

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

To Conduct Research on the Public Safety Assessment,
Risk Assessments, and Pretrial Detention



April 25, 2018

Table of Contents

Background	3
The Future of the PSA	4
RFP Structure and Research Objectives	5
Tier I: Research Objective 1.....	6
Tier I: Research Objective 2.....	7
Tier I: Research Objective 3.....	8
Tier II: Research Objective 4.....	9
Tier II: Research Objective 5.....	9
Research Site Description	10
Research Teams and National Provider Collaboration	11
Application Step One — LOI Submission	11
Application Step Two — Proposal Submission.....	12
Project and Award Timeframe	15
Optional Conference Call	15
Eligibility	15
Advisory Board	15
Term	15

Request for Proposals to Conduct Research on the Public Safety Assessment, Risk Assessments, and Pretrial Detention

Background

The vast majority of the 750,000 people in our nation's jails are defendants awaiting trial, many of whom are charged with low-level, nonviolent crimes. Rigorous research has revealed the myriad financial and human costs associated with detaining these individuals. Taxpayers spend \$14 billion on pretrial incarceration each year, and studies have shown that even a short stay in jail can cause a person to lose his or her job, housing, health care, and child custody. Recognizing these negative consequences, numerous organizations have invested in efforts aimed at reducing unnecessary pretrial incarceration while increasing public safety. At the same time, a number of states, counties, and cities have adopted pretrial reforms designed to make their systems fairer and more effective.

One such reform is a shift away from judges making decisions based primarily on a defendant's charge, toward judges making decisions that prioritize an individual's level of risk. This risk-based approach builds on research by pretrial experts dating back to the 1950s, as well as the learnings of pretrial services practitioners, who for decades have been pioneers in the field. Some forward-looking jurisdictions have used a risk assessment to gauge the likelihood that a defendant will fail to return to court or commit a new crime if released before trial. However, although these risk assessments have been studied and validated for many years, until recently, they had not been widely implemented.

When the Laura and John Arnold Foundation (LJAF) began working on criminal justice reform in 2011, we set out to determine where research, data, and innovation could make the greatest impact on the justice system. Leaders in the field repeatedly pointed to the pretrial phase and argued that the widespread use of risk assessments could produce significant improvements.

Our team partnered with leading criminal justice researchers to study why risk assessments had not been adopted on a broad scale. We learned that existing pretrial risk assessments were often costly and time-consuming to administer, relying on data that could only be gathered through defendant interviews. Further, most of the existing pretrial risk assessments were created using data from a single jurisdiction, and some states and counties were not comfortable adopting a tool that was based on case records from another locality. The existing tools presented a single risk level for each defendant, combining—and assigning equal weight to—the risk that a defendant will fail to appear for a future court hearing and the risk that he or she will reoffend. In addition, we found that none of the existing tools predicted an individual's risk of new violent criminal activity, which is perhaps judges' greatest concern.

Building on this research, the team created the Public Safety Assessment (PSA), a high-quality universal risk assessment that uses nine factors to produce two risk scores: one predicting the statistical likelihood that an individual will commit a new crime if released before trial, and another predicting the statistical likelihood that he or she will fail to return for a future court hearing. The assessment also flags defendants that it calculates present an elevated risk of committing a violent crime. Scores fall on a scale of one to six, with higher scores indicating a greater level of risk. It is up to jurisdictions to establish a framework

for how to use these scores in judicial decision-making about pretrial detention determinations and how to manage individuals at each level of risk. For more information on the data used to develop the PSA, please see [this](#) document, and for more information about the PSA risk factors and formula, please see [this](#) document.

The researchers piloted the PSA in 2013 and 2014 throughout the entire state of Kentucky; Mecklenburg County, North Carolina; Santa Cruz County, California; and Gila, Mohave, Pinal, and Yuma Counties in Arizona. Preliminary data from pilot jurisdictions indicated the PSA had the potential to produce a positive impact. Jurisdictions reported decreases in jail populations or pretrial detention without reported increases in crime. Mecklenburg County, for instance, saw a 20 percent decrease in its jail population over the year it implemented the PSA.

