

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

GPA Assessor Preparations

Before the Assessment

The following information, provided by NIJ, is available to the assessment team for review prior to the assessment:

1. Application and abstract
2. Original budget narrative and budget detail worksheet
3. Award package information
4. Progress and financial report(s)
5. Approved Grant Adjustment Notices (GANs)
6. Funding drawdown report
7. High Risk designation information, if applicable
8. A listing of any CO Outsourcing contracts
9. Sole source contracts, if applicable

This information is available on the NFSTC GPA Portal under the album for the state in the NIJ Reports sub-album.

REVIEW ALL AVAILABLE DOCUMENTS BEFORE YOU ARRIVE ON SITE. Leads, should complete as much of the template as possible prior to arrival on site using the grant documents supplied from the portal.

During the assessment

Upon arrival, the Lead will conduct a short opening meeting with the staff to introduce assessors and to discuss the objectives of the GPA Program and the objectives of the GPA site visit (5-10 minutes). Upon completion of this meeting, a short tour of the facility will be requested, if applicable. (*Document meeting in Item 1*)

Upon completion of the assessment/audit, the team will conduct a closing meeting with the appropriate members of the agency's management team. (*Document meeting in Item 27*)

Guide to selecting the GPA template appropriate Appendix

There is one GPA report template that is applicable to all grants included in the GPA program. The template has Appendices that pertain to a specific type of grant award. This template is located on the NFSTC portal in the Assessor Resources Album. Assessors are to check the portal for the latest version of the template prior to going out on assignment and download the latest version. In addition, assessors are to check the portal for the latest version of this Guide and review prior to leaving on assignment(s).

The following information is provided for specific types of grants being assessed using the appropriate Appendix for the award.

Convicted Offender Backlog Reduction

Prior to 2008, states could utilize the OJP contract process for the outsourcing of convicted offender (CO) DNA samples to a private vendor or they could utilize NIJ grant funding to complete the analysis of these samples in their own laboratory (in-house).

In 2008, the DNA Convicted Offender Backlog Reduction Program permitted a grantee to use grant funding to: 1) perform DNA analyses in-house of CO samples, 2) enter into their own contract with a

vendor laboratory to perform DNA analysis of CO samples; and/or 3) utilize funds to review profiles returned from a vendor laboratory.

- **Convicted Offender Backlog Reduction – Appendix 1**
In house or Outsource (awards from 2008 forward)
 - 1) Grantee performs DNA analyses of CO samples in-house;
 - 2) Grantee enters into a state contract with a private vendor for the DNA analysis of CO samples;
 - 3) A combination of 1 & 2
- **Convicted Offender Backlog Reduction-Outsourcing – OJP Contract Appendix 2**
State utilizes the OJP Contract Office contract process to select vendor laboratories to perform DNA analysis of CO samples

Coverdell (Formula) Appendix 3

These grants are made to State Administering Agencies (SAA). A single report will be completed for the SAA that includes, if applicable, records of sub-grantee expenditures and/or activities.

Coverdell (Competitive) Appendix 3

These grants are made to State Administering Agencies (SAA) **and/or** local governmental agencies based on a competitive review of the proposals received by the NIJ. A single report will be completed for each Grantee receiving a Competitive award that includes, if applicable, records of sub-grantee expenditures and/or activities.

Coverdell (Mixed) Appendix 3

Coverdell awards made to the State Administering Agency (SAA) may be a mix of Formula and Competitive funding under a single grant number. A single report will be completed for the SAA documenting activity related to both the Competitive and Formula funding that includes, if applicable, records of sub-grantee expenditures and/or activities.

DNA Backlog Reduction (BR) Appendix 4

Typically one agency is the grantee; however, in some states; a central agency applies for the funds for the state as a consortium grant and distributes the funds to the respective agencies in the state. A single report capturing grant related activity for all funding recipients will be completed for the grantee. Grants for FY 2007 and later allow state and units of local government to use funding to analyze backlogged forensic casework as well as improve laboratory infrastructure and analysis capacity. Appendix 1 addresses both of the approved activities.

Solving Cold Cases with DNA Appendix 5

These competitive grants are made to agencies to utilize investigative and DNA laboratory services to review and solve cold cases in their jurisdictions. A report will be completed for the grantee that includes activities of any partner agencies receiving funds from this award.

General Instructions for using the GPA Report Template Guide**Informational Materials**

1. All instructions to the Assessors are in **red**; and will be found within the Guidance section
2. Examples of suggested wording for observations to support the ratings will be found in the Comments and Action Items and/or Issues for Resolution sections.
3. Training considerations will be **highlighted in yellow** and will be found within the Guidance section.

Instructional Materials***General Information:***

- Complete the appropriate Appendix for the specific award being reviewed.
- Fill in the Report template completely before submitting for the review process.
- Copy, paste and use the file name from the Report Log on the portal for each report generated.
- Upload the report into the Grant Specific Album found within the Agency Specific Draft GPA album.
- Notify the GPA report team identified on the portal that the report(s) has/have been uploaded and are ready for review.

Questions section

Read the Guidance section for each Item carefully prior to answering the questions. Do not leave any questions unanswered.

Comments section:

Comments are general in nature, but specific to the award and site visit and should include sufficient detail to adequately provide support for the ratings. There is no need to restate the questions asked as a comment.

If during the site visit, an agency takes an action to bring an issue into compliance with the requirements of a particular item, please provide information on the action taken in the Comment area and do not list the issue as an Action Item.

If during the site visit, an agency states they will be taking action to bring an issue into compliance with the requirements of a particular item, please provide information on the proposed action in the Comment area and list the non-compliant issue as either an Action Item or an Issue for Resolution, as applicable.

Action Items section:

Provide a brief summary statement within the "Action Items" section on what was observed or discovered to support each rating. Action items are those that grantee can resolve and are not as great of consequence as Issues for Resolution. The NIJ Program Manager needs to be aware of these situations, but no formal follow up is required. For example:

- Grant and/or Financial Point of Contact is incorrect
- Late Progress Reports and or Financial Reports need to be submitted
- Purchases are not occurring according to the timeline submitted with the proposal
- No cost extensions must be requested to accommodate purchase delays
- The grantee acknowledges that they have not read the Conflict of Interest definition in Chapter 3 of the OJP Financial Guide
- The grantee needs to take the appropriate actions to remove Special Condition #XXX

If there are no Action Items observed relative to the questions asked please include the word "None".

Issues for Resolution section:

Provide summary information within the "Issues for Resolution" section on what was observed or discovered to support each rating. "Issues for Resolution" are more serious in nature and require formal follow up by the NIJ grant manager. For example:

- The grantee moved funds between approved categories in excess of 10% of the total amount of the grant without an approved GAN?
- The grantee has expenditures that are unallowable under the solicitation
- There is a lack of financial control regarding comingling of funds

- The grantee has expended funds from a category that was not in the approved budget
- The activity in the Progress Reports is not consistent with the proposal
- The activity supported by grant funds does not reflect the goals outlined in the proposal
- Funding was expended from (name budget category) for a (name item/services purchased) without prior approval
- The purchase from company "X" were made prior to receipt of a GAN documenting sole source approval

If there are no Issues for Resolution observed relative to the questions asked please include the word "None".



Grant Progress Assessment Report

Agency	The agency name from OJP Form 4000/2	
Street Address	The address from OJP Form 4000/2	
City	If the address on the OJP Form and the address for the site visit are different place a note in Section A Comments.	
State		
Zip Code		
Grant POC:	Type the name of the current grant POC	
POC Email	Type the e-mail address of the current grant POC	
Date(s) Assessment Conducted	The dates team is on site: Month xx – yy, 20XX	
	Name	Signature
NFSTC Assessor	Type name of assessor (Lead Assessor name listed first and additional assessors listed subsequently. Add as many boxes as needed)	Signature will be inserted by NFSTC when final report is complete
NFSTC Assessor		

PERFORMED BY THE NATIONAL FORENSIC SCIENCE TECHNOLOGY CENTER AS AUTHORIZED BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

INTRODUCTION

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) has provided grant funds to State and local crime laboratories for the enhancement of the laboratories' capacity to conduct forensic testing. As part of the NIJ grant administration responsibilities there is also an obligation to review the status and impact of these grants by conducting site visits to grant recipients.

To assist the NIJ in this oversight role, this Grant Assessment Checklist has been developed. Qualified assessors will utilize this form to review grant status and to assess the use of Federal funds to increase the capabilities and capacities of State and local crime laboratories. Assessors are required to use the Grant Assessment Checklist to review the NIJ grant(s) received by the respective agency.

The National Forensic Science Technology Center (NFSTC) conducts biennial grant progress assessments (GPA) at the request of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ). These assessments are not a financial audit. They are intended to provide a comprehensive overview of the grant program administrative information to NIJ, while serving as an educational tool to the individual grantees. Upon completion of each assessment, the reports are provided to the NIJ Grant Program Office for follow-up and dissemination of the reports to the grantee. The objectives of the program include:

- the strengthening of NIJ program management and oversight
- assisting NIJ in performing the required due diligence by overseeing that grant funding is being used as specified
- educating grantees regarding grant program requirements and special conditions
- identifying challenges faced by grantees in achieving grant program objectives
- identifying successful grantee achievements and/or grant programs
- providing the opportunity to assess the impact of grant funds
- ensuring that Federal grant funds are being used for the purpose of achieving the goals and objectives set forth by Congress.

The NIJ will utilize the supported DNA Laboratory Audit/GPA Program and its contract auditors/assessors to conduct these grant assessments. All Lead GPA assessors have undergone training in the use of this checklist by personnel from the National Forensic Science Technology Center (NFSTC) and the NIJ.

The grant assessment is conducted for the NIJ and based upon the assessment report to the Program Office, the NIJ will make a determination if an additional financial assessment or programmatic assessments are required.

A. Grant Information

Check type Place an "X"	Grant Type	Award Number List number found in Section 4 of 'Award', OJP Form 4000/2
	DNA Convicted Offender Backlog Reduction (Appendix 1)	
	Coverdell NFSIA (Appendix 3)	
	DNA Backlog Reduction (Appendix 4)	
	Solving Cold Cases with DNA (Appendix 5)	
		Delivery Order Number
	DNA Convicted Offender Backlog Reduction – Outsourcing-OJP Contract (Appendix 2)	From Task Order
Award Amount (per award letter):		\$ List information from Section 11 of 'Award', OJP Form 4000/2
Revised Award Amount (if applicable)		\$ This amount may be more or less than the original amount and may be adjusted after the award is made. The grantee must submit a revised budget using the new amount.

Period of Performance	
Beginning Date	List information from Section 5 of 'Award', OJP Form 4000/2
Ending Date	List information from Section 5 of 'Award', OJP Form 4000/2
Extended to (if applicable)	List information from latest GAN approving an extension
If extended, how many months total for all approved extensions?	Add up all extensions from approved GAN(s).

Guidance

Provide an opening statement that outlines how funds will be used by the grantee and all sub-grantees (if applicable). If the grantee has an approved GAN for either a budget change or change of scope, make sure the most current information is used as a basis for the language in the Comments

If the grant award recipient address and the address of the agency being assessed are different place, note the address of the assessment site visit in Comments.

The information for this Section is captured from the application proposal, the budget narrative, approved scope and/or budget modification GANS and/or from observation of records maintained by the agency:

The limit for the sum of all extensions is typically 36 months. New DNA awards have an 18 month period of performance with an additional 18 months of possible extensions. Comment on any grants that exceed this limit.

Assessors shall carefully review any grant related Special Conditions included in the award document and ensure these have been met.

In general terms, outline how the funds are **planned to be used**. For example, state that the grantee is going to purchase Equipment to reduce the backlog, that the grantee will use Personnel funds to support overtime for working cases or performing validation, that the grantee will use funds in Contract to outsource XXX number of cases, etc. There is no need to itemize or provide a listing of what the grantee is planning to purchase. Provide detailed information on how the funds **have been used**, (itemize the expenditures), in Item 2.

- **For single agency grantees**

Provide an opening statement that outlines how funds will be used
e.g. Grant funds are to be used by the grantee/lab to....

- **For Coverdell or consortiums:**

Provide an opening statement that outlines how funds will be used by the grantee (SAA or administering agency for consortium) and all sub-grantees (if applicable).
e.g. The Office of the XXXX, is the State Administering Agency for the Paul Coverdell awards. Per the SAA's budget approved by NIJ, grant funds will be used to support the following activities.....

- Include a brief description of how the grantee (SAA or consortium administering agency) will use funds.
- Include a brief description of how funds will be used by each of the sub grantees.

Document if the agency has correspondence from OJP that states the grant has been closed.

Comments

Action Items

Copy and paste all Action Items here. Number them according to the Item the action refers to. If there are no Action Items, enter "None".

