various attitude changes about antisocial behavior; drug use; and delinquent peers
 - Other potential mediating variables, based on the theory of change for JDTCs
- Data collection should consist of a combination of administrative data and document collection and surveys developed for the study. It is expected that the evaluation team will work with the court’s research liaison at each site to ensure that systems are in place to capture the data, as indicated here. This may include enhancing the capacity of the local data management system or the provision of a database for the purposes of this study. The evaluation team shall be responsible for ensuring data integrity so that valid and reliable data are collected.
- The evaluation team shall comply with all federal human subjects and privacy protections, including but not limited to securing informed consent from all participants. The evaluation team also shall be responsible for securing approval from AIR’s Institutional Review Board (IRB).
- The evaluation team will participate with a research advisory group of representatives of key stakeholder groups involved at all levels of JDTC programs, including court administrators, judges, other court personnel (probation officers, prosecutors, and public defenders); treatment program staff; parents/guardians; and youth. As was true during the development of the guidelines, AIR will convene the research advisory group to provide

oversight and input on the plans for and the results of the evaluation. Federal agencies and staff also will be engaged and consulted.

- Any recipient of an award under this solicitation will be expected to prepare for submission to the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) all data sets that result in whole or in part from the work funded by the award, along with associated files and any documentation necessary for future efforts by others to reproduce the project's findings and/or to extend the scientific value of the data set through secondary analysis.

The period from November 1, 2017, to March 31, 2018, is designated as a planning and start-up phase before the start of the evaluation on April 1, 2018. The evaluation team shall plan to use that period for planning for the evaluation. Milestones during the planning phase include:

- Submission of Preparation Plan by December 1, 2017, for the evaluation that lays out plans and timelines for working with the sites to get ready for study, and the development of instruments and protocols.
 - First draft of Evaluation Plan due to AIR by January 22, 2018
- Final version of Evaluation Plan delivered to AIR by March 1, 2018
 - Final distribution of study materials, final steps in IRB approval, preparation of instruments for administration before April 1, 2018
- The evaluation team shall provide training to the sites on the research activities before April 1, 2018.

In recruiting JDTCs for this evaluation, AIR will require applications from JDTCs that lay out a plan (to be provided to the evaluation team) for each of the following:

- Work with the researchers to enroll eligible youth (as defined above) to JDTC over a 2-year period. Data on a comparison group of similar youth should be made available to the evaluation team.
- Work with the researchers to secure informed consent for research participation of all individuals involved and protect their private and identifiable information.
- Participate in the data collection components of an evaluation, which includes:
 - Designating at least one person in the participating site who will be responsible to work with the evaluators and help with data collection. This person could also serve other roles, such as being a coordinator for the initiative.
 - Completing staff surveys, collecting program materials, completing practice assessments, and facilitating access to administrative data.
 - Making available to the researchers data on the reoffending and recidivism outcomes for each participant and any youth in the comparison group.

Deliverables

All proposals submitted under this solicitation should describe all products that the evaluator will produce from the project. Successful applicants will submit relevant reports and deliverables to AIR. These will be a part of their progress reporting or special reports and include the following:

- Practitioner-friendly interim reports highlighting the project's progress and interim findings, as AIR requires.
- A detailed evaluation plan within 4 months of the award period start date. AIR and OJJDP will review and provide input.
- A detailed progress report to AIR every month describing the status of the evaluation, methodological and implementation issues, progress toward the project goals, and any other relevant issues regarding the project's completion.
- Electronic copies of (1) a final, technical report and abstract highlighting key findings suitable for publication in a refereed journal, and (2) a final report, including an executive summary, documenting the project and its findings, suitable for a nontechnical audience, to be developed and disseminated at OJJDP's discretion.

Eligibility Information

AIR invites proposals from nonprofit organizations (including faith-based, community, and tribal organizations); for-profit organizations; and institutions of higher education (including tribal institutions of higher education) with demonstrated expertise in helping communities develop, maintain, and enhance family drug courts. For-profit organizations must agree to waive any profit or fee for services. If appropriate, AIR encourages primary applicants to partner with Subawardees to enhance the capacity and expertise of the full evaluation team.