Our team could not have anticipated the strong and immediate demand for pretrial policy change and the PSA. Since the pilot phase, we have received more than 700 inquiries regarding the PSA. To date, approximately 40 jurisdictions have launched, or are in the process of implementing, the PSA. It has played an important role in driving broader system reforms and promoting new pretrial research.

The Future of the PSA

LJAF is committed to evaluating the PSA and understanding its impacts. Projects currently underway include studies to measure jail populations, release rates, pretrial recidivism, and court appearances before and after PSA implementation; validation studies to test for predictive accuracy and predictive bias; and qualitative studies to assess stakeholder perception and use. Researchers are also conducting at least one randomized controlled trial to find out whether use of the PSA leads to reductions in rates of failure to appear in court, new criminal activity, and new violent criminal activity, as well as length of stay in jail. Additionally, LJAF has supported New Jersey's court system in compiling the most comprehensive pretrial dataset to date. In anticipation of the public release of that dataset, LJAF has awarded several grants to examine predictive bias and the PSA's predictive power.

As we proceed to build upon findings from the field, LJAF is answering the call for greater PSA accessibility. In the coming months, we will make the assessment widely available, along with a suite of web-based instructional materials. Jurisdictions and training and technical assistance (TTA) providers will be able to use these resources to implement the PSA at their own pace.

Today, we are releasing two Requests for Proposals (RFPs) to step into the next generation of PSA research and practice. The first RFP seeks a national provider to support PSA implementation, evaluation, and knowledge dissemination. The second, complementary RFP seeks proposals to execute a comprehensive pretrial research agenda. Both solicitations are intended to support a thriving national movement seeking answers about evidence and pretrial decision-making.

RFP Structure and Research Objectives

To build on the studies currently underway, LJAF is expanding its current PSA and pretrial research agenda. This RFP contains two tiers of research projects: Tier I focuses on broadening the scope of current PSA research and includes the rigorous evaluation of PSA performance, the PSA algorithm, judicial decision-making, and system impact. Tier II covers exploratory research projects on new pretrial risk assessment models and the impact of pretrial detention.

The research agenda is comprised of five objectives: Objectives 1 through 3 fall within Tier I, and Research Objectives 4 and 5 falls within Tier II. Respondents can express interest in conducting projects in both tiers through a Letter of Interest (LOI), which is the first step in the application process. Those who intend to address only Tier I are expected to respond to Research Objectives 1 through 3 in their LOI. Respondents who intend to address only Tier II can select either Research Objective 4 or Research Objective 5 in their LOI. Respondents who intend to address both Tier I and Tier II should submit two separate LOIs. If invited to submit full proposals, respondents should submit two separate proposals—one for Tier I and the second for Tier II. We provide more information on the submission requirements for LOIs and proposals toward the end of this RFP. To satisfy the research objectives, project teams may partner with universities, researchers, scholars, policymakers, practitioners, and subject matter experts to ensure a highly qualified team.

Research teams selected for Tier I studies will work in collaboration with LJAF, the selected national provider, and LJAF-approved research sites.¹ LJAF will select up to 10 research sites through a competitive RFP process. Each of the sites will receive intensive technical assistance from a team of implementation and research experts who will provide training, data and technology support, and guidance on policy development. The 10 research sites will be launched at pre-determined intervals, rather than simultaneously, and the TTA offered by the national provider for each of these sites is expected to last up to five years. All Tier I research will be conducted at these research sites. Therefore, the term of these projects will be up to five years, depending on renewed LJAF approval after the two-year mark. Respondents should take this project length into consideration when developing study design. In addition, respondents should specify how developing, piloting, and evaluating new policies, practices, and assessments can be appropriately staggered to fulfill research objectives. Please see the “Research Site Description” section below for more information on the research sites.

Respondents selected for Tier II studies will work with LJAF to identify research sites that are well suited to accomplishing the goals of their proposal. RFP respondents are welcome to suggest partner sites and are encouraged to explain why the sites meet the study objectives.