Issues for Resolution

Copy and paste all Issues for Resolution here. Number them according to the Item the issue refers to. If there are no Issues for resolution, enter "None".

B. Entrance Interview

1. Site Interview Information		Yes	No	N/A
1a	Was an Entrance interview conducted?			
1b	Was the purpose of the GPA visit explained?			
	Record names of grantee representative(s) present below:			

Guidance

Explain the purpose of the assessment and the expectations for this on site monitoring visit. (Refer to the Introduction of this document for the points to be discussed.)

Discuss and document in comments below any issues, problems or concerns the grantee may have expressed during the entrance interview.

Circulate a roster to collect names of those in attendance.

Items to mention during the meeting:

- The team is present to review grant status and to assess the use of Federal funds to increase the capabilities and capacities of State and local law enforcement agencies
- The objectives of the GPA program include:
 - the strengthening of NIJ program management and oversight
 - assisting NIJ in performing the required due diligence by overseeing that grant funding is being used as specified
 - educating grantees regarding grant program requirements and special conditions
 - identifying challenges faced by grantees in achieving grant program objectives
 - identifying successful grantee achievements and/or grant programs
 - providing the opportunity to assess the impact of grant funds
 - ensuring that Federal grant funds are being used for the purpose of achieving the goals and objectives set forth by Congress.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

C. Financial Review

When completing the following Table:

- It is acceptable to use the common rules for rounding to the nearest dollar for each of the categories in the Table.
- Dollar sign is not required
- Show over expenditures in the balance column as (XXX) **NOT** as a negative sign: -XXX.
- The amount of the funding to be listed in the “Approved Amount” column is the total amount of funds approved for that budget category, regardless of any temporary holds placed on the funding (i.e. NEPA).
 - The Approved Amount is the last OJP approved budget. There can be multiple budget modifications with OJP approvals over the life of the grant. Use **ONLY** the last OJP approved budget substantiated by a GAN to populate the Approved Amount column because it is now the **ONLY** budget that is of value.
 - Do not list a new budget that has been submitted to OJP and has **NOT** been approved yet. You do not know if it will be approved.
- Insert a 0 value for those Categories having no approved funds.
- Allowable expenses for each type of grant program are found in the chart below.
- If the grantee expends more funds than in the total budget, it has to utilize local funds to cover the excess. Please comment as to how it will cover the over expenditure(s).
- If the grantee expends local funds prior to release of the funds by OJP but after the start of the award, note these funds as expenditures. Include a statement below that details what actually took place.
- Encumbered funds are the costs of a purchase where a “purchase order” has been submitted to a supplier and the agency has not paid for the item (goods or services may or may not be delivered).
- Indicate if the funds were not used in the correct category according to the budget summary.

Use general statements to summarize activity in each budget category and **this includes information as to what documentation was available to justify the expenditure**. If funding was expended by a sub recipient for any of the above categories, include the sub recipient and details of their use of the funding.

Expenses related to training such as registration fees, while linked to the “Travel” category, should be listed in the “Other Costs” category.

If a SAA awarded funds to a sub grantees for activities associated with any of the above budget categories via a contractual agreement, include information that while funds were used by the sub grantee for XXXX, the SAA budgeted the expenditures in the Consultants/Contracts category.

The SAA may maintain copies of invoices from sub grantees but this is not a requirement. Documentation must be maintained by the grantee to support oversight of expenditures and progress toward approved goals at the sub grantee level.

The table below is an embedded Excel table with formulas, do not change. Double click on an empty cell and then add numbers in Approved Amount, Expenditures and/or Encumbrances. The Balance and Total Costs will automatically calculate.

2. General Budget Expenditures		Reported as of: _____		
“Reported as of _____” - date is taken from the most current agency report of expenditures by budget category. There is no requirement regarding this time frame. The expenditure report may be from the last quarter, the last month, etc.				
Budget Category	Approved Amount	Expenditures	Encumbered	Balance
2a – Personnel				0
2b – Fringe Benefits				0
2c – Travel				0
2d – Equipment				0
2e – Supplies				0
2f – Construction				0
2g – Consultants/Contracts				0
2h – Other				0
2i – Indirect Costs				0
Total Costs	0	0	0	0

Guidance (2a – i)

During the site visit, review expenditures to determine if they are reasonable and allowable. Follow up on any items identified from the NIJ Program Office, such as original budget, budget modifications, financial reports, unallowable expenditures, draw-downs, cost sharing/match, etc.

Use general statements to summarize activity. Include additional details relative to each funding category. If funding was expended by a sub recipient for any of the above categories, include the sub recipient and details of their expenditures.

Examples of documentation to look for:

- **Expenditures:** invoices, payment records, timesheets, time cards, payroll records, electronic transfers of funds, travel reimbursement forms, copies of checks, etc.
- **Encumbered:** contracts, purchase orders, bills, etc.

Financial monitoring elements include the general review of financial reports as well as review of grant expenditures compared to the approved budget.

	07 DNA Backlog	08 DNA Backlog	09 DNA Backlog	10 DNA Backlog	07 Cold Case	08 Cold Case	09 Cold Case	10 Cold Case	08 Convicted Offender	09 Convicted Offender	10 Convicted Offender	08 Coverdell	09 Coverdell	10 Coverdell
Accreditation	X											X	X	X
Administrative Expenses 3% max	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	1	1	1
Computerization/ Software	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
Construction / Renovation	X	X	X	X					X			2	2	2
Consultant/contractor	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Vendor Testing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Education, Training and Certification	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X
Hiring Personnel	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Laboratory Equipment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
Local Match														
Overtime	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Supplies	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Travel	3	3	3	3	4	4	X	4				X	X	X

1. Not more than 10 percent of the total amount of a Coverdell grant may be used for direct or indirect administrative expenses
2. The Coverdell law limits the amount of funds that can be used for the costs of a new facility or facilities. Maximum amounts are determined by the total amount of the Coverdell grant (including both base and competitive funds) and the total amount of funds available for Coverdell grants nationwide. The details on how the maximum funds are determined are located in the Grant Announcement.
3. Reasonable travel expenses directly associated with training may be paid. (Approval of travel related expenditures must be demonstrated (i.e., be in compliance with the state policy). Review and document travel expenditures that appear excessive.

Additionally, the NIJ has provided the following information from the OJP Financial Guide and subsequent information from the OCFO; this information has been recently provided to the DNA grantees:

Per the OJP Financial Guide, travel costs must be in accordance with Federal or an organizationally approved travel policy. Recipients may follow their own established travel rates. However, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) reserves the right to determine the reasonableness of those rates. If a recipient does not have a written travel policy, the recipient must abide by the Federal travel policy. Sub-recipients of States must follow their State's established travel policies. If a State does not have established travel policy, the sub-recipient must abide by the Federal travel policy including per diem rates. The current travel policy and per diem rate information is available at the GSA Web site <http://www.gsa.gov>.

DNA Backlog Reduction awards are formula awards, and as a result, the budgets are not reviewed

by an OCFO analyst (unless the budget is modified by GAN). Therefore, the Program Office is responsible for determining whether certain travel rates (i.e., lodging) are reasonable. The DNA Backlog Reduction Program Office has created a set of guidelines to facilitate the determination of reasonableness of those rates.

DNA grantees and GPA assessors should abide by the following guidelines for assessing whether lodging costs are unreasonable.

1. If you are using an organizationally approved written travel policy that is less restrictive than the Federal travel policy (i.e., has lodging rates higher than the current GSA rates), you must be able to provide this documentation upon request.
 2. Always try to get a room at the hotel for the government rate. Unfortunately, most hotels only have a small block of rooms reserved at the government rate.
 3. To determine the federal rate for lodging anywhere in the country, access the GSA website at <http://www.gsa.gov/portal/category/21287> to find the lodging rates used by the federal government. Click on the state displayed on the map and then find the city or county where you will be staying.
 4. If the lodging costs are 150% of, or 1.5 times, the GSA rate, you should determine what additional costs you would incur by staying in a nearby location that offers the GSA rate, and then determine if it is more economical to stay at the meeting hotel.¹ The major factor to consider is transportation cost per day if the hotel is not within walking distance - taxi costs or rental car? This analysis should be saved in the grant files. Most agencies allow reimbursement of actual hotel costs above and beyond the state/local rate, and require that this analysis be done before asking for actual hotel rates, so this should be no additional burden on grantees.
 5. If the lodging costs are 200% of, or double, the GSA rate, you must do the analysis described in #3 above and obtain the prior approval of your Program Manager before making the hotel reservations. At this rate, you should consider employing methods to reduce the cost per traveler to GSA rate levels, thereby eliminating the need to obtain prior approval from your Program Manager. Example: Request that same gender employees on official travel share a room².
 6. Lodging rates above 300%, or 3 times, the GSA rate, will not be approved.³
4. Funds may be used for travel for investigative purposes within the scope of the program (excluding witness travel).

For Informational Purposes Training Point

Indirect Costs vs. Administrative Costs:

The OJP Financial Guide defines Indirect Costs as those 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. However, in order to be reimbursed for indirect costs, a recipient must first establish with the federal government an appropriate indirect cost rate. To do this, the recipient must prepare an indirect cost rate proposal and submit it to the cognizant Federal agency. The cognizant Federal agency is generally determined based on the preponderance of Federal dollars received by the recipient. Once this rate has been approved by the federal agency, the agency can add this rate to its grant proposals. However, indirect costs are not allowable in most NIJ awards; but a SAA or other grant

¹ From 41 CFR 301 Subpart D: Actual expense reimbursement may be warranted when lodging and meal expenses within prescribed allowances cannot be obtained nearby; and costs to commute to/from the nearby location consume most or all of the savings achieved from occupying less expensive lodging.

² Per 41 CFR 301: If the person sharing the room is not a Government employee on official travel, your reimbursement is limited to the single occupancy rate.

³ Per 41 CFR 301 – 11: The maximum amount that you may be reimbursed under actual expense is limited to 300 percent (rounded to the next higher dollar) of the applicable maximum per diem rate.

recipient can request administrative costs encountered in the administration of the award. In this instance, an agency could request to utilize funding up to the limit for a particular grant program for support costs (administrative salaries, supplies, equipment, etc.) These funds would be enumerated in the grant recipient's budget proposal as administrative costs but the funds would be located in one of the recipient's budget categories (personnel, fringe, supplies, equipment, etc.) and not in the Indirect Cost category. In these circumstances, an assessor should expect to see supporting documentation for expenditures in each of the respective budget categories. The only time in which funds should be present in the Indirect Cost category is when a recipient has been approved for a federal Indirect Cost rate and it has been included in the Indirect Cost category of the budget. In this circumstance, an assessor would expect to find supporting documentation for costs for the Indirect Cost category.

Expenditures:

If the grantee has expended local funds on the project after the official award date but prior to the actual release of the funds by OJP, this is considered as the grantee making expenditures toward the goal of the grant and the applicable criterion is therefore to be marked as "Yes". If, after the award date but prior to the actual release of funds from OJP, the grantee has not expended local funds, this is to be marked "N/A".

Any expenditure of funds after the official award date, whether federal funds or local funds, on projects specified in the grant proposal are to be considered expenditures.

Activity		Yes	No	N/A
2j	Was a timeline for activity submitted with the application?			
2k	Is the grantee obligating or expending funds according to the submitted timeline?			
2l	Is the grantee drawing down funds to support the expenditures?			
2m	Has the grantee moved funds between approved categories in excess of 10% of the total amount of the grant without an approved GAN?			
2n	Has the grantee expended funds from a budget category that was not in the approved budget?			

Guidance (2j – n)

If a timeline is submitted, the budget must be reviewed to determine if the grantee's draw-down activity has occurred in accordance to the time line submitted in the grantee's application.

Movement of funds between approved budget categories is allowable up to 10% of the total award amount, provided there is no change of scope. However, many of the NIJ Program managers are now requiring a GAN whenever any funds are moved between budget categories. Grantees are never authorized under the 10% "rule" to move funds into a budget category with a \$0 balance. In order to move funds into a new budget category, a budget modification and/or a change of scope GANs MUST be submitted.

Time lines are required, per the solicitation for the following awards;

- **Cold Case beginning with 2008**
- **Convicted Offender beginning with 2009**

DNA Backlog Reduction awards

- For the Personnel Category (2a), where applicable, BR funds can be utilized to work any backlogged DNA case as defined by the laboratory. Information must be maintained that details the number of cases analyzed with this funding.
- For the Supply Category (2e), BR funds can be utilized to work any backlogged DNA case as defined by the laboratory. Information must be maintained that details the number of cases analyzed with this funding.