Proposal Process and Deadlines

- Questions concerning this RFP should be submitted via electronic mail to TestingJDTCGuidelines@air.org no later than 5:00 PM Eastern Time on October 9, 2017.
- For resource planning purposes, applicants are requested to submit 'an intent to propose' notification via electronic mail to TestingJDTCGuidelines@air.org no later than 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on **October 10, 2017**.
- **All proposals shall be submitted by email to TestingJDTCGuidelines@air.org no later than 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on October 20, 2017.**

AIR expects to announce the subaward(s) on or about **October 31, 2017**.

For questions or assistance with any other requirements of this application, please call Ms. SooYun Chung at 202-403-5739 or e-mail SChung@air.org.

Cancellations

AIR reserves the right to cancel this RFP, accept or reject any and all proposals, in whole or in part, received in response to this RFP, to waive or permit the cure of minor irregularities, and to conduct discussions with all qualified or potentially qualified applicants in any manner necessary to serve the best interests of AIR. AIR also reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to award a subaward on the basis of the written proposals received without discussions or negotiations.

Award Basis

The subaward shall be awarded to the responsible applicant (applicant[s] if multiple awards are authorized) submitting the proposal that has been determined to be the most advantageous to AIR, considering price and evaluation factors set forth in this RFP.

Incurred Expenses

AIR will not be responsible for any costs incurred by any applicant in preparing and submitting a proposal or in performing any other activities related to submitting a proposal in response to this solicitation.

Mandatory Contractual Terms

By submitting a proposal in response to this RFP, the applicant, if selected for award, shall be deemed to have accepted the terms and conditions of this RFP. Any exceptions to this RFP shall be clearly identified in the applicant's response to this RFP. A proposal that takes exception to these terms may be rejected.

Conflict of Interest Affidavit and Disclosure

The applicant shall complete and sign the Conflict of Interest Affidavit and Disclosure (see Attachment A, Conflict of Interest and Certification) and submit it with their proposal. All applicants are advised that if a subaward is awarded as a result of this solicitation, the applicant's personnel who perform or control work under this contract and each of the participating subcontractor personnel who perform or control work under this contract shall be required to complete agreements substantially similar to the Conflict of Interest Affidavit and Disclosure in Attachment A.

Federal Funding Acknowledgement

Programmatic conditions apply to this RFP because of federal funding. (See Attachment B, Federal Agency Requirements.)

This subaward contains federal funds. The source of these federal funds is the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). The conditions that apply to all federal funds awarded by the Department of Justice are contained in Attachment B, Federal Agency Requirements. Any additional conditions that apply to this particular federally funded subaward are contained as supplements to Attachment B, Federal Agency Requirements. Submission of

applicant's proposal indicates the applicant's intent to comply with all conditions of this RFP and Attachment B, Federal Agency Requirements.

Awards

The anticipated duration of services to be provided November 1, 2017 through September 30, 2020.

Phase II will last as long as 36 months to test the guidelines in selected JDTCs. AIR will competitively award one or more subawards. The total amount of funding available for subawards is not to exceed the ceiling amount of \$2,000,000 for the entire 36-month period of performance.

Proposal Format

Applicants shall submit proposals in one volume that contains the technical approach and cost proposal (see Cost Proposal below for requirements). The volume should be sent via e-mail to TestingJDTCGuidelines@air.org as a PDF file.