¹ Within the PSA National Provider RFP, research sites are identified as “High-Touch Training and Technical Assistance (TTA) Sites.” The objective of these sites is to accomplish the research agenda defined within this RFP. “High-Touch TTA sites” and “research sites” are used interchangeably, and throughout this RFP are referred to exclusively as research sites. Please note that Tier I research will be conducted at the 10 selected research sites.

Tier I: Research Objective I

PSA Implementation—Current implementation research on the PSA has studied stakeholder interest, judicial decision making, and system impact. This work encompasses qualitative and quantitative studies. Research Objective 1 seeks to expand upon this research in the following four areas.

- (1) Examine full implementation of the PSA
 - a. Full implementation is defined as the complete rollout of the PSA. Full implementation indicates that: (i) training for pretrial staff and stakeholders is complete; (ii) policies related to the PSA have been developed and adopted; and (iii) PSA and pretrial outcome data are integrated into local data systems in order to capture the necessary measures to conduct validations, evaluate judicial decision making, and examine system impact.
- (2) Evaluate and strengthen fidelity to LJAF’s implementation standards and sustainability.
- (3) Anticipate PSA performance with local data prior to adoption.
- (4) Continue to evaluate judicial decision-making.

Potential Research Questions—Below is a list of possible research questions, though the list is not meant to be exhaustive. LJAF would like to see these research questions highlighted within proposals, along with an explanation of how they can be addressed by specific study designs. However, respondents are encouraged to list additional questions that can be answered through the research projects.

- (1) How does PSA implementation impact judicial decision-making, stakeholder interest, and sustainability? Does this vary whether measured at the judge or case level?
- (2) How do PSA concurrence rates impact defendant outcomes?
- (3) How does the Decision-Making Framework² (DMF) impact decision making, stakeholder interest, and sustainability? How often do decisions align with the DMF? Does PSA performance in terms of predictive validity vary based on correspondence with the DMF?
- (4) Does the DMF make appropriately weighted tradeoffs between false positives and false negatives? How much should each type of error be weighted?
- (5) How does PSA implementation impact the pretrial system and pretrial population? Does variation in implementation reduce bias?
- (6) How does judicial decision making with and without the PSA impact defendant outcomes in terms of release, case processing, disposition, and long-term recidivism?
- (7) What measures of fidelity are relevant and sustainable for jurisdictions to implement when adopting the PSA?

² The DMF is a policy guide that accompanies the PSA. The DMF is customized by local policymakers and stakeholders to objectively and consistently translate PSA results into a release recommendation.

- (8) What is the relationship between fidelity, the predictive validity of the PSA, and judicial decision making with the PSA?

Tier I: Research Objective 2

Validation of the PSA—To date, PSA validation research funded by LJAF has been focused on both historical and prospective data analysis to examine how well the PSA predicts failure to appear and new criminal activity, including new violent criminal activity, during the pretrial period. Most validation analyses have been limited to sites that adopted the PSA early on and had sufficient data to conduct a validation. LJAF intends to expand upon this validation work and ensure that this process can be conducted by each site that adopts the PSA. To fulfill this objective, LJAF has set the following goals:

- (1) Evaluate predictive accuracy.
 - a. LJAF is particularly interested in econometric or statistical techniques that would help measure and ensure continued predictive accuracy, though certain observations are essentially censored or suppressed—namely, the counterfactual risk presented by detained defendants if they had been released instead.
- (2) Develop a validation model for jurisdictions to implement locally.
- (3) Test the validation model, particularly with regard to predictive bias as to race and gender.

Potential Research Questions—The examples below are possible research questions; the list is not meant to be exhaustive. LJAF would like to see these research questions highlighted within proposals as questions that can be addressed by specific study designs. However, respondents are encouraged to list additional questions that can be answered through the research projects.

- (1) How well do the PSA scales predict failure to appear, new criminal activity, and new violent criminal activity during the pretrial period?
- (2) Do the risk factors, corresponding weights, six point scales, and violence flag work equally well regardless of race or gender?
- (3) Can a validation model be developed and tested for local jurisdictions to provide routine validation results?