When completing Question 2j

Timelines may be included in the application documents when not required by the solicitation. Review the application files provided by NIJ. Timeline content is what has been approved by the Program Manager. There is no set formula for the contents or form. If a time line was submitted with the application, as required or otherwise, rate Yes. If no time line was submitted and the solicitation does not require a time line Rate N/A and comment as such.

When completing Question 2k

When a grantee receives an extension (without a new time line) rate as No and provide supporting information regarding the extension and absence of a corresponding time line in the Comments section. An Action Item is not required in this situation.

When completing Question 2l

Review the Financial Reports and note the reported expenditures during each quarter. Compare the funding draw down report to the Financial Report and current expenditures. Is the grantee drawing down funds to reimburse expenditures? Does the rate of drawdown mirror the expenditures? If not ask the grantee for justification and comment. Draws must be timed so that the grantee will be able to expend funds within 10 days of the draw down to prevent excess "cash on hand". It is acceptable for the fiscal office handling the financial transactions for the award to be separate from the grantee. Grantees do not need approval for this to occur.

When completing Questions 2m:

Rate 2m Yes only when the current budget table above indicates that the grantee has moved or will move funds in excess of 10% of the total budget. Any past budget modifications that were approved via a GAN are to be commented on in Item 18 and not relevant to this question.

Training Point

Expenditures:

The agency can make purchases other than what was described in the narrative so long as the amount is less than 10% (cumulative) of the total award and was in an approved budget category. They cannot expend funds in a budget category that is not approved e.g. \$ 0 funding. If they decide they need to make a purchase that goes above the 10% an approved GAN is required. The 10% limit on the movement of funds between categories without a GAN does not apply to awards less than \$100,000, unless there is a change in project scope.

If the SAA (or a grant manager) did not have any documentation for expenditure (their own or for a sub) add the following comment to the appropriate category and also list this as an Action Item, e.g.:

The grantee did not provide records to substantiate the costs for the expenditure of funds for xxxx at this time.

Suggested general statements**Comments**

2a –Funds expended for personnel costs, as outlined in the budget, were used to:

- Support the salary for an administrative assistant.
- Support OT to work backlogged cases.
- Support a technician in the XXX laboratory

Personnel timesheets were on record and were reviewed by the assessor from *date* to *date* for personnel funded from the award.

2b – Funds expended for Fringe Benefits costs, as outlined in the budget, were used to:

- Pay benefits for an administrative assistant.

Assessors observed time records for the administrative assistant that supported expenditure of funding for Fringe Benefits.

2c – Funds expended for Travel costs, as outlined in the budget, were used to:

- Send four analysts to professional training at the ASCLD/LAB meeting
- Send two analysts to AAFS

Assessors observed travel re-imbusement forms, registrations forms and travel/training forms, confirming expenditures in this category.

2d – The grantee requested funding on behalf of XX sub-grantees. XX of the XX sub-grantees made purchases in this category. Funds expended for equipment costs, as outlined in the budget were used to:

- Reference Item 12 - Equipment

Assessors observed invoices confirming expenditures in this category.

2d – Grantee/sub grantee XXX purchased miscellaneous laboratory equipment such as balances, microscopes, a filing system.

Assessor's observed invoices confirming expenditures in this category.

2d - The administrative agency purchased a printer. Invoices were available for the assessor. The sub-grantee xxxx purchased autopsy equipment; a request for reimbursement for this equipment was on file.

2d - The sub-grantee xxx has placed an order for DNA equipment; Copies of Purchase Orders were included with the sub grantee quarterly report included in the grantee's files. The equipment has not been delivered and the purchase is listed as encumbered funds.

2e – The SAA has not expended funds in this category specific for its own use. Sub grantees requested funds for books, proficiency tests and other supplies. Funds were expended for supplies costs as outlined in the budget.

- Supplies have been ordered but have not been delivered to the sub-grantee. Supplies purchased with these grant funds are being used to validate XXX equipment.
- Supplies purchased with these grant funds are being used to work backlogged cases. Invoices for X number of amplification kits were available for review.
- Funds are being used by the SAA for general office supplies.

Assessors observed a spreadsheet and invoices of supplies purchased with grant funds in this category.

2f – Funds expended for construction costs, as outlined in the budget, were used to:

- Renovate the cabinetry for agency xxx.
- Install new fencing for the secure evidence storage area for agency xxx.

Assessor's observed invoices and contracts confirming expenditures in this category.

2f – No funds were requested in this category.

2g – The grantee did not request fees for consultants/contracts specific for its own use. Several sub-grantees requested funds for accreditation fees, instrument maintenance and contract workers. Funds expended for contracts/consultants costs, as outlined in the budget, were used to:

- Pay for services provided by a LIMS contractor by agency xxx
- Pay for services for the installation of new laboratory bench work by agency xxx
- Pay for contractual services to provide laboratory training program(s) by agency xxx
- A consultant has been identified and a work contract was signed on xx/xx/xxxx.

Assessor's reviewed invoices for the consultant and invoices for contracts for which funds were expended.

2g – All sub-grantee expenditures were consolidated into this category. Funds expended in this category were utilized as designated in each sub-grantee's submitted budget to the grantee. The SAA had documentation to support expenditures in each of the sub grantees budget categories.

2h – The SAA has not expended funds in this category specific for its own use. Several sub grantees requested funds for meeting registrations. Funds expended for Other costs, as outlined in the budget, were used to:

- Pay registration costs associated with 4 analysts attending the Promega professional meeting.
- Pay application fees for accreditation

Assessor's observed travel re-imbusement forms, registrations forms and travel/training forms, confirming expenditures in this category.

2i – The budgeted Indirect Costs were/were not based on a federal Indirect Cost rate that was approved by OJP.

Funds expended in this category were used to:

- Pay the general administrative costs for the SAA

Assessor's observed invoices, purchase orders and time records confirming expenditures in this category.

2j & k – Rated N/A. Per the solicitation, timelines are not required for xxxxx grants.

2k - Rated No as the grantee is not obligating or expending funds according to the original submitted timeline. A XX month project period extension was approved; no new time line is in effect.

2l - Draw downs did occur for each quarter where the grantee had financial activity, and the draw downs are in line with and supported by timesheets, invoices and purchase orders.

Action Items

2d – The budget documented approval for the purchase of (name item or services). The grantee states these have been purchased but no documentation supporting the expenditures was available for review.

2k – The grantee has not purchased (name item or services) according to the timeline submitted with the proposal.

2m - The total transfer of funds between categories was greater than 10% of the total grant. The

grantee did file a GAN for a budget modification however; it has not been approved at the time of this assessment.

Issues for Resolution

2a – Funding from the Personnel budget have been used to pay the salary of an existing analyst. This use of funds is unallowable under the solicitation.

2l - Draw down totals exceed the reported total expenditures at the time of the site visit

2m - The total transfer of funds between categories was greater than 10% of the total grant. The grantee did not file a GAN for a budget modification.

2n – The grantee expended funds from the xxxxx category which had a zero budget. The grantee did not file a GAN for a budget modification.

3. Progress/Financial Reports		Yes	No	N/A
3a	Does the rate of expenditure from the financial reports mirror the activity reported by the grantee in the progress reports?			
3b	Did the grantee have a hold placed on funding due to the late filing of semi-annual progress reports or quarterly financial reports?			
3c	If funding was held, has action been taken by the grantee to permit OJP to release the funding?			

Guidance

Review financial reports in conjunction with progress reports to compare the rate of expenditures with the project activity level noted in the progress report. Provide grantee's justification, where appropriate.

Review progress reports submitted during the past year; address any incomplete or delinquent progress reports with grantee. The assessor shall determine if the grant recipient had one or more "holds" placed on its funding as a result of late filing of semi-annual progress reports or quarterly financial reports and the reason these reports were submitted late.

Using financial reports, determine if the rate of expending funds on the services/purchases appears to be reasonable? If not ask the grantee for justification and comment. If expenditures are delayed by "Holds" on funding, comment on the effect of the holds.

Below is the time table for submission of semi-annual Progress and quarterly Financial reports. Be sure to review all reports that were due prior to the site visit:

Semi-annual Progress Reports are due:

Reporting period:	Due no later than:
January 1–June 30	July 30
July 1–December 31	January 30

Quarterly Financial Status Reports are due:

Reporting quarter:	Due no later than:
January 1–March 31	April 30
April 1–June 30	July 31
July 1–September 30	October 30
October 1–December 31	January 31

When rating 3a:

This question is asking about reported activity (Progress Reports) vs. reported expenditures (Financial Reports). Rate and comment on the correlation between the NIJ Financial reports (not draw downs) and the NIJ Progress Reports. Based on your reviews and site observations, are the reported expenditures in line with the reported activity?

There is no need to include the details of the submitted progress and financial reports as NIJ has access to this information in GMS. A summary commenting on how the financial reports and the progress reports correlated is acceptable.

Training Point

If a grantee has experienced a “Hold” placed on its funding as a result of a late filing of a semi-annual progress report or a quarterly financial report, it may not receive an official GAN from OJP for the placement of the “Hold” or the subsequent release of funds. The only documentation the grantee may have is the e-mail correspondence from OJP advising it of either of these situations. However, if a “Hold” has occurred, the PMS or a recent printout of the GAN table from GMS will indicate an “Other GAN event” was issued for the placement of the “Hold” and an “Other GAN event” was issued for the release of funds. The assessor should indicate in the comments section what documentation was actually observed during the assessment.

Suggested general statements**Comments**

3a – The progress report states there has been no activity and the financial reports indicate there have been no expenditures.

3a –Progress reports support expenditures to work backlogged cases, and to purchase DNA kits used for casework. The rate of expenditure in the financial reports is in line with activity included in the progress reports.

3b – A GMS printout of grant adjustments indicates that access to the grant funds were frozen on XX/XX/XX due to an overdue progress / financial report.

3c – The overdue report(s) were received and OJP released the grant funds on XX/XX/XX.

Action Items

3a - The rate of expenditures is not consistent with the activity described in the Progress Report. Equipment has been purchased but not reported in the Progress Report.

3c - The overdue report(s) have not been submitted and the grant funds are still frozen.

3c - The overdue report(s) have been submitted but have not been received by OJP and the grant funds are still frozen.

Issues for Resolution

4. Commingled funds		Yes	No	N/A
4a	Are the grant funds commingled?			
4b	Is there a budget code assigned to this grant?			
4c	Do discrete grant expenditures have separate activity/accounting codes from other grant funds or funding sources?			

Guidance

If other funds are being used to support grant activity, check to see that funds are not commingled and that the grantee's financial management system keeps them separate. The grantee should have separate accounting codes for each award and expenditures should be charged to the appropriate account. More specifically, the agency must have a unique financial code for each award. Two awards cannot share a single code, even if the grantee can trace expenditures to each grant.

Review the various grants to check and see that each grant has its own unique financial accounting number/budget code. Check that expenditures are posted to the correct budget code for each grant. In general, grant expenditures should be posted to one account however, if any expenditure is duplicated, spread out over two or more grants financial accounts or split with agency funding comment below.

Commingled is when each award is not accounted for separately. All purchases on grant funds must be linked via an accounting code back to a specific grant account.

Suggested general statements

Comments

4a - c – The grant binder maintained by the financial office includes records that track expenditures specific to this award. The grant has a unique budget code and expenditures are traceable to the accounting code assigned to this award.

Action Items

4a – Grant funds have been released and the grantee has yet to assign a budget code to this award.

4b - There is evidence that some expenditure(s) have an incorrect accounting code. The grantee acknowledges that this is a coding error and will resolve this.

Issues for Resolution

4a – c - There is a lack of financial control. There is no unique budget code assigned to this award and grant fund expenditures are not accounted for separate from other funding sources.

5 Administrative Costs		Yes	No	N/A
5a	Have the expenditures for administrative costs exceeded the grant's threshold?			
5b	Is the grantee or sub grantee using an approved federal Indirect Cost Rate for administrative costs?			
5c	If 5b is yes, does the grantee have documentation of the cognizant federal agency?			

Guidance

Administrative expenses are limited to the allowable amount stated in each grant announcement. Currently the limits are:

- Coverdell: up to 10% of the award
- Backlog Reduction: up to 3% of total award.
- Convicted Offender/Arrestee: up to 3% of the total award
- Cold case: up to 3% of the total award for 2007 awards; for 2008 - 2010, there is no cap specified in the solicitation.

Check the approved budget for the allowable administrative cost percentage vs. the actual budget expenditures. If the actual budget percentage is greater than the allowable limit in the specific solicitation, request that the grantee explain the discrepancy.

If the agency has an approved Indirect Cost Rate, document in the Comments section what federal agency approved the rate and what the grantee's approved federal cost rate is. NOTE: even if the agency has an approved federal Indirect Cost rate greater than the amount listed in the solicitation, they are limited to the level established by the solicitation.