Proposals must include the following:

1. **Proposal Cover.** The proposal cover should specify the applicant's name and contact information, including an address, telephone number, and primary e-mail address.
2. **Research Study Description (8 pages maximum).** Describe how your organization will conduct this work. This includes detailed explanations of:
 - The research participants and sampling plan
 - The proposed plan for random assignment, if appropriate
 - The proposed plan for collecting and analyzing data for a high-quality comparison group
 - The examination of the quality of the conceptual/program design, implementation, and program fidelity, including how variations affect the impact on youth outcomes
 - The outcomes to be examined
 - The mediators and moderators of the impact of the program delivery
 - The data sources, data collection tools, and data collection procedures
 - The statistical analyses anticipated
 - The monitoring and measuring of threats to internal validity
 - Implications of the external validity of the proposed program and research approach
 - How the applicant will provide the programmatic sites with the training and support to collect the data that the evaluation requires
 - Anticipated limitations and barriers in the approach

3. **Capabilities and Competencies (4 pages maximum).** Identify the organizations and individuals responsible for implementing the project. Describe the mission and priorities of the lead agency, its governing structure, membership, and capacity to implement the proposed project. In addition, describe the role of organizations that would serve as project partners and explain why their participation is necessary to achieve the goals of the project. In addition, describe the qualifications and experience of proposed staff and include their résumés as an attachment to your application. Include names of key personnel along with a brief biographical statement for each that describes their relevant experience for doing this type of work.
4. **Accountability (2 pages maximum).** Provide a brief description of how you will measure work progress and outcomes including, but not limited to, the implementation of planned activities, the completion of short-term objectives, and the overall impact of the proposed research design on the intended long-term goals of the project. In this section, you should also propose how you will work collaboratively with AIR to facilitate their oversight of this work.
5. **Information Security Process (1 page maximum).** Discuss the procedures of your organization related to protection of information and security of information that you collect.
6. **Past Performance.** Attach up to four letters of reference/past performance demonstrating high-quality work and high satisfaction with this work from a funder or as a subawardee/subcontractor on up to four research or evaluation studies that your organization has been involved with. Be sure the letter(s) describe your role, responsibilities, point of contact name and contact's e-mail address and phone numbers. Past performance ideally should be within the past 7 years.

Cost Proposal

Budget Detail Worksheet and Budget Narrative

Applicants should provide a budget that (1) is complete, allowable, and cost-effective in relation to the proposed activities; (2) shows the cost calculations demonstrating how they arrived at the total amount requested; and (3) provides a brief supporting narrative to link costs with project activities. The budget should cover the entire award period.

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

1. **Budget Detail Worksheet.** A sample Budget Detail Worksheet can be found at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Apply/Resources/BudgetDetailWorksheet.pdf>. Applicants who submit their budget in a different format should include the same budget categories listed in the sample Budget Detail Worksheet.
2. **Budget Narrative.** The budget narrative should thoroughly and clearly describe every category of expense listed in the Budget Detail Worksheet. AIR expects proposed budgets to be complete, cost effective, and allowable (e.g., reasonable, allocable, and necessary for project activities).

Applicants should demonstrate in their budget narratives how they will maximize cost effectiveness of grant expenditures, and may elect to describe cost effectiveness in relation to potential alternatives and the goals of the project. For example, a budget narrative might detail why planned in-person site visits are necessary, or how technology and collaboration with outside organizations could be used to reduce costs, without compromising quality.

The narrative should be mathematically sound and correspond with the information and figures provided in the Budget Detail Worksheet. The narrative should explain how the applicant estimated and calculated all costs, and how they are relevant to the completion of the proposed project. The narrative may include tables for clarification purposes but need not be in a spreadsheet format. As with the Budget Detail Worksheet, the budget narrative should be broken down by year.

Application Formatting

All applications should be within the stated page limitations, single-spaced, using a standard 12-point font (e.g., Times New Roman), with 1-inch margins. The proposal narrative should not exceed 15 pages in length. This page limit does not apply to the budget, budget narrative, résumés, and letters of reference.