For Research Objective 2, respondents should consider the project timeframe and the ability to work in up to 10 research sites when describing the study design. For example, for a validation model to be developed and tested across jurisdictions, a study design may propose that the validation model be developed in four research sites; then piloted, tested, and revised in another four sites; then released to the remaining sites to evaluate the revised model.

Tier I: Research Objective 3

Improve the PSA Algorithm—The PSA algorithm is straightforward and contains what research has shown are the strongest risk factors to predict failure to appear, new criminal activity, and new violent criminal activity during the pretrial period. It does not rely on factors such as race, ethnic background, income, level of education, employment status, neighborhood, or any demographic or personal information other than age. The data used to develop the PSA were robust, as they included all multi-jurisdictional pretrial risk assessment datasets in existence at the time. Still, as we know from risk assessment research, assessments can and should be improved whenever possible. As policies and practices shift, as the data improves, as target populations change, and as the research evolves, it is essential to update assessments. To that end, LJAF has set the following goals for Research Objective 3:

- (1) Improve overall prediction by developing and testing new PSA algorithms.
- (2) Ensure new PSA algorithms are free of predictive bias.
- (3) Create new pretrial risk assessment models and algorithmic procedures for jurisdictions to establish tools with local data.

Potential Research Questions—Possible research questions are listed below; however, the list is not meant to be exhaustive. LJAF would like to see these research questions highlighted within proposals, along with an explanation of how they can be addressed by specific study designs. Respondents are encouraged to list additional questions that can also be answered through the research projects.

- (1) What improvements can be made to the current PSA algorithm, including to each risk factor, corresponding weights, and scales, to improve its overall predictive accuracy?
- (2) Are there other risk factors that serve as strong predictors for failure to appear, new criminal activity, and new violent criminal activity during the pretrial period?
- (3) Do the new algorithms avoid predictive bias based on race or gender?
- (4) Do manual processes work better to improve the PSA algorithm or are more sophisticated techniques, such as machine learning, essential to improve predictive accuracy? How do the various techniques impact transparency and implementation?
- (5) What procedures and techniques can jurisdictions use to develop and validate their own pretrial risk assessments? Can algorithmic procedures be integrated into a model for jurisdictions to test? What mechanisms or procedures can be included in these models to test for predictive bias for both race and gender?
- (6) How do risk assessments developed with local data perform in comparison to risk assessments developed with alternate data sources?

Tier II: Research Objective 4

Develop New Risk Assessment Models—LJAF recognizes that the time is ripe to develop and test offense-specific pretrial risk assessment models. Judges, stakeholders, and policymakers frequently ask whether a pretrial risk assessment can predict the likelihood of a subsequent arrest for drunk driving, domestic assault, or a sex crime. While offense-specific risk assessment instruments exist, there are limitations in terms of development, implementation, and evaluation. In response to these limitations, LJAF intends to move forward in this new research domain with the following two goals:

- (1) Develop, evaluate, and improve upon the predictive accuracy of offense-specific pretrial risk assessment instruments.
- (2) Understand the impact of offense-specific pretrial risk assessment instruments on decision-making, public safety, and pretrial detention.

Potential Research Questions—Possible research questions are listed below; however, the list is not meant to be exhaustive. LJAF would like to see these research questions highlighted within proposals, along with an explanation of how they can be addressed by specific study designs. Respondents are encouraged to list additional questions that can also be answered through the research projects.

- (1) What risk factors are strong predictors of other pretrial outcome measures of interest, such as drunk driving, domestic violence, and sex crimes?
- (2) If new offense-specific pretrial risk assessments are developed to predict pretrial outcomes of interest, how well do they perform on prospective data? Can these specific assessments be successfully implemented alongside a broader pretrial risk assessment, and if so, how? Are both assessments necessary to inform the release decision?
- (3) How is judicial decision making impacted when both an offense-specific pretrial risk assessment and a pretrial risk assessment are implemented?
- (4) What is the impact on pretrial detention when an offense-specific pretrial risk assessment instrument is implemented?
- (5) How is the system impacted when offense-specific pretrial risk assessments are introduced? That is, how do law enforcement, prosecutors, judges, and pretrial services practitioners respond?)