If the budgeted amounts for administrative costs exceed the limits of the grant, make a comment for 5a even if the agency has not expended funds as of the date of the assessment. Verify the sum of all of the administrative costs does not exceed the total allowable amount. For example, administrative costs may be allocated across budget categories, i.e. electrical costs allocated to the "Other" category, salaries and benefits for grant administrative personnel may be allocated to the "Personnel and Benefits" categories, and general office supplies may be allocated to the "Supply" category. The sum of the funds allocated for these categories may not exceed the allowable limit for the grant being reviewed.

Suggested general statements

Comments

5a-c – Rated N/A as the grantee has not budgeted or expended any funds for administrative costs.

5c – The grantee/sub grantee XXXXX is using a federal indirect cost rate of __%. This rate is approved by _____ federal agency. Documentation was included in the grant file.

Action Items

5a – The combined total of all budget categories that comprise the administrative costs exceed the solicitation allowable limit. Expenditures at the time of the assessment have not exceeded the solicitation limit.

5c - The grantee has no documentation of their approved federal Indirect Cost Rate for administrative costs.

Issues for Resolution

5a - Administrative costs have exceeded the solicitation allowable limit.

6. Sub Grantee Expenditures		Yes	No	N/A
6a	Are sub grantees included in the funding for this grant?			
6b	Has the sub-grantee(s) expenditures exceeded its approved budget projection?			

Guidance

Check approved sub-grantee allowable expenditures versus actual budget. If the actual budget expenditures are greater than allowable, request that the grantee explain the discrepancy. For example, are local/state funds being used to pay the balance of the bill? If they are under their budget projections, has the grantee made an effort to reallocate the funds for use by another sub-grantee?

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

7. Sub-Grantee Process Monitoring		Yes	No	N/A
7a	Are sub grantees included in the funding for this grant?			
7b	Does the grantee have a written process to monitor sub-grantee financial reporting?			
7c	Does the grantee monitor the sub-grantee financial duties?			
7d	Is the overall monitoring by the grantee adequate?			

Guidance

Review the grantee's financial monitoring process and determine if it is adequate.

For the monitoring of the sub grantees to be considered adequate, the grantee must have written procedures in place that requires the sub grantee report financial activities to the grantee and that the grantee reviews the reports.

From the 09 Financial Guide: "Fund requests from sub-recipients create a continuing cash demand on award balances of the State. The State should keep in mind that idle funds in the hands of sub-recipients will impair the goals of effective cash management. All recipients must develop procedures for the disbursement of funds to ensure that Federal cash on hand is kept at a minimal balance." To comply with this requirement, the grantee's procedures should ensure that the funds are spent by the sub-grantee within 10 days of the receipt from the grantee.

Suggested general statements

Comments

7d – Rated N/A. At the time of this assessment there has been no monitoring of the sub grantees because the first planned monitoring is not yet due **OR** there are no expenditures submitted by the sub grantee(s) for the grantee to initiate its monitoring plan.

Action Items

7b – The grantee has no documented fiscal monitoring plan for its sub grantees.

7c – The grantee has not monitored its sub grantees fiscal obligations at the time of the assessment. However, there is time remaining (xx months) in the current POP.

Issues for Resolution

7c – The POP has ended and the grantee has not monitored its sub grantees fiscal obligations.

D. Administrative - Award File Review

8. Files		Yes	No	N/A
8a	Does the grant recipient have a copy of the grant application?			
8b	Does the grant recipient have a copy of the signed award letter?			
8c	Does the grant recipient have copies of correspondence with the granting agency			

Guidance

Documents in the grantee's files can be electronic and/or hard paper copies.

Administrative monitoring elements focus on: the compliance with the grant's terms and conditions, reporting requirements, completeness of documentation and compliance with regulations.

Suggested general statements

Comments

8a - c - The agency maintains a comprehensive grant file. The grant proposal, award letter and correspondence with the granting agency and/or sub grantees were available for review.

8a - c - The SAA maintains a well documented system for this grant via hardcopy and electronic forms. The documentation includes the grant proposal, award letter and correspondence from the sub-grantees recording the purchases made using grant funding.

Action Items

8a – c - The grant files are incomplete because the grantee has not kept copies of application and/or award and/or correspondence.

Issues for Resolution

9. Services		Yes	No	N/A
9a	Does the proposal or subsequent approved GAN specify services/activities that will be provided?			
9b	Are the services/activities described in the progress reports consistent with those listed in the proposal or subsequent approved GAN?			
9c	Have the services/activities described in the progress reports been accurately reported?			

Guidance

Review the grantee progress reports and compare with the services/activities described in the proposal or subsequent approved GAN. Check that the grantee is performing the services/activities and is accurately reporting them in the progress reports.

When rating 9b and c:

Services and or activities are those actions taken by the grantee towards achieving the goal(s) of the grant proposal or subsequent approved GAN. These questions are relative to the information in the Progress Reports. Is the agency reporting on activities as outlined in the proposal or approved subsequent GAN and is the information in the reports, **based on site visit observation**, accurate? A comment describing what was observed to support the ratings would be appropriate.

Details from the progress reports do not need to be included as NIJ has access to that information in GMS. A summary of reported activity is sufficient.

Suggested general statements

Comments

Action Items

9c - The grantee has not accurately reported the (services/activities) described in the Progress Report # xx. Subsequent Progress Reports correctly reported activities.

Issues for Resolution

9b – The activity in Progress Report #X is not consistent with the proposal. The proposal states funds in Personnel will be used to hire an analyst to work 50 backlogged cases. The Progress Report states that “during the last 6 months the analyst has been performing general lab duties and has been working on validation studies”. (No backlogged cases were work during this time period).

10. Confidentiality		Yes	No	N/A
10a	Does the grant recipient have a copy of the Privacy Certificate?			X
10b	Have there been any changes to the Privacy Certificate?			X
10c	If there have been changes in the Privacy Certificate does the grantee have copies of those changes?			X
10d	Has the grantee documented any changes in research protocols that may affect the confidentiality/security of the research or statistical information collected?			X

Guidance

These items are not rated for the NIJ grants under review by the GPA program.

11. Human subjects		Yes	No	N/A
11a	Does the project involve human subjects?			X
11b	Does this project require Certification from an IRB or from the OJP Office of General Counsel?			X
11c	If the project requires Certification has it been reviewed and approved by an IRB?			X

Guidance

These items are not rated for the NIJ grants under review by the GPA program.

12. Inventory		Yes	No	N/A
12a	Can the grant recipient account for individual equipment items costing in excess of \$5,000?			
12b	Can the grant recipient account for all computer (including software) and photographic equipment items costing more than \$1,000?			

Guidance

Documentation must be maintained by the grantee to support the oversight of expenditures for the purchase of equipment.

- Sub grantees may have the purchase orders and/or the equipment invoices, regardless; the grantee/administering agency must have some mechanism of tracking/accounting for equipment purchases.
- The tables below must include equipment purchased by the grantee/administering agency specific for their use and equipment purchased by/for a sub-grantee.

Each agency may have their own threshold cost for equipment. The Financial Guide states that agencies that have their own policy must follow it. If an agency lacks a policy, they must follow the federal procedures.

Training Point: Questions for Item 12 should be taken literally, because it is specific to a purchase. In light of this, the question is: “Can the agency account for items purchased for the award, whether using local or federal funds?” If, during the grant period, an agency decides to purchase items not being held by a Special Condition with local funds and submit the request for reimbursement once the funds have been released, can they account for the items? If so, rate the answer “Yes; if they cannot, answer “No”. If the agency has not made any purchases, for whatever reason, the answer is “N/A”

When completing the tables:

- Identify the agency/lab where the equipment is located when equipment is dispersed to multiple locations (for example NFSIA SAA or Headquarters for a regional laboratory)
- Provide the agency number assigned to the equipment when conducting a review where the equipment is located on site.
- For sub grantees, the name of the item(s) purchased in these categories must be included in the table and a serial number or agency number for the equipment must be available in the grantee’s files and included in the table.

12a – Equipment Cost >\$5,000.00/item		
Item	Serial #	Agency or Agency #

12b – Computer & Photographic Equipment Cost >\$1,000.00/item		
Item	Serial #	Agency or Agency #

Suggested general statements

Comments

12a & b - Rated N/A because there is no funding for equipment in this grant

12a & b - Rated N/A as the grantee/sub grantee(s) has not ordered or received any equipment that was planned to be purchased as of the date of the assessment

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

12b – The grantee purchased computers using DNA Backlog funds. The assessment team observed some computers assigned to other units of the laboratory.

13. Sub-Grantee Monitoring		Yes	No	N/A
13a	Are any of the sub grantees debarred or suspended from participation in Federal assistance programs?			
13b	Do written procedures exist regarding sub grantee monitoring and/or site visits?			
13c	Does the grantee monitor the sub-grantee for compliance with the conditions of the sub-grant award?			
13d	Does the grantee monitor the sub-grantee for compliance with the Federal Financial Guide?			
13e	Is the grantee monitoring process adequate?			
13f	Does the grantee perform site visits on sub-grantees?			
13g	Are the sub-grantees in compliance with the conditions of the sub-grantee award?			
13h	Does the grantee document sub-grantee site visit findings in a report?			
13i	Does the grantee have a process for following up on issues, if applicable?			
13j	Does the grantee know when and where to report issues with sub grantees to OJP?			

Guidance

Assessors should review sub-grantee site visit reports or completed checklists in the grantee's file to verify that site visits are occurring, if required by the agency's internal policy.

Additionally, the assessors should review the following documents when examining sub grantee monitoring:

- financial reports, progress reports, drawdown activity
- budgets
- audit reports, audit findings and audit resolutions related to the award being reviewed.

When sub awards are made to another organization(s), the grantee must hold sub grantees accountable to the same level of administrative, financial and programmatic reporting requirements as the grantee.

For a grantee's monitoring process to be considered "adequate" the grantee must have written procedures in place that require sub grantee administrative, financial and programmatic reporting. If the grantee requires site visits, records of these site visits must be maintained by the grantee. In the Comments section, include the name of the sub grantee(s) monitored/visited by the grantee.

Check that the grantee is monitoring sub grantee related activity/expenditures and verifying activity/expenditures are in line with what was approved. Monitoring would include a review of grant funded equipment and personnel time records.

Comment on and describe the procedures and or processes used by the grantee to monitor sub grantee expenditures and grant related activity.

Assessors should request to review the grantee's monitoring policies and determine whether they and sub grantees are in compliance.

Suggested general statements**Comments**

13a – j - There is no sub-grantee activity associated with this grant funded project.

13b - The grantee has procedures in place to monitor sub grantee activity but there have been no purchases or activity to report/monitor as of this assessment.

13f - The administering agency maintains quarterly reports from the sub grantees documenting expenditures that are broken down by category. Detailed records for purchases made using grant funds are on file at sub grantee locations. The administering agency does an excellent job of tracking grant expenditures in an agency database and then verifying the expenses and grant related activity through Programmatic Site Visits; documentation of those site visits were on file and reviewed by assessors.

Action Items

13b – The grantee is performing site visits, however the grantee has no written procedures in place for sub grantee monitoring.

13i – The grantee performed a site visit of sub grantee xxx and identified issues. The grantee has not followed up on issues it discovered.

13j - The grantee has not reported issues with the sub grantees to the NIJ Grant Manager.

Issues for Resolution

13f – The grantee is not performing site visits of the sub grantees, as required by internal policy. Based on communication with the grant manager there are no plans to visit the sub grantee by the end of the POP.

E. Administrative – Personnel Review

14. Key personnel		Yes	No	N/A
14a	Are the individuals listed as “Key Personnel” working on the project?			
14b	Are they performing the duties specified in the grant proposal?			
14c	Is the award point of contact current in GMS?			
14d	Is the financial point of contact current in GMS?			

Guidance

Through discussion and observation and review of documentation, check that Key Personnel identified in the project are actually working on the project and that any changes have been approved.

Items 14a & b are limited to only those individuals identified as “Key Personnel” in the grant proposal, written communication or subsequent GAN(s). A replacement for POCs must be by a GAN; however, NIJ can be notified by other means (such as e-mail) to changes in other Key Personnel. Paul Coverdell solicitations do not require the inclusion of a list of “Key Personnel” whereas DNA Backlog Reduction, Convicted Offender Backlog Reduction and Cold Case solicitations do.

Items 14 c & d: Verify during the site visit that the points of contact listed in the original award documents are the individuals currently serving in those positions. This information may be found in the “Application Number” document in the zipped files on the portal. If they are not, check to make sure the grantee has documentation (either a GAN or e-mail) from NIJ acknowledging the change in personnel. If the grantee does not have this documentation, make a statement in the Comments section and in the Action Item section.

There is no need to include names of Key Personnel or point of contracts under Comments unless there is a discrepancy with the information in the award document, other written communication or any subsequent GANs.