Evaluation and Selection Criteria

The evaluation of the proposals may include the following criteria (not in any specific order):

- The proposed research plan
- The ability of the applicant to perform services within the timeframe specified
- The price of the requested products/services
- The degree of compliance to terms set forth in this RFP
- Past performance with similar services

Additional Requirements

Applicants selected for awards must agree to comply with additional legal requirements upon acceptance of an award. AIR encourages applicants to review the information pertaining to these additional requirements before submitting an application. Additional information for each requirement can be found at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

- Civil Rights Compliance
- Civil Rights Compliance Specific to State Administering Agencies
- Faith-Based and Other Community Organizations
- Confidentiality
- Research and the Protection of Human Subjects
- *Anti-Lobbying Act*

- Financial and Government Audit Requirements
- Reporting of Potential Fraud, Waste, and Abuse, and Similar Misconduct
- *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA)
- DOJ Information Technology Standards (if applicable)
- Non-Supplanting of State or Local Funds
- Criminal Penalty for False Statements
- Compliance with [Office of Justice Programs Financial Guide](#)
- Suspension or Termination of Funding
- Nonprofit Organizations
- For-Profit Organizations
- *Government Performance and Results Act* (GPRA)
- Rights in Intellectual Property
- *Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006* (FFATA)
- Awards in Excess of \$5,000,000—Federal Taxes Certification Requirement
- Active SAM Registration
- Policy and Guidance for Approval, Planning, and Reporting of Conferences (including Meetings and Trainings)

Attachments

Attachment A.

Conflict of Interest and Certification

Under the *Fiscal Year 2014 Initiative to Develop and Test Guidelines for Juvenile Drug Courts* Grant (“Project”), American Institutes for Research (AIR) must ensure that all research funded under this Cooperative Agreement demonstrates research and evaluation independence, including that safeguards are established to monitor such research and evaluation objectivity and integrity are achieved.

Research and evaluation independence and integrity includes ensuring that the design, conduct, or reporting of research and evaluation funded under this project will not be biased by any personal or financial conflict of interest (COI) on the part of investigators responsible for the research and evaluation or on the part of AIR. Conflicts can be either actual or apparent. Examples of potential investigator (or other personal) conflict situations may include those in which an investigator would be in a position to evaluate a spouse’s work product (actual conflict), or an investigator would be in a position to evaluate the work of a former colleague (potential apparent conflict). With regard to potential organizational conflicts of interest, as one example, generally an organization could not be given a grant to evaluate a project if that organization had itself provided substantial prior technical assistance to that project, as the organization in such an instance would appear to be evaluating the effectiveness of its own prior work. The key is whether a reasonable person understanding all of the facts could be confident that the results of any research or evaluation project are objective and reliable. Any outside personal or financial interest that casts doubt on that objectivity and reliability is a problem.

AIR’s process and procedures has put in place to identify and eliminate (or, at the very least, mitigate) potential personal or financial conflicts of interest on the part of its staff, consultants, and/or subcontractors. AIR must also identify any potential organizational conflicts of interest with regard to the proposed research/evaluation.

Project-Specific Potential Conflict of Interest Mitigation Strategies

This project is unique in that OJJDP solicited proposals for a two-phase project. Per the solicitation requirements, the first phase involves the grantee developing new Juvenile Drug Treatment Court (JDTC) Guidelines, and the second phase involves the grantee’s leading a subawarding process to test the implementation of (or gaps in knowledge about) those guidelines. OJJDP’s solicitation (and later conversations with the project officer) have illustrated that there was a clear and compelling need to structure the project in such a way. This need is in response to significant concerns regarding how JDTCs have been implemented to date. There is extensive research documenting mixed results of the impact of JDTCs, with some courts leading to worse outcomes for youth than had they experienced standard court processing. Because of this mixed evidence and potential for harm in JDTCs, OJJDP solicited a grantee that would be able to both develop first the guidelines on the basis of the best research knowledge, and then a process that would actually be able to directly test the implementation and revise the guidelines

as appropriate. This closed feedback loop to developing, testing, and revising led OJJDP to create the solicitation with this two-phase project.

Nonetheless, because this project includes both JDTC Guidelines development in Phase I, and the testing of the guidelines in Phase II, special care is needed to avoid either actual or apparent conflict of interest that would compromise the research independence and integrity of the testing phase of the project. For the reason that the expert advisors are engaged in Phase I of the project to assist in developing JDTC Guidelines, and research awardees for testing JDTC Guidelines in Phase II.