Tier II: Research Objective 5

Understand the Impacts of Pretrial Detention—Given the magnitude of problems associated with pretrial detention, we must undertake a more comprehensive and rigorous examination of the impacts of pretrial detention. In 2013, LJAF produced a report on the impacts of pretrial detention titled, “The Hidden Costs of Pretrial Detention” (Lowenkamp, VanNostrand, & Holsinger). From this study, we learned that short periods of detention might result in pretrial failure and recidivism for low-risk defendants. However, the consequences of pretrial detention extend well beyond these outcomes. Researchers and policymakers have added to the knowledge base, but the research is still preliminary. LJAF recognizes that further

research is required to understand how pretrial detention and the use of bail impact defendants and their likelihood of success. LJAF expects that both quantitative and qualitative methods will be employed to satisfy Research Objective 5. There are two primary goals proposed:

- (1) Understand the impact of pretrial detention on defendant stability (*e.g.*, maintaining employment, housing).
- (2) Understand the impact of pretrial detention on pretrial outcomes and recidivism.

Potential Research Questions—Possible research questions are listed below; however, this list is not meant to be exhaustive. LJAF would like to see these research questions highlighted within proposals, along with an explanation of how they can be addressed by specific study designs. Respondents are encouraged to list additional questions that can also be answered through the research projects.

- (1) How does pretrial detention and its length impact defendants in terms of the experience of being detained and long-term impacts on family, labor, financial stability, and residential stability? How does bail impact these measures of interest?
- (2) How does pretrial detention and its length impact defendants in terms of pretrial outcomes (failure to appear and new criminal activity), as well as recidivism? Does the use of bail impact pretrial outcomes and recidivism?

Research Site Description

A primary purpose of the research sites is to fulfill Research Objectives 1 through 3. Specifically, the overall goal is to test the implementation and validation of the PSA and then to continue to apply rigorous and sophisticated methods to build upon the existing risk factors, weights, and scales in order to develop an even more predictive pretrial risk assessment. Research sites will likely need robust data systems, collaborative stakeholders, and a strong commitment to evaluation to ensure the success of this work.

Respondents should consider the various statistical methods available in developing predictive, fair, and transparent algorithms. Similarly, respondents should demonstrate a strong understanding of the current state of pretrial risk assessment research, and be able to describe the data that research sites will need in order to identify and test the strongest predictors of pretrial failure.

Respondents submitting a proposal under Tier I are strongly encouraged to read LJAF's first RFP, which focuses on identifying a national provider. The national provider will be responsible for facilitating an intensive TTA model that will serve up to 10 jurisdictions, selected by LJAF, to accomplish Tier I research objectives. The national provider will provide long-term, in-person TTA with exceptional fidelity to LJAF implementation standards. Interested jurisdictions will undergo a formal application process that takes into account case volume, data capacity, research viability, and geographic diversity, among other criteria. The national provider will deliver pre- and post-launch site support (typically 12 – 18 months) and will extend post-launch work as appropriate for the research underway in each site.

Respondents for this RFP should specify the criteria that a jurisdiction must satisfy to accomplish the research objectives within their study. LJAF requests this information in order to define these expectations for jurisdictions' formal application and selection processes.

Research Teams and National Provider Collaboration

LJAF expects research grantees to work in partnership with our organization and the national provider. The national provider team will be comprised of training, implementation, data and technology, and research experts. LJAF anticipates that the collaborative process between the national provider and the research teams will be reciprocal. Research teams will be asked to describe a study's research objectives and the steps that a jurisdiction must take to fulfill the overall study goals. Likewise, the national provider will be asked to update the research team and LJAF on PSA implementation. Research teams are expected to communicate research results, including the development of a new pretrial risk assessment and offense specific risk assessments, directly with the national provider to ensure prompt dissemination to the field. Routine collaboration and communication between the national provider and research teams will be critical to ensure a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities and to ensure that the national provider promptly notifies the research teams of any challenges that may interfere with research objectives. Research teams and the national provider will be expected to participate in quarterly in-person meetings at LJAF's office in New York City and to participate in monthly conference calls with LJAF.