“Key Personnel” can be administrators/supervisors/technical leaders/grant managers, etc. “Working” on the project is not limited to those positions funded by the grant. These individuals can have responsibility for the project that justifies their “work”.

Suggested general statements Comments

Action Items

14a - A Key Personnel (position) is currently vacant.

14c – The financial point of contact and/or the grant point of contact is not current in GMS

Issues for Resolution

15. Time and Effort		Yes	No	N/A
15a	Did the grantee budget for personnel expenditures?			
15b	Are expenditures in line with approved budget?			
15c	Are individuals in positions funded by this grant required to submit time and effort reports?			
15d	Do the time and effort reports reflect the activities specifically supported with these grant funds?			
15e	Have the time and effort reports been signed (either in writing or electronically) by the employee and a supervisor?			
15f	Are actual hours worked recorded on the time and effort reports?			
15g	Does the grantee maintain documentation verifying time and effort for sub-grantees paid with grant funds, if applicable?			

Guidance

Review time and effort reports for all personnel being paid using these grant funds. Time and effort reports may be electronic or hard copy.

Comment on, or describe the procedures or processes used by the grantee to track grant funded personnel activity.

For Item 15g, the grantees may either maintain time and effort records for the sub-grantees or they should monitor sub grantee personnel related activity/expenditures via progress reports, financial reports and/or site visits (see Item 13).

Time and effort reports are required for grant funded personnel who are consultants or contractors.

Suggested general statements

Comments

15a – f - Funding was approved to support overtime for five scientists working backlogged cases.

Time cards documenting the actual number of OT hours worked as well as the case file number(s) being worked are submitted to the section supervisor for review and signature. The section supervisor maintains a spreadsheet as a running log to track total number of OT hours each scientist is paid as well as the total number of cases worked. Copies of the time sheets and the log were available for review.

15a – g- The grantee requested funding for overtime on behalf of two sub grantees. The grantee monitors sub grantee personnel related activities/expenditures via fiscal and programmatic reports submitted by the sub grantee. While the grantee does not maintain copies of sub grantee time sheets the grantee has records documenting that they monitor these during site visits (reference Item 13).

15c - f – Grant funded personnel are required to submit weekly timesheets. Timesheets are submitted electronically and include the date, the number of hours worked and the grant code number. Electronic signatures are required for both the employee and supervisor.

Action Items

15g – The grantee has reimbursed the sub grantee for personnel expenditures. However, grantee is not verifying time and attendance records to support the request for reimbursement.

Issues for Resolution

15b – Cold case detectives being paid by grant funding are investigating other types of cases in addition to the cold cases.

F. Programmatic Review

16 Grant Manager		Yes	No	N/A
16a	Did the NIJ Grant Manager visit the project site where grant related activity is being performed?			
16b	If there are multiple sites, does the grant file document what sites were visited by the NIJ grant manager?			
16c	Does the post site letter provided to the grantee after a NIJ Program Manager's site visit include any programmatic or administrative problems requiring formal resolution?			
16d	Have the issues identified in 16c been resolved?			

Guidance

The site of a grant-funded project is the site where the program or activity funded by the grant is taking place.

Programmatic monitoring review elements address the content and substance of the program. The monitoring involves a qualitative and/or quantitative (i.e., performance measures) review to determine grant performance, innovation and contributions to the field. It assesses whether grant activities are consistent with the grant implementation plan and responsive to grant goals and objectives.

Review information the grantee has in its files concerning previous site visits by the NIJ Program Manager. If there have been no site visits by the NIJ Program Manager, rate 16a as No and 16b – through – d as N/A and no comments are needed.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

17. Goals, Objectives, Activities and Services		Yes	No	N/A
17a	Does the activity supported by grant funds reflect the goals outlined in the original proposal or subsequent approved changes in scope?			
17b	Are there any issues from previous site visits? (See Item 16c)			
17c	Have the issues identified in 17b been resolved? (See Item 16d)			

Guidance

Through discussion and review of documentation, review how the objectives are being implemented and compare to what had been planned.

The ratings for this Item are based on the documentation and activity observed while on site.

Suggested general statements**Comments**

17a - Funding was approved to support the salaries for two full time forensic scientists. The proposal states that with the addition of these positions the case backlog will be reduced. Documentation in the grant file verifies the use of funding for this purpose. The scientists have been hired, trained and as of mo/day/year are actively working cases.

Action Items**Issues for Resolution**

17a – The activity supported by grant funds does not reflect the goals outlined in the proposal. Cold Case funds are being used to work backlogged cases rather than cases where all investigative leads have been exhausted.

18. Deliverables		Yes	No	N/A
18a	Are the deliverables being produced in a timely manner?			
18b	Are the deliverables being produced in a quality manner?			

Guidance

Through discussion and review of documentation, review how the deliverables are being produced and compare to what had been planned. Provide information detailing the deliverable for each grant in the appropriate Appendix at the end of this document.

Review grant related objectives with observed deliverables. Determine whether or not equipment purchases are operating as expected. Also, determine whether or not all of the deliverables have resulted in the anticipated outcomes.

Review any approved GANs requesting an extension of the period of performance and comment on why the extension was necessary.

Deliverables are the products or results of the work being supported with the grant funds. There are several things to consider when rating this question. One is the request for extensions, another is if the activity observed is following the time line submitted with the proposal (where applicable, reference 2j). Additionally, if an award was granted and there have been no expenditures/activities for months at a time, the deliverables are not being produced in a timely manner. This is also applicable to a situation where the award is about to end and there is an excess amount of funding in the budget yet to be spent or encumbered. Rate NO and give your opinion if you think they cannot spend the funding in the time left or the agency has no plan to do so.

If the grant POP is closed, rate 18a N/A and provide a comment to support the rating.

If there is a delay in producing deliverables that is from a slowdown outside the control of the grantee such as delays by the procurement department, routine business practices, routine delays in the hiring practice, contractual issues or delivery of goods/services purchased, then comment on these as to the extent it has affected deliverables. Note this in the Comments section and no Action Item is needed.

If there is a delay in producing deliverables that is under the control of the grantee such as failing to order goods, not following up on contract negotiations, failing to follow their own guidelines which resulted in a delay, then comment on this as an Action Item.

Suggested general statements

Comments

18a & b - The grant period of performance is due to end in 2 months. Records reviewed indicate all funding has been expended or encumbered. Equipment purchased with grant funding has been validated and is in use. All casework outsourced with these grant funds was analyzed in a quality manner. Reference the Appendix for additional details.

18b – Rated N/A as a limited amount of the funding has been expended. Deliverables could not be evaluated at this time.

Action Items

18a –Funds have not been expended and services are not being provided in a timely manner.

18a – Deliverables are not being produced in accordance with the proposal's time line.

Issues for Resolution

18a – With 3 months remaining in the POP, the grantee has in excess of \$100,000 remaining in the budget. No information was available regarding a plan to spend the remaining funds prior to the close date.

19. Funding or Scope Modifications		Yes	No	N/A
19a	Have there been any changes or modifications to the approved award?			
19b	Are the changes allowable?			
19c	Where required, does the grantee have records indicating OJP approval? (i.e. was the appropriate GAN filed in GMS before the changes were initiated?)			

Guidance

Comment on any changes to the scope of the project and comment on budget modifications which involved movement of funds from one category to another, elimination or addition of budget categories or change of scope.

Assess whether the changes in activities are unallowable or if they require authorizations.

Comment on all changes to the approved award. This includes changes that did not require a GAN, as well as changes that did require a GAN. For example, include in Comments if the grantee:

- purchased additional items of equipment above and beyond what was purposed as a result of savings from the approved items of equipment.
- moved funds between budget categories

This section is limited to budget modifications and scope changes. Do not include commentary regarding other types of GANs.

Suggested general statements

Comments

19a – c - There have been several GANs requested and approved for this award:

- GAN # xx was submitted to reflect the grantee receiving only the Base award. A budget modification was necessary due to the agency not receiving the Competitive portion of their original grant request.
- GAN # yy was for a change in project scope. It requested that the grantee be allowed to include two sub grantees rather than the three in the original proposal.
- GAN # zz requested a reallocation of funding to cover out of state training and to utilize a portion of the funding for updating of the Medical Examiner's information system. The grantee removed the equipment and the renovation funding from the budget in this modification as well.

19a & b – Rated Yes, the grantee moved 5% of the funding from the Personnel budget category to the Supplies budget category.

19c – Rated N/A as OJP approval is not required when the total movement of funding between budget categories is less than 10%.

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

19a – c – Funding approved in the Equipment budget category for the purchase of xxx without prior approval.

20. Measurement Data		Yes	No	N/A
20a	Does the project require the collection of defined performance measurement data?			
20b	Does the grantee have a process for collecting the performance data			
20c	Does the grantee have sufficient records to substantiate reported performance data that is both accurate and auditable?			
20d	Is the performance measurement linked to the grant's established goals?			
20e	If there are sub-grantees, does the grantee have a process to perform on-site validation of the sub grantee data?			
20f	Is the process for collecting and reporting data adequate?			

Guidance

To validate that performance measure reporting requirements are being met, assessors will complete the information in the table above.

The assessor should review the agency's aggregate performance measurement data and determine if there are any glaring reasons for concern, such as possible over-reporting, under-reporting, spikes in reporting, or lack of progress reported. In such instances, request justification from grantee.

Discuss all performance measures with grantee to ensure that the grantee has a clear understanding of how they are defined

Provide additional information detailing performance measurement data for each grant in the Appendix at the end of this document (if applicable).

Adequacy for the collection and reporting of data can be assessed by checking to see that consistent procedures are used, whether they are based on a proven model, and whether safeguards are in place to protect performance data integrity. If there has been limited activity and no data is present, the adequacy of the reporting process can't be evaluated, rate 20f N/A.

All awards in the GPA program require the collection of performance measurement data. Solicitations for each award include language describing the collection of data for the required performance measures. Reference and review the solicitation prior to the site visit, rate this section taking into consideration the specific performance measures.

Where applicable, in Comments, reference the appropriate Appendix if additional information is included.

Performance data (metrics) is contained in the solicitation. It is not necessary to list the performance metrics under Comments. Comment if the agency did not report the data in the Progress reports or reported it incorrectly.

The following information has been provided by the NIJ concerning Performance Measures and it has recently been provided to all agencies having a DNA award:

Performance measures that are required for DNA awards are clearly defined within the solicitation, and are submitted with the semi-annual progress reports. Grantees agree to provide these metrics

when they sign the award document and accept all special conditions (which specify that performance measures must be provided).

Data Collection Plans are required to be submitted with each application starting in 2009. The actual verbiage from the FY 10 DNA Backlog Reduction Program details the expectation very well and states:

Plan for Collecting the Data Required for Performance Measures: The data collection plan is a description of the applicant's plan for collecting the data required for performance measures. Applicants must discuss this plan in their applications. The plan must describe how the performance measure data will be derived, state who will be responsible for collecting the data, and state that the data will be available for review 3 years post award, as required. The data collection plan should be rigorous enough to ensure that the performance measure data provided are accurate, auditable, and correctly measure the impact of the Federal funds provided.

The data collection plan must clearly describe both the method for the collection and tracking of performance measure data *produced as a result of federal assistance provided under this solicitation* as well as the method for reporting such data on a semi-annual basis. For projects that include forensic casework backlog reduction activities and objectives, the data collection plan must also include an explanation of how the tracking and reporting methods will avoid the possibility of "double counting" cases affected by federal funds.

Performance measures can be broken into two categories and several subcategories:

Capacity measures:

Includes ***turnaround time*** as well as the ***average number of DNA samples analyzed/analyst/month***. This data should be collected for the ***DNA/Biology Unit in toto***. If the DNA Unit is a standalone section within your lab, then you should report only the performance measures for the DNA Unit. If the DNA Unit is integrated with the screening unit into a Forensic Biology Unit – then the metrics for turnaround time should incorporate the entire time it takes to work a case. The average number of DNA samples analyzed/analyst/month should only reflect samples tested for DNA. These metrics do not require an analysis of the federal contribution to your turnaround time of sample throughput.

Turnaround time:

Grantees are required to specify the turnaround time at the beginning of the award period and at the end of each 6 month reporting period (awards prior to 2009 required collection of quarterly data). The turnaround time at the time the award was issued should never change from one progress report to the next (unless a determination has been made that the original reported turnaround time was incorrect, in which case an explanation is required). The turnaround time is a measurement of the time the case is received in the lab until the delivery of the final lab report to the submitting agency. *It is not the time that an analyst receives the assignment until the report is delivered.* Most DNA laboratories have LIMS systems and collection of accurate data on actual turnaround time should be easy to collect. If a lab has not yet purchased a LIMS system, records can be maintained using spreadsheets or other paper records. Remember that the data must be auditable, so the lab has to maintain the data that backs up the performance measures reflected in the semi-annual progress report. For convicted offender/arrestee awards, the turnaround time is measured from the receipt of the sample in the lab until the sample profile is uploaded into CODIS.