Expert Advisors. Individuals engaged to provide expert advice for JDTC Guidelines development in Phase I also may have an interest in receiving research funds to test the guidelines in Phase II (“Expert Advisors”). Some advisors may be involved in other JDTC-related initiatives with specific models for JDTC implementation, or may contribute to guidelines inclusion criteria, or to the development of sample testing research questions. However, these experts are acting as advisors to AIR and its subcontractors about discrete aspects of the guidelines and do not have decision-making power or direct influence in the final, complete creation of the guidelines in the project. This separation of roles and responsibilities helps mitigate potential conflicts of interest. In addition, to identify and avoid conflict of interest, expert advisors will receive a description of conflict of interest avoidance requirements relevant to their involvement in the project. If they agree to participate as expert advisors, they will receive the Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan, complete the checklist, and sign the Conflict of Interest Certification before their engagement as expert advisors.

Conflict of Interest Certification

The offeror hereby certifies that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, there are no current or presently planned interests (financial, contractual, organizational, or otherwise) relating to the work to be performed under the subaward resulting from this request for proposal that would create any actual or potential conflict of interest (or apparent conflicts of interest, including conflicts of interest for immediate family members: spouses, parents, children) that would impinge on its ability to render impartial, technically sound, and objective assistance or advice or result in its being given an unfair competitive advantage. In this clause, the term “potential conflict” means reasonably foreseeable conflict of interest. The offeror further certifies that it has and will continue to exercise due diligence in identifying and removing or mitigating, to the satisfaction of AIR or AIR’s client, such conflicts of interest (or apparent conflicts of interest).

The offeror’s inability or unwillingness to certify to or provide the information described above shall render the offeror’s proposal ineligible for award.

Offeror’s Signature, Commitment, and Acceptance

As a duly authorized representative of _____, I hereby attest:

1. That I have read and accept the terms and conditions of the RFP; and

2. That I have reviewed the statements and certifications provided above and certify that such statements and certifications are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge as of this date.

Offeror:

RFP:

Testing Phase of Juvenile Drug Treatment Court (JDTC)

Name/Title:

Signature:

Date Signed:

Attachment B.

Federal Agency Requirements

The term “Cooperative Agreement” or “Grant” shall mean “Subaward”; the term “Awardee” or “Recipient” shall mean “Subawardee”; the term “Government” shall mean “AIR”; and the term “Contracting Officer” or “Grants Management Specialist” shall mean the “AIR Contract Officer or other authorized individual.”

1. The Subawardee agrees to comply with the financial and administrative requirements set forth in the current edition of the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Financial Guide.
2. The Subawardee acknowledges that failure to submit an acceptable Equal Employment Opportunity Plan (if Subawardee is required to submit one pursuant to 28 C.F.R. Section 42.302), that is approved by the Office for Civil Rights, is a violation of its Certified Assurances and may result in suspension or termination of funding, until such time as the Subawardee is in compliance.
3. The Subawardee agrees to comply with the organizational audit requirements of OMB Circular A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations, and further understands and agrees that funds may be withheld, or other related requirements may be imposed, if outstanding audit issues (if any) from OMB Circular A-133 audits (and any other audits of OJP grant funds) are not satisfactorily and promptly addressed, as further described in the current edition of the OJP Financial Guide.
4. Subawardee understands and agrees that it cannot use any federal funds, either directly or indirectly, in support of the enactment, repeal, modification or adoption of any law, regulation or policy, at any level of government, without the express prior written approval of OJP.
5. The Subawardee must promptly refer to the DOJ OIG any credible evidence that a principal, employee, agent, contractor, subgrantee, subcontractor, or other person has either (1) submitted a false claim for grant funds under the *False Claims Act*; or (2) committed a criminal or civil violation of laws pertaining to fraud, conflict of interest, bribery, gratuity, or similar misconduct involving grant funds. This condition also applies to any Subawardees. Potential fraud, waste, abuse, or misconduct should be reported to the OIG by mail:

Office of the Inspector General
U.S. Department of Justice
Investigations Division
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Room 4706
Washington, DC 20530
E-mail at oig.hotline@usdoj.gov, hotline: (contact information in English and Spanish): 800-869-4499 or hotline fax: 202-616-9881

Additional information is available from the DOJ OIG website at <https://oig.justice.gov/>.