Application Step One — LOI Submission

Groups and individuals interested in responding to this RFP should first submit an LOI by 11:59 p.m. EST on May 18, 2018. Please send the LOI to PRETRIALRESEARCH@arnoldfoundation.org with the subject line, "PRETRIAL RESEARCH RFP LETTER OF INTEREST." All LOIs must adhere to the criteria below. Failure to meet any of these criteria within the specified timeframe may result in disqualification. LJAF may reach out to the project point of contact with questions following the LOI submission. Teams selected to submit full proposals will be notified on May 28, 2018.

- Page length: LOIs are not to exceed five single-spaced pages with 11- or 12-point font.
- Tier specification: Specify Tier I or Tier II. If submitting an LOI for both Tier I and Tier II, please submit two LOIs, one for each tier. As a reminder, LOIs submitted for Tier I must address Research Objectives 1 through 3. If submitting only for Tier II, specify the research objectives to be addressed—that is, whether Research Objective 4 or 5.
- Study design: For Tier I, provide a brief summary of the study designs for Research Objectives 1 through 3. For Tier II, provide a brief summary of the study design to address the selected research objective. Please define the outcome measures for all study design summaries.
- Jurisdiction criteria: List the specific jurisdiction criteria necessary for the study design(s) to be successfully completed. If submitting an LOI for Tier I, it may be necessary to organize the criteria for Research Objectives 1 through 3. Examples of criteria include specific data elements, staff

capacity to extract data and accompanying data dictionaries, and stakeholder support for research.

- Deliverables: Provide a brief list of project deliverables. Example deliverables may include peer-reviewed articles, technical reports, policy briefs, new assessment models, and ancillary materials. Respondents are encouraged to explain what deliverables will be most appropriate and what will provide the greatest benefit for target audiences, including researchers, criminal justice agency stakeholders, policymakers, and practitioners.
- Project contact: Provide the name, organizational affiliation, email, and telephone number for the primary project contact.
- Team biographies: Provide a brief biography for each project team member, specifying their role and responsibilities for the project. Team biographies do not count toward the total page length.
 - LJAF anticipates that project teams may involve multiple partners and subcontractors with the expertise needed to satisfy Tier I and Tier II research objectives.
- Budget: Specify the overall project hours by project team member, total travel and administrative costs, and the overall project cost. The budget does not count toward the total page length.

Application Step Two — Proposal Submission

Project teams selected to submit proposals will be contacted between by May 28, 2018. Proposals are due by 11:59 p.m. EST on June 18, 2018 and should be submitted via email using the subject line “PRETRIAL RESEARCH RFP PROPOSAL.” to PRETRIALRESEARCH@arnoldfoundation.org. All proposals must adhere to the criteria listed below. Failure to meet any of these criteria within the specified timeframe may result in disqualification. LJAF may reach out to the project point of contact with questions following the proposal submission and will notify project teams of grant awards on or about August 1, 2018.

Proposals should be clearly labeled as Tier I or Tier II. Respondents submitting proposals for both Tier I and Tier II are required to submit two separate proposals, one for each tier.

LJAF is strongly committed to the principles of research transparency and integrity. In order to ensure the utmost in rigor, we require that all research involving statistical inferences be pre-registered, and that all non-confidential materials including, but not limited to, survey instruments, computer code, articles, and reports be open and freely available online without a subscription or license fee. In the case of confidential data, proposals should briefly discuss whether it would be permissible to create a de-identified dataset for public use, and if so, how much additional labor that would entail.

- Proposal format: The proposal length should not exceed 15 pages, single-spaced, with 11- or 12-point font. A table of contents, cover page, references or bibliography, and brief team biographies are all are required but do not count toward the 15-page limit.