Average Samples analyzed/analyst/month:

For case working laboratories, grantees should count only forensic samples (questioned samples) and the known reference samples tested. It is not acceptable to count controls, reagent blanks, or

the number of items submitted in a case (as not all items are subjected to DNA testing). Most grantees find that recording the number of samples from extraction logs or injection logs as the easiest way to collect this data if their LIMS system is incapable of tracking this data.

Grantees of convicted offender/arrestee awards should provide identical data only for the actual number of offender samples tested. Controls, blanks, etc should not be counted.

In instances where a lab may require analysts to test a mixture of offender and casework samples, these two sample types must be broken out separately.

The metric calls for the average number of DNA samples worked/analyst/MONTH. Grantees may find it easiest to calculate the total number of samples worked during the reporting period, and then would have to divide the total by the number of months in the reporting period and the number of analysts that contributed to the samples worked.

Remember the metric calls for samples tested – not cases tested. The lab must have a mechanism in place to track samples worked.

In cases where a grantee has federally supported positions on an award, the turnaround time and throughput from *only these individuals* should not be reported. We need data on the capacity of the entire DNA/Biology Unit.

Case working metrics:

Includes data on **backlogs of cases or database samples** to be worked, **actual cases or database samples worked using federal grant funding**, and information on **profiles entered into CODIS and CODIS hits** from cases/samples worked with federal funding.

Backlog data:

Grantees are required to specify the backlog of cases or database samples at the beginning of the award period and at the end of each 6 month reporting period (awards prior to 2009 required collection of quarterly data). The backlog at the time the award was issued should never change from one progress report to the next (unless a determination has been made that the original reported backlog was incorrect, in which case an explanation is required). This data should reflect the entire backlog of cases in the DNA/Biology Unit or the backlog of offender samples in the Database Unit.

Cases worked and/or database samples worked:

This metric requires that the cases worked and/or offender samples tested were assisted by the federal award. The DNA Backlog Reduction program requires that grantees work at least 1 case for every \$1,000 in overtime funds and supply funds awarded. **Only cases worked on overtime and/or using supply funds from the award should be counted – not all cases worked in the section.** This means that cases worked on overtime as well as cases worked using federally funded supplies must be tracked. Most laboratories track cases worked on overtime on their time and attendance sheets or in an Excel spreadsheet. Cases worked with federal supplies are usually tracked using the lot number of the amplification kits as that is the primary expense in reagent costs. Grantees must have a method of comparing cases worked on overtime with those receiving assistance from supplies so cases are not double counted. Some agencies have initiated a code sequence to the case number or CODIS profile uploaded which denotes that the case received federal assistance.

Optional Metrics:

You will note that we have added a new optional metric to the FY09 and FY10 DNA Backlog Reduction Program progress reports. We discussed this performance measure at the Grant

Management Summit, but there seems to be confusion as to how to handle this metric. **Although the metric is optional, a response is required to be entered in GMS.**

Remember - Casework metrics are designed to capture the number of cases worked, profiles entered into CODIS, and CODIS hits obtained due to assistance with federal funds. The solicitation requires that a minimum of 1 case be worked for each \$1000 in overtime and supply funds received. You are also required to collect data on cases outsourced using federal funds. Care must be taken when calculating casework metrics so that you don't count the same case two or three times as receiving the benefit of federal assistance. For instance a case that is outsourced and then overtime is used to review the data for CODIS entry should only be counted once. A case worked using federal supply funds and overtime should only be counted once. A case worked by a grant funded DNA analyst, using federal supplies, and overtime should only be counted once. A case worked by a grant funded screener and then turned over to a DNA analyst who uses supply or overtime assistance to work the case should only be counted once.

Below are the entries we'd like you to make in this optional metric:

- Grantees that do not have any grant funded personnel on their award should simply enter **"NA"**.
- If you have technicians or screeners funded by the grant, you should enter **"see narrative"** - and provide what information is relevant to their contribution to your casework production in the narrative section of your report. Do not include their contributions to any of the DNA casework performance measures. An example of an entry for a screener in the narrative would be that the screener worked 50 cases in the reporting period and 23 were referred to the DNA unit for further testing. An example entry in the narrative for a technician would be that the technician extracted and quantitated all 50 cases worked by DNA analysts in the lab during the reporting period.
- If you have grant-funded DNA analysts on your award, and no supply or overtime funds were used in the analysis of their cases - **please enter the number of cases grant funded DNA analysts worked under this award.**
- If grant funded DNA analysts are working cases that also receive the benefit of federal overtime and supply funding assistance; the grantee must be careful to avoid double or triple counting of casework metrics. In this instance, enter the following- **"NA - the casework metrics include the contributions of all allowable federal funding categories"**.

Samples uploaded to CODIS and CODIS hits obtained as a result of federal funding assistance:

If laboratories use a unique code when entering profiles to CODIS for samples that received federal assistance, the recovery of accurate data to meet these performance measures is easily obtained by your CODIS administrator, who can run a query for these two measures based on the dates of the reporting period. All profiles uploaded to CODIS and all CODIS hits for the laboratory during the reporting period should *not* be reported, just those that are attributable to grant funding.

GPA assessors should discuss with grantees how they track performance metrics and make a determination if the tracking mechanism used within the lab produce accurate, auditable data that meets the requirements requested in the performance measures.

Suggested general statements

Comments

20a – Performance data are as defined in the solicitation.

20b - Data is tracked using an ad hoc query created by the Technical Leader.

20d – The goal of this award is to increase the DNA unit's turnaround time and reduce the number of

backlogged cases. The defined performance measurement data is therefore linked to the proposed goals. Reference Appendix A for details

Action Items

20c & f - The grantee did not maintain a record of in-house casework specifically supported with grant funds, nor did it appear that there is a process in place to differentiate between grant funded and non-grant funded cases when reporting performance metrics

20f – The process for collecting and reporting data is not adequate because they are not collecting the proper data. The performance measurement asks for xxx (the number of cases analyzed and delivered to the requesting agency using funding provided under this award) and they are reporting yyyy (the number of cases worked for a time period rather than cases attributable specifically to the work supported with the grant funding).

Issues for Resolution

G. Grant Administration

21 Practices		Yes	No	N/A
21a	Did the assessor observe or discuss with the grantee any promising practices regarding grant activities/services?			

Guidance

Describe programs, initiatives, practices or activities, if any, considered to be successful models for others to follow.

This section is to capture assessor observations on promising practices. Item 28 captures the grantee’s comments on the successes they were able to achieve using grant funding.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

22 Issues		Yes	No	N/A
22a	Were there any action items or issues raised by the grantee or discovered during the site visit that may require action on the part of the grantee?			

Guidance

When there are no issues or action items associated with any of the questions in the report, rate this section “No”. When action items or issues have been identified with one or more of the questions in the report, rate this section “Yes”. Include the following under “Action Items” and/or “Issues for Resolution” - “Action Items and/or Issues have been identified, reference Section A of this report”.

Suggested general statements

Comments

Action Items

22a – Action Items have been identified; reference Section A of this report.

Issues for Resolution

22a – Issues have been identified; reference Section A of this report.

23 High Risk		Yes	No	N/A
23a	Is the Grantee a High Risk agency as designated by OAAM?			
23b	Are there any actions planned or in progress to resolve withholding or non-withholding special conditions?			
23c	Does the grantee indicate that there are any impediments/risks to completing the remediation plan or planned activities related to the issue that caused the grantee to be placed on the High Risk list?			

Guidance

NIJ will provide information as to whether or not the grantee is on the High Risk list and any available documentation regarding outstanding audits for the grantee from OAAM. This step will help the assessor determine which issues may be appropriate to discuss with the grantee during the site visit.

Document any steps that are taken to help the grantee resolve those known issues.

In the portal Gallery you will find the state specific NIJ Reports sub album. If an agency has been deemed at risk by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, it will be listed in this sub album. Rate 23 b & c N/A if the High Risk designation does not involve an NIJ award.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

24. Roadblocks		Yes	No	N/A
24a	Did the grantee experience any roadblocks to grant implementation?			

Guidance

Provide comment regarding any roadblocks the grantee has experienced as well as any action items.

A roadblock is a problem or situation that has held up the agency from implementation of the grant or stopped the progress of an activity sometime during the POP.

Routine administrative, financial or other issues that are common in day to day business are better considered as slowdowns rather than roadblocks and should be commented on in Item 18 for their effect on deliverables. Roadblocks are situations where nothing can be done to implement or continue a particular activity until it is removed. A roadblock may involve significant effort on the part of the grantee to resolve.

A roadblock could be due to, for example, failure of a governmental or administrative body to accept an award and/or to authorize the expenditure of the funds; a hiring freeze for grant funded staff; natural disasters; internal agency policy that prevents the grantee from working on a current grant until a previous one is completed or a failure to satisfy a Special Condition.

Comment on how long the roadblock held up the agency.

Comment on whether or not the agency has a plan in place to mitigate the time lost, other than an extension for the POP, due to the roadblock.

In general, if the roadblock that is reported is still open or unresolved, then it can be listed as an Action Item; if the roadblock is past history at the time of the site visit, then it will not be listed as an Action Item.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

25 Technical Assistance		Yes	No	N/A
25a	Has the grantee requested any financial-related, administrative, and/or programmatic assistance during the site visit?			
25b	Was any assistance provided to the grantee during the site visit?			
25c	Does the grantee indicate they have developed sustainability plans related to the continuation of the activities, services, and/or purchases performed using these grant funds?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
25d	If new programs have been implemented, does the grantee have plans for these programs be funded after OJP funding has ceased?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
25e	If additional employees were hired, will the grantee continue to fund these positions after OJP funding has ceased?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
25f	Does the grantee indicate they would benefit or plan to request Technical Assistance from OJP to develop sustainability plans?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Guidance

Provide comments regarding any financial, administrative, and/or programmatic assistance that was provided to or requested by the grantee.

Comments**Action Items****Issues for Resolution**

26 Fraud, Waste and Abuse		Yes	No	N/A
26a	Does the grantee acknowledge they and the sub-grantee(s) have read the Conflict of Interest definition in Chapter 3 of the OJP Financial Guide?			
26b	Does the grantee have sole source contracts that they will use with these grant funds?			
26c	Does the grantee understand OJP guidelines on the use of sole source contracts using grant funds?			
26d	If the grantee is using consultants, is the process fair and reasonable?			
26e	If the grantee is using consultants, and they have exceeded the federal threshold on compensation, did the grantee receive prior approval from NIJ?			
26f	Did the grantee support their draw downs with evidence (general ledgers, receipts, or time sheets)?			
26g	Is any income generated by grant activities properly reported?			

Guidance

Thoroughly review the grantee's financial, administrative and programmatic compliance to detect any potential indicators of fraud, waste, and abuse. Inquire about grantee's internal controls/segregation of duties.

If the federal threshold on compensation was exceeded, does the grantee have authority from NIJ to exceed the threshold?

Review grantee procurement activity and approval of all sole source contracts in excess of \$100,000.

The federal threshold for sole source approval requirements supersedes state policy.

The grantee must have an understanding of OJP guidelines on the use of sole source contracts even if the budget proposal does not include an item that qualifies for sole sourcing. Contracts must be awarded via a competitive process unless approved by OJP as a sole-source purchase. If the agency receives only one response in the bidding process, the grantee must seek sole source approval from OJP when the contact amount is in excess of \$100,000

Note: Beginning in FY09, sole source justification for Convicted Offender and Cold Case grants may be included in the grantee's application. If the grantee has documentation of sole source authorization based on budget approval (such as communication from the NIJ Program Manager or financial clearance memo), no further action is required (i.e. approval via a GAN is not needed). Otherwise, sole source using funding from all other grant programs require approval via a GAN.

If an individual is hired as a temporary employee by the agency and is paid salary and benefits, whether or not they receive a contract, then they are considered an employee and not a contractor. However, if they received a contract and were paid as a 1099 employee, they are a contractor and items 26d & e need to be answered.

A simplified definition of a consultant is someone that provides advice and a contractor is someone that provides a service.