6. Subawardee understands and agrees that it cannot use any federal funds, either directly or indirectly, in support of any contract or subaward to either the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) or its subsidiaries, without the express prior written approval of OJP.
7. The Subawardee agrees to comply with any additional requirements that may be imposed during the grant performance period if the agency determines that the Subawardee is a high-risk grantee. Cf. 28 C.F.R. parts 66, 70.
8. The Subawardee agrees to comply with applicable requirements regarding registration with the System for Award Management (SAM) (or with a successor governmentwide system officially designated by OMB and OJP). The details of Subawardee obligations are posted on the Office of Justice Programs web site at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Explore/SAM.htm> (Award condition: Registration with the System for Award Management and Universal Identifier Requirements), and are incorporated by reference here. This special condition does not apply to an award to an individual who received the award as a natural person (i.e., unrelated to any business or nonprofit organization that he or she may own or operate in his or her name).
9. Pursuant to Executive Order 13513, “Federal Leadership on Reducing Text Messaging While Driving,” 74 Fed. Reg. 51225 (October 1, 2009), the Department encourages recipients and subawardees to adopt and enforce policies banning employees from text messaging while driving any vehicle during the course of performing work funded by this grant, and to establish workplace safety policies and conduct education, awareness, and other outreach to decrease crashes caused by distracted drivers.
10. The Subawardee agrees to comply with all applicable laws, regulations, policies, and guidance (including specific cost limits, prior approval and reporting requirements, where applicable) governing the use of federal funds for expenses related to conferences, meetings, trainings, and other events, including the provision of food and/or beverages at such events, and costs of attendance at such events. Information on pertinent laws, regulations, policies, and guidance is available in the OJP Financial Guide Conference Cost Chapter.
11. The Subawardee understands and agrees that any training or training materials developed or delivered with funding provided under this Subaward must adhere to the OJP Training Guiding Principles for Grantees and Subgrantees, available at <https://ojp.gov/funding/Implement/TrainingPrinciplesForGrantees-Subgrantees.htm>.
12. The Subawardee agrees that if it currently has an open award of federal funds or if it receives an award of federal funds other than this OJP award, and those award funds have been, are being, or are to be used, in whole or in part, for one or more of the identical cost items for which funds are being provided under this OJP award, the Subawardee will promptly notify, in writing, the grant manager for this OJP award, and, if so requested by OJP, seek a budget-modification or change-of-project-scope grant adjustment notice (GAN) to eliminate any inappropriate duplication of funding.

13. The Subawardee understands and agrees that award funds may not be used to discriminate against or denigrate the religious or moral beliefs of students who participate in programs for which financial assistance is provided from those funds, or of the parents or legal guardians of such students.
14. The Subawardee understands and agrees that: (1) No award funds may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography, and (2) Nothing in subsection (a) limits the use of funds necessary for any federal, state, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, or adjudication activities.
15. Within 45 calendar days after the end of any conference, meeting, retreat, seminar, symposium, training activity, or similar event funded under this Subaward, and the total cost of which exceeds \$20,000 in award funds, the Subawardee must provide the program manager with the following information and itemized costs:
 - a. name of event;
 - b. event dates;
 - c. location of event;
 - d. number of federal attendees;
 - e. number of nonfederal attendees;
 - f. costs of event space, including rooms for break-out sessions;
 - g. costs of audio visual services;
 - h. other equipment costs (e.g., computer fees, telephone fees);
 - i. costs of printing and distribution;
 - j. costs of meals provided during the event;
 - k. costs of refreshments provided during the event;
 - l. costs of event planner;
 - m. costs of event facilitators; and
 - n. any other costs associated with the event.

The Subawardee must also itemize and report any of the following attendee (including participants, presenters, speakers) costs that are paid or reimbursed with cooperative agreement funds:

- a. meals and incidental expenses (M&IE portion of per diem);
- b. lodging;
- c. transportation to/from event location (e.g., common carrier, Privately Owned Vehicle (POV)); and,
- d. local transportation (e.g., rental car, POV) at event location.