The OJP Financial Guide further states *“Compensation for individual consultant services is to be reasonable and consistent with that paid for similar services in the marketplace. Consideration will be given to compensation including fringe benefits for those individuals whose employers do not provide such benefits. In addition, when the rate exceeds \$450 for an 8-hour day, or \$56.25 per hour (excluding travel and subsistence costs), a written PRIOR APPROVAL is required from the awarding agency. Prior approval requests require additional justification. An 8-hour day may include preparation, evaluation, and travel time in addition to the time required for actual performance. Please note, however, that this does not mean that the rate can or should be \$450 for all consultants. Rates should be developed and reviewed on a case-by-case basis and must be reasonable and allowable in accordance with OMB cost principles. Approval of consultant rates, in excess of \$450 a day, that are part of the original application with appropriate justification and supporting data will be approved on a case-by-case basis. The following is the policy in regard to compensation of various classifications of consultants who perform like-type services. If consultants are hired through a competitive bidding process (not sole source), the \$450 threshold does not apply.”*

The grantee may use consultants. The rate of compensation can vary from consultant to consultant. Examine what the consultant is supplying to the grantee and evaluate if the compensation is reasonable for services. Determine if the rate of compensation for any consultant is greater than \$450 per eight hour day (\$56.25 per hour); if so comment below.

From earlier examination of expenditures (Item 2), determine if sufficient evidence to support draw downs exist.

Determine if the grantee is generating fees/income from the services supported by grant funds. Comment below on how the income is reported to OJP and/or affecting the grant.

Suggested general statements

Comments

26b - The grantee has sole source contracts with following:

- Vendor A
- Vendor B
- Vendor C

26g – Income is being generated through the activities supported by the grant funds. This profit was being used for the general activities being carried out in the laboratory.

26g – Rated N/A, no income is being generated.

Action Items

26b - The grantee has plans to expend total funds in excess of \$100,000 from company X during the POP but does not have or has not requested a GAN at this time.

Issues for Resolution

26b –Equipment purchased from XXXX company exceeded \$100,000. There was no competitive bidding for the purchase nor was there a GAN documenting sole source approval prior to the purchase.

26e - The grantee has paid consultants in excess of the maximum reimbursement without OJP approval.

H Exit Interview

27. Site Interview Information		Yes	No	N/A
27a	Was an exit interview conducted?			
27b	Was a summary of the results of the monitoring visit presented?			
27c	Did the exit interview include any potential action items and/or issues for resolution?			
27d	Was feedback solicited from the grantee about the site visit and was the grantee asked to complete the on-line NFSTC Team Evaluation?			
Record names of grantee representative(s) present below:				

Guidance

Provide comment regarding feedback from the grantee

Circulate a roster to collect names of those in attendance.

Request the grantee fill out team evaluations on the NFSTC web site. Lead assessors are encouraged to send a follow up email reminder immediately after the conclusion of the site visit that includes a link to the evaluation survey.

Suggested general statements

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

I Other

28. Program Successes:

Assessors are requested to document grantee achievements that are a direct result of their grant award. This information shall be documented below in a free-form narrative and may consist of details which describe how the grantee exceeded the original goals and objectives set forth in the grant. Examples should include an increase in the number of cases being worked, success stories in solving cases, novel approaches to solving problems, etc.

The assessor will provide a summary paragraph of information that has been provided by the grantee to demonstrate the successes of the program. This summary is to state that the verbiage is from the grantee Project Manager, Lab Director, etc.

Include Program Successes only if they have not been previously captured in a Progress Report.

If none provided by the grantee state "None provided"

Comments

29. Opportunities for Program Improvement

Assessors should document areas where the grantee believes that the grant program can be improved. This information shall be documented below in free-form narrative. Examples shall include difficulties with the procurement process, contract process, contract vendor(s), receipt of funds, etc. Assessors should attempt to identify the specific issues, if applicable.

The assessor will provide a summary paragraph of information that has been provided by the grantee to demonstrate, in the grantee's opinion, what opportunities for improvement are available for this program. This information should include that the verbiage is from the grantee Project Manager, Lab Director, etc.

If none provided by the grantee state "None provided"

Comments

Appendix 1 DNA Convicted Offender Backlog Reduction

In 2008, the Convicted Offender Program permitted the grantee agency to use grant funding to: 1) perform DNA analyses in-house of Convicted Offender (CO) samples, 2) enter into their own contract with a vendor laboratory to perform DNA analysis of CO samples; and/or 3) utilize the OJP Contract Office contract process to select vendor laboratories to perform DNA analysis of CO samples. **This template is to be utilized for those laboratories utilizing the grant program to either perform in-house analysis of DNA samples or enter into their own contract with vendor laboratories to perform the required analyses.**

Records		Yes	No	N/A
1	Does the grantee have records detailing the number of samples that they sent to their contract laboratory?			
2	Does the grantee have copies of the invoices submitted by the contract laboratory?			
3	Does the grantee have records detailing the number of samples that they worked in-house?			

For Outsourced samples:

4	Number of samples authorized to be outsourced:	
5	Number of samples sent to the vendor:	
6	Number of sample results returned:	
7	Number of samples with profiles:	
8	Number of samples technically reviewed by the laboratory:	
9	Number of profiles qualified for CODIS entry:	
10	Number of profiles entered into CODIS:	
11	Estimate the average time that it took laboratory personnel to enter the profile data received from the vendor laboratory into CODIS: _____	

and/or

For In-house samples:

12	Number of samples authorized:	
13	Number of samples completed:	
14	Number of samples technically reviewed by the laboratory:	
15	Number of profiles qualified for CODIS entry:	
16	Number of profiles entered into CODIS:	
17	Estimate the average time that it took laboratory personnel to enter the profile data analyzed in-house into CODIS: _____	

Guidance

In-House analysis of samples: The assessor shall compare the grant award and any progress reports sent to the NIJ. The assessor shall compare records which delineate the number of samples that the lab worked in-house that are directly attributable to federal funding assistance. The assessor shall compute the average amount of time data was available for review until entry into CODIS.

Outsourcing of samples: The assessor shall review state laboratory records to complete the table(s) above. The Outsource table may be copied for multiple CLINs as needed. The assessor shall review the CODIS records to determine the dates that the profiles were entered into CODIS.

These dates will be compared to review dates within the State laboratory and the date of receipt of the sample profiles from the vendor laboratory. Assessors shall compute the average amount of time that it took the State laboratory to enter the profile data received from the vendor laboratory into CODIS.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Profiles		Yes	No	N/A
18	Does the grantee have documentation that it reviewed the profiles for quality and accuracy before entering them into CODIS?			
19	Is the quality of the convicted offender profile data sufficient for upload into CODIS?			
20	Were the specifications, as outlined in a vendor contract or the grantee's internal protocols, for minimum and maximum rfu limits or definition of an allele met for all profiles entered into CODIS?			
21	Were samples which did not initially meet the grantee's acceptance criteria re-tested prior to entry into CODIS?			
22	Have the reviewed profiles been entered into CODIS?			
23	Have the profiles been correctly entered into the appropriate CODIS Index?			

Guidance

The assessor shall request that the grantee pull random profiles of convicted offender samples tested in-house and/or tested by a vendor laboratory. The assessor shall review a minimum of three batch sets (which must total at least 100 convicted offender profiles). If each batch of samples is larger than 33 samples in size, the assessor shall review a minimum of 33 samples from each of the three batches pulled for review. The assessor will examine these documents before answering this Criterion.

The assessor shall examine the profiles entered into CODIS to determine that the grantee's interpretation guidelines and/or technical specifications in the statement of work were met. This includes the minimum and maximum rfu limits (or definition of what an allele is if the Hitachi platform is used). If samples did not meet the grantee's internal quality standards and/or technical specifications, the assessor shall determine if they were re-tested in-house, by the vendor lab, where applicable and report the pertinent information.

The assessor shall request that the grantee provide a CODIS report on each of the profiles that the reviewer examines, so the assessor can determine if the samples have been entered into CODIS correctly.

Comments**Action Items****Issues for Resolution**

Corrective Action		Yes	No	N/A
24	Has the lab encountered any issues during their analysis or review of the DNA profile data?			
25	If 21 is Yes, does the lab have a corrective action file documenting the issues?			
26	Is there a documented resolution of these issues (at minimum retesting the sample(s) in question)?			

Guidance

The assessor shall examine the grantee's corrective action files to determine if issues have been successfully resolved. These records may consist of a log of sample retests, memorandum, or correspondence, and any resolution.

Comments**Action Items****Issues for Resolution**

QA Samples		Yes	No	N/A
27	Has the grantee analyzed QA /random re-analysis samples?			

Guidance

The assessor shall check to determine:

- if the grantee analyzed QA /random re-analysis samples.
- if the grantee reviewed and verified that the QA /random re-analysis samples yielded the correct results.
- Was corrective action taken if expected results were not obtained?
- *NOTE – The current NIJ solicitation does not specify a set percentage of QA /random re-analysis samples that must be tested, the DNA Quality Assurance Standards do not specify a specific number or percentage of QA /random re-analysis that must be tested, but CODIS does require that 5% of convicted offender samples that are **outsourced** must be QA /random re-analysis samples. NDIS procedures are silent as to whether in-house testing requires QA /random re-analysis samples to be run.*

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Appendix 2 DNA Convicted Offender Backlog Reduction-Outsourcing-OJP Contract

In 2008, the Convicted Offender Program permitted the grantee agency to use grant funding to: 1) perform DNA analyses in-house of Convicted Offender (CO) samples, 2) enter into their own contract with a vendor laboratory to perform DNA analysis of CO samples; and/or 3) utilize the OJP contract process to select vendor laboratories to perform DNA analysis of CO samples. **This template is to be used for those laboratories utilizing the OJP Contract Office contract process to select vendor laboratories to perform DNA analysis of CO samples.**

Administrative Documentation		Yes	No	N/A
1	Does the State laboratory have a copy of the Statement of Work?			
2	Does the State laboratory have a copy of a letter from NIJ notifying them that they are the recipient of a Delivery Order award for their convicted offender samples?			
3	Does the State laboratory have documentation that they submitted the required reports?			
4	Does the State laboratory have copies of correspondence with the granting agency and/or the vendor laboratory?			

Guidance

The State laboratory should maintain a file of activities related to their convicted offender outsourcing award. Please refer to the Statement of Work Appendix D for required reporting mechanisms.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Contract Modifications		Yes	No	N/A
5	Has either the contract vendor or the State laboratory made modifications to the technical specifications in the Statement of Work?			
6	If yes, does the State laboratory have documentation that the NIJ Contract Office and the NIJ Convicted Offender Outsourcing Program Manager were notified of the change(s)?			

Guidance

The assessor should check the correspondence files to see if there is any documentation that the vendor lab or the State laboratory has suggested, or made any changes to the technical specifications. Examples of technical specifications that may be changed are the minimum or maximum acceptable rfu levels, the peak imbalance levels, etc. It is permissible for a State laboratory and vendor to agree to make a change (e.g. changing the acceptable maximum rfu level from 5000 to 7000); however, the NIJ Contract Office and the Program Manager must be notified in writing that a

change is being requested that is agreeable to both parties so that the Contract Officer can make official modifications to the Statement of Work.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Sample Numbers

Contract Line Item Number: _____

7	Number of samples authorized to be outsourced:	
8	Number of samples sent to the vendor:	
9	Number of sample results returned:	
10	Number of samples with profiles:	
11	Number of samples technically reviewed by the laboratory:	
12	Number of profiles qualified for CODIS entry:	
13	Number of profiles entered into CODIS:	
14	Estimate of the average time that it took the State laboratory to enter the profile data received from the vendor laboratory into CODIS:_____	

Guidance

The assessor shall review state laboratory records to complete the table above. The above table may be copied for multiple CLINs as needed.

The assessor shall review the CODIS records to determine the dates that the profiles were entered into CODIS. These dates will be compared to review dates within the State laboratory and the date of receipt of the sample profiles from the vendor laboratory.

Assessors shall compute the average amount of time for the review of sample profiles and enter the information.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Profiles		Yes	No	N/A
15	Does the State laboratory have documentation that it reviewed the convicted offender profiles received from the vendor lab?			
16	Is the quality of the data sufficient for the profiles to be entered into CODIS?			
17	Were the contract's specifications for the minimum and maximum rfu limits, or definition of an allele, met for all profiles entered into CODIS?			
18	Were samples which resulted in profiles which did not initially meet the technical specification's retested prior to entry into CODIS?			
19	Have the reviewed profiles been entered into CODIS?			
20	Have the profiles been entered into the appropriate CODIS Index?			

Guidance

The assessor shall request that State laboratory personnel pull random profiles of convicted offender samples received from the vendor laboratory. Since most vendor laboratories provide data to crime labs in batch sets, the assessor shall review a minimum of three batch sets (which must total at least 100 convicted offender profiles) for each of the awards that the State laboratory has received. If each batch of samples is larger than 33 samples in size, the assessor shall review a minimum of 33 samples from each of the three batches pulled for review. The assessor shall examine these documents before answering questions 15 – 20 above and all of its subordinate criteria

The assessor shall examine the profiles entered into CODIS to determine that the technical specifications in the statement of work were met. This includes the minimum and maximum rfu limits (or definition of what an allele is if the Hitachi platform is used). If samples did not meet the technical specifications, the assessor shall determine if they were retested by the vendor or by the State laboratory itself.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Corrective Action		Yes	No	N/A
21	Has the State laboratory encountered any issues during the review of the DNA profile data?			
22	If 21 is Yes, does the State laboratory have a corrective action file documenting the issues encountered during their review of DNA profile data?			
23	Is there a documented resolution of these issues (at minimum retesting the sample(s) in question)?			