Note that if any item is paid for with registration fees, or any other nonaward funding, then that portion of the expense does not need to be reported.

Further instructions regarding the submission of this data, and how to determine costs, are available in the OJP Financial Guide Conference Cost Chapter.

16. With respect to this Subaward, federal funds may not be used to pay cash compensation (salary plus bonuses) to any employee of the Subawardee at a rate that exceeds 110% of the maximum annual salary payable to a member of the federal government's Senior Executive Service (SES) at an agency with a Certified SES Performance Appraisal System for that year. (A Subawardee may compensate an employee at a higher rate, provided the amount in excess of this compensation limitation is paid with nonfederal funds.)

This limitation on compensation rates allowable under this Subaward may be waived on an individual basis at the discretion of the OJP official indicated in the program announcement under which this Subaward is made.

17. Approval of this Subaward does not indicate approval of any consultant rate in excess of \$650 per day. A detailed justification must be submitted to and approved by the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) program office prior to obligation or expenditure of such funds.
18. The Subawardee agrees, as condition of Subaward approval, to comply with the requirements of 28 CFR Part 46 and all other Department of Justice/Office of Justice Program's policies and procedures regarding the protection of human research subjects, including informed consent procedures and obtainment of Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, if appropriate.
19. The Subawardee shall submit to OJJDP a copy of all interim and final reports and proposed publications (including those prepared for conferences, journals, and other presentations) resulting from this Subaward, for review and comment prior to publishing. Any publication produced with grant funds must contain the following statement: "This project was supported by Grant # 2014-DC-BX-K001 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication/program/exhibition are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Justice." All reports and products may be required to display the OJJDP logo on the cover (or other location) with the agreement of OJJDP. OJJDP defines publications as any planned, written, visual or sound materials substantively based on the project, formally prepared by the Subawardee for dissemination to the public.
20. The Subawardee agrees, as a condition of Subaward approval, to comply with the requirements of 28 CFR Part 22, including the requirement to submit a properly executed Privacy Certificate that is in accordance with the requirements of 28 CFR Section 22.23 to OJJDP for approval.

21. Pursuant to 28 C.F.R. Part 18, OJP may suspend or terminate funding under this Subaward before the completion of the project funded by this Subaward, for the Subawardee's failure to comply with these special conditions or with the project's goals, plans, and methodology set forth in the approved application, including IRB-approved protocols. In the case of suspension, the Subawardee will be unable to draw down funds until OJP determines that the Subawardee is in compliance.
22. The Subawardee acknowledges that the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) reserves a royalty-free, nonexclusive, and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish, or otherwise use, and authorize others to use (in whole or in part, including in connection with derivative works), for federal purposes: (1) any work subject to copyright developed under an award or subaward; and (2) any rights of copyright to which a subawardee or Subawardee purchases ownership with federal support.
23. The Subawardee acknowledges that OJP has the right to (1) obtain, reproduce, publish, or otherwise use the data first produced under an award or subaward; and (2) authorize others to receive, reproduce, publish, or otherwise use such data for federal purposes. "Data" includes data as defined in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) provision 52.227-14 (Rights in Data—General).
24. Approval of this Subaward does not indicate approval of any consultant in excess of \$650 per day. A detailed Justification must be submitted to and approved by the AIR Contract Officer prior to obligation or expenditure of such funds.
25. It is the responsibility of the Subawardee (and of each lower-tier Subawardee, if applicable) to ensure that this condition is included in any lower-tier subaward under this Subaward.
26. Pursuant to 28 C.F.R. Part 18 AIR may suspend or terminate funding under this award before the completion of the project funded by this award, for the Subawardee's failure to comply with these special terms and conditions or with the projects goals, plans or methodology set forth in the approved application, including IRB-approved protocols.

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

The Subawardee agrees to assist OJJDP to comply with the *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA) and other related federal environmental impact analyses requirements in the use of these grant funds either directly by the Subawardee. Accordingly, prior to obligating grant funds, the grantee agrees to first determine if any of the following activities will be related to the use of the grant funds and, if so, to advise OJJDP and request further NEPA implementation guidance. Subawardee understands that this special condition applies to its activities whether or not they are being specifically funded with these grant funds. That is, as long as the activity is being conducted by the Subawardee, or any third party and the activity needs to be undertaken in order to use these grant funds, this special condition must first be met. The activities covered by this special condition are: a. new construction; b. minor renovation or remodeling of a property either; (1) listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or; (2) located within a 100-year flood plain; c. a renovation, lease, or any other proposed use of a building or facility that will either; (1) result in a change in its basic prior use or; (2) significantly change its size and; d. Implementation of a new program involving the use of chemicals other

than chemicals that are; (1) purchased as an incidental component of a funded activity and; (2) traditionally used, for example, in office, household, recreational, or education environments.

Certification Regarding Lobbying (Title 28 CFR Part 69)

1. No federally appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the Subawardee, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any federal contract, the making of any federal grant, the making of any federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.
2. If any funds other than federally appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or intending to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the Subawardee shall complete and submit Standard Form -LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," to the Pass-through Entity.
3. The Subawardee shall require that the language of this certification be included in the Subaward documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subawardees shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U. S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

Pilot Program for Enhancement of Contractor Employee Protections (48 CFR 3.9080)

Subawardee is hereby notified that they are required to: inform their employees working on any federal award that they are subject to the whistleblower rights and remedies of the pilot program; inform their employees in writing of employee whistleblower protections under 41 U.S.C §4712 in the predominant native language of the workforce; and include such requirements in any agreement made with a subcontractor or subgrantee.

Audit and Access to Records

Subawardee certifies by signing this Subaward Agreement that it complies with the Uniform Guidance, will provide notice of the completion of required audits and any adverse findings which impact this Subaward as required by parts 200.501- 200.521, and will provide access to records as required by parts 200.336, 200.337, and 200.201 as applicable.

Promoting Objectivity in Research Applicable to Subawardees (Financial Conflicts of Interest)

Subawardee must designate herein which entity's financial conflicts of interest policy will apply

(Select One):

- PTE Subawardee

If applying its own financial conflicts of interest policy, by execution of this Subaward Agreement, Subawardee Institution certifies that its policy complies with the requirements of the relevant Federal Awarding Agency as identified herein:

Subawardee shall report any financial conflict of interest to AIR's Contract Officer. Any financial conflicts of interest identified shall, when applicable, subsequently be reported to Federal Awarding Agency. Such report shall be made before expenditure of funds authorized in this Subaward Agreement and within 45 days of any subsequently identified financial conflict of interest.

Offerors must agree to comply with additional legal requirements upon acceptance of a subaward AIR encourages offerors to review the information pertaining to these additional requirements prior to submitting a Proposal. Additional information for each requirement can be found at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/funding/other_requirements.htm.

ABOUT AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH

Established in 1946, with headquarters in Washington, D.C., American Institutes for Research (AIR) is an independent, nonpartisan, not-for-profit organization that conducts behavioral and social science research and delivers technical assistance both domestically and internationally. As one of the largest behavioral and social science research organizations in the world, AIR is committed to empowering communities and institutions with innovative solutions to the most critical challenges in education, health, workforce, and international development.



AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH®

1000 Thomas Jefferson Street NW
Washington, DC 20007-3835
202.403.5000

www.air.org

Making Research Relevant

LOCATIONS

Domestic

Washington, D.C.
Atlanta, GA
Austin, TX
Baltimore, MD
Cayce, SC
Chapel Hill, NC
Chicago, IL
Columbus, OH
Frederick, MD
Honolulu, HI
Indianapolis, IN
Metairie, LA
Naperville, IL
New York, NY
Rockville, MD
Sacramento, CA
San Mateo, CA
Waltham, MA

International

Egypt
Honduras
Ivory Coast
Kyrgyzstan
Liberia
Tajikistan
Zambia