Guidance

The assessor shall examine the State laboratory's corrective action files to determine if problems or issues with the vendor lab have been successfully resolved. These records may consist of a log of sample retests, memorandum, or correspondence with the contract lab as to issues/problems seen and their resolution.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Quality Assurance Reanalysis		Yes	No	N/A
24	Has the State laboratory performed quality assurance testing for the samples submitted to the vendor?			

Guidance

The assessor shall check to determine:

- if the State laboratory reviewed and verified that the QA /random re-analysis samples yielded the correct results
- if corrective action was taken when the QA samples did not yield the expected results
- *NOTE – The current NIJ solicitation does not specify a set percentage of QA /random re-analysis samples that must be tested, the DNA Quality Assurance Standards do not specify a specific number or percentage of QA /random re-analysis that must be tested, but NDIS does require that 5% of convicted offender samples that are **outsourced** must be QA /random re-analysis samples.*

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Appendix 3 Paul Coverdell NFSIA Awards

Award Type		YES	NO	N/A
1	Was the grantee a recipient of a "Base" only award?			
2	Was the grantee a recipient of a "Competitive" only award?			
3	Was the grantee a recipient of a "Base/Competitive" mix award?			

Guidance

The assessor shall identify the type of Coverdell award made to the grant recipient.

For Coverdell Base/Competitive Mix provide a statement that outlines how Base funds will be used by the Grantee and/or all sub-grantees.

For Coverdell Base/Competitive Mix provide a statement that outlines how Competitive funds will be used by the Grantee and/or all sub-grantees.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Allegations of Serious Negligence or Misconduct		YES	NO	N/A
4	Have there been any allegations of serious negligence or misconduct reported to the grantee?			
5	Does the grantee have records indicating the number and nature of such allegations?			
6	Does the grantee have information on the referrals of such allegations (e.g., the government entity or entities to which referred, the date of referral)?			
7	Does the grantee have information on the outcome of such referrals?			
8	If any such allegations were not referred, does the grantee have the reason(s) for the non-referral?			
9	Does the grantee have copies of the annual report(s) submitted to NIJ?			

Guidance

Beginning with the 2009 awards, for each fiscal year of an award, Coverdell recipients are required to report to the National Institute of Justice on an **annual basis** information relating to questions 4 thru 8 above. This section is to be completed for the 2009 and later Coverdell awards.

The Special Condition for the Coverdell awards is as follows:

- 1) If the award closes within the original 12 month period of performance (on or before Sept. 30), the report is to be attached to the Final Progress Report for the award. OR
- 2) If the award is extended beyond the September 30 end date, a report is to be filed with the Progress Report for the period ending December 31 for the original portion of the award AND another report is to be submitted with the Final Progress Report, as well.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Technical Assistance		Yes	No	N/A
10	Does the grantee have a state plan for forensic science?			

Guidance

The Paul Coverdell National Forensic Science Improvement Act grants program requires a “Certification of a Plan for Forensic Science Laboratories”. The assessors are to obtain information from the grantee that it has a plan on file to support this certification..

States and units of local government must certify that they have developed a plan for forensic science laboratories to improve the quality and timeliness of forensic science or medical examiner services provided. There are two forms for this certification; one is to be used if the grant application is from the “State” the other is to be used if the grant application is from a unit of local government.

Suggested general statements

Comments

10 –The grantee could not inform the assessors that there was a plan for the improvement of laboratory or medical examiner services.

Action Items

10 – The grantee has no record of a plan to support the required certification.

Issues for Resolution

Appendix 4 DNA Backlog Reduction

Records		Yes	No	N/A
1	Does the grantee have records detailing the number of cases that they sent to their contract laboratory?			
2	Does the grantee have copies of the invoices submitted by the contract laboratory?			
3	Does the grantee have records detailing the number of cases that they worked in-house?			

For Outsourced cases

4	Number of cases authorized to be outsourced:	
5	Number of cases sent to the vendor:	
6	Number of cases returned:	
7	Number of cases with profiles:	
8	Number of samples technically reviewed by the laboratory:	
9	Number of profiles qualified for CODIS entry:	
10	Number of profiles entered into CODIS:	
11	Estimate the average time that it took laboratory personnel to enter the profile data received from the vendor laboratory into CODIS: _____	

and/or

For In-house cases:

12	Number of cases authorized:	
13	Number of cases completed:	
14	Number of samples technically reviewed by the laboratory:	
15	Number of profiles qualified for CODIS entry:	
16	Number of profiles entered into CODIS:	
17	Estimate the average time that it took laboratory personnel to enter the profile data analyzed in-house into CODIS: _____	

Guidance

The assessor should compare the grant award and any progress reports sent to the NIJ. The assessor shall compare records which delineate the number of cases that the lab sent to and received from the contract lab or worked in-house that are directly attributable to federal funding under this award. Assessors shall compute the average amount of time for the review of case profiles and enter the information in 11 & 17.

Backlog Reduction cases can be defined by the laboratory in the information provided in 1 – 17 above.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Documentation		Yes	No	N/A
18	Does the grantee have documentation that they reviewed the case profiles for quality and accuracy before entering them into CODIS?			

Guidance

A minimum of ten percent up to a maximum of 10 cases analyzed by a vendor, whichever is the smaller number, will be reviewed by the assessment team.

A minimum of ten percent up to a maximum of 10 cases analyzed internally, whichever is the smaller number, will be reviewed by the assessment team.

The assessor shall review the CODIS records to determine the dates that the profiles were entered into CODIS. These dates will be compared to review dates within the grantee laboratory and the date of receipt of the sample profiles from the vendor laboratory, or for grantee laboratories processing samples internally, the date of their final review.

Comment on the number of case files the technical assessor reviewed.

Suggested general statements

Comments

18 – Ten cases were provided by the laboratory and reviewed by the technical assessor. Of these, four were entered into the CODIS database for upload to CODIS. All of the profiles for upload to CODIS were technically reviewed prior to CODIS entry.

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Data Quality		Yes	No	N/A
19	Is the quality of the data sufficient for the profiles to be entered into CODIS?			
20	Were the grantee laboratory's minimum and maximum rfu limits or definition of an allele met for all profiles entered into CODIS?			
21	Were samples which did not initially meet the grantee laboratory's acceptance criteria retested prior to entry into CODIS?			

Guidance

The assessor shall review profiles entered into CODIS which were analyzed with grant funds to determine that the grantee laboratory's interpretation guidelines/technical specification outlined in a vendor contract were met. This includes the minimum and maximum rfu limits (or definition of what an allele is if the Hitachi platform is used). If any samples did not meet the grantee laboratory's

internal quality standards, the assessor shall determine and report if they were re-tested by the vendor or internally by the grantee.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Corrective Action		Yes	No	N/A
22	Has the grantee laboratory encountered any issues during the review of the DNA profile data?			
23	If 21 is Yes, does the grantee laboratory have a corrective action file documenting the issues encountered during their review of DNA profile data?			
24	Is there a documented resolution of these issues (at minimum retesting the sample(s) in question)?			

Guidance

The assessor shall review the grantee laboratory's corrective action files.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Quality Assurance Samples		Yes	No	N/A
25	If the grantee laboratory budgeted for the analysis of Quality Assurance samples, have these been submitted and analyzed?			

Guidance

The assessor shall check to determine:

- If the grantee laboratory submitted QA samples to their vendor laboratory
- If the grantee laboratory reviewed and verified that the QA samples yielded the correct results
- If the vendor laboratory did not yield the expected results, was corrective action taken.

Note: The Solicitation may state that funds "may be used for QA samples," but a grantee laboratory does not have to include this in their contract with a vendor lab. Neither do they have to test QA samples if cases are tested in house, unless the stated in their proposal that they were going to conduct QA sample analysis.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Accreditation		Yes	No	N/A
26	Is the grantee accredited?			
	If "Yes," by: _____			
27	Did the grantee request funding to prepare for accreditation, become accredited, or to maintain accreditation?			
28	Have the funds requested for accreditation or preparation been used for the intended purpose?			
29	If grant funding was used to conduct an accreditation inspection/assessment, was the contract for the inspection/assessment competitively bid?			
30	If the grant recipient has not yet been accredited, has a target date for the accreditation inspection/assessment been set?			
	If so, please record this date: _____			

Guidance

Grant funds may be used to prepare for laboratory accreditation by ASCLD/LAB, FQS-I, NAME or other appropriate accrediting bodies. Funds may also be used for application and maintenance fees charged by appropriate accrediting bodies. If the grantee has requested funds in the grant proposal for this purpose, the assessor will ascertain if these funds have been used for their intended purpose. If the grantee is seeking accreditation, but is not yet accredited, the assessor should record the expected accreditation inspection/assessment date.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Validation		Yes	No	N/A
31	Did the grantee request funding for the validation of equipment or procedures?			

32	Has the validation been completed?			
33	Is the validated equipment or procedure currently in use by the grant recipient?			

Guidance

Compare the objectives to what has been accomplished?

32 - If validation has not been completed, list what is pending and comment on time table by grantee to complete the validation.

33 - If validated equipment or procedure is not currently in use, comment on the grantee's time table to bring it on line. If the grantee has no estimate of when it will bring the equipment or procedure on line, then list that as an Action Item.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Inventory		Yes	No	N/A
34	If the equipment is for a grantee, is it being used for its intended purpose			
35	If the equipment is for a sub grantee, does the grantee have evidence the equipment is being used for its intended purpose			

Guidance

The grantee should have some mechanism to show that the equipment purchased is being used for intended purposes.

For equipment that has been purchased, received and is not currently being used for its intended purpose, comment on the grantee's time table to bring it on line. If the grantee has no estimate of when it will bring the equipment on line, then list that as an Action Item

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

Appendix 5 Solving Cold Cases with DNA

System		Yes	No	N/A
1	Does the grantee have a system or process to identify, evaluate, and prioritize cold cases to see if DNA evidence may exist?			
2	Does the grantee have a system or process to send cases with potential DNA evidence to a lab for testing?			
3	Does the grantee have a system or process to ensure that probative forensic profiles obtained are searched in CODIS?			
4	Does the grantee have a system or process to follow up on any CODIS hits that occur?			

Guidance

The assessor shall review the investigating agency's system to evaluate and identify cold cases to test the evidence discovered and to follow up on any CODIS hits that result from this project.

The assessor should ensure that the evaluation/selection/prioritization criterion being employed is consistent with what was stated in the proposal. The assessor should also identify discrepancies, and list reasons (if applicable).

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution

DNA Testing		Yes	No	N/A
5	Is there evidence of a coordinated effort between the investigating agency and the DNA laboratory?			
6	Does the investigating agency have an MOU with a public DNA laboratory, access to a public DNA laboratory or contract with a private DNA laboratory?			
7	Does the investigating agency have an MOU with or access to a government laboratory to review data and upload profiles to CODIS?			
8	Does the grantee have a system which tracks the DNA results?			

Guidance

The assessor shall determine the level of coordination between the grantee and the laboratory responsible for analyzing the evidence and CODIS upload.

Comments

Action Items**Issues for Resolution**

Records		
9	Number of cases listed on the grant proposal that would be reviewed:	
10	Number of cases evaluated to determine if DNA evidence is present:	
11	Number of cases in which potential DNA evidence was found:	
12	Number of cases submitted to a DNA lab for testing:	
13	Number of cases yielding DNA profiles that qualify for upload to CODIS:	
14	Number of DNA profiles uploaded to CODIS:	
15	Number of cases which yielded a CODIS hit:	
16	Number of cases with CODIS hits that were followed up on:	
17	Number of arrests or indictments:	
18	Number of convictions that resulted from this grant:	

Guidance

The assessor shall review the investigating agency's case tracking system, and use the table above to summarize the information obtained from the system. The assessor shall detail (provide additional attachments, if necessary) CODIS hits and activities associated with those hits, as applicable.

Comments**Action Items****Issues for Resolution**

Investigative Challenges		Yes	No	N/A
19	Has the grantee encountered challenges during their follow-up to CODIS hits?			

Guidance

The assessor shall describe any issues that the grantee has with following up on CODIS hits, such as the inability to locate the suspect, difficulty in obtaining known reference samples from the suspect to confirm the CODIS hits, etc.

Comments

Action Items

Issues for Resolution