- Proposal content: The following sections should be clearly defined and labeled within the proposal. We suggest that the table of contents include these sections.
 - Tier I or Tier II: Respondents should specify whether the proposal is being submitted in response to Tier I or Tier II. Respondents who would like to address both tiers are required to submit two proposals.
 - Research objective(s): For each research objective(s) addressed, specify the research questions within that objective that the project team intends to study and why those questions are important to the field.
 - Literature review: Provide a brief summary of the literature to date on the research objective(s) and related research questions. Highlight the gaps in the current state of research related to these questions and explain how the proposal intends to respond to these gaps.
 - Study design: Respondents should provide a detailed description of the research design. Please see the two companion documents accompanying this RFP. The first is titled, “Questions for Impact Studies,” and the second is titled, “Key Items for Randomized Controlled Trials.” Both documents define the primary elements that should be incorporated in the study design of the proposal. These elements include:
 - Data measures and sources needed to answer research questions.
 - Primary and secondary measures, including distinguishing both independent and dependent variables.
 - Sample size and statistical power.
 - If conducting a randomized controlled trial or quasi-experimental design, specify the characteristics of the treatment or intervention group and the comparison or control group.
 - Analytical strategy that specifies the statistical analysis that will be followed to address all research questions.
 - Jurisdiction criteria: Specify the necessary criteria that a jurisdiction must satisfy to successfully conduct the proposed study design. If submitting an LOI for Tier I, it may be necessary to organize the criteria by research objective. Examples of criteria include specific data elements, staff capacity to extract data and accompanying data dictionaries, and stakeholder support for research.
 - Potential study limitations: Describe potential study limitations and how the research team intends to mitigate these challenges.

- Project timeline, milestones, and deliverables: Within a table, clearly identify the project timeline, proposed dates to accomplish project milestones, and project deliverables. Research teams should consider how to disseminate research results to multiple target audiences, including policymakers, practitioners, and researchers. Respondents are encouraged to develop papers for both peer-review publication and companion briefs that highlight study results and policy implications. The potential deliverables will likely vary based on the research objectives and questions addressed. Respondents are encouraged to identify which tools, guides, policies, and related materials would be helpful for the field when identifying the project deliverables.
- Institutional Review Board (IRB) protocol: If the proposed study should be submitted to an IRB for review, briefly describe the steps that will be taken to accomplish this and what documentation or data will be required of the project team. All steps to satisfy IRB protocol should be integrated within the project timeline table.
- Data management: Project activities are expected to involve handling of sensitive personal data subject to data privacy legal obligations. Provide a brief summary of the mechanisms (*e.g.*, encryption methods, user access controls such as two factor authentication, etc.) you have used in the past to protect sensitive data, both in transit and in storage, in accordance with applicable laws and/or agreements.
- Appendices: Include brief project team biographies that specify the project team role and responsibilities for the project team member, organizational chart (if appropriate), and references or bibliography.
- Budget: All budgets should specify the costs associated with the primary project activities, personnel responsible for completing the project activities, and the hours necessary by project team member to complete the project activities. Budgets should also include associated costs for travel and necessary administrative costs.
- Budget narrative: The narrative serves to offer additional detail about the primary project activities, project timeframe, and project deliverables.
- Proposal Attachments: Resumes and curricula vitae for project team members should be included as separate attachments. This documentation is not included in the total proposal page count.

Project and Award Timeframe

April 25:	RFP released
May 3:	Optional conference call
May 18:	LOIs Due
May 28:	Distribution of invitations to submit full proposals
June 18:	Deadline to submit full proposals
August 1:	Notification of award

Optional Conference Call

LJAF will answer questions related to this RFP during an optional call on May 3, 2018 at 3:00 p.m. EST. Potential respondents are encouraged to prepare for this conference call in advance by reviewing the research objectives and proposal requirements, as well as the complementary national provider RFP and information about the PSA on the LJAF website. To join the call, please dial (877) 594-8353 and use the code: 25475242#. Respondents are welcome to submit questions in advance by emailing PSARESEARCHRFP@arnoldfoundation.org with “PSA RFP Call” in the subject line.

Following the call, all questions and responses will be posted on LJAF’s website on or about May 7, 2018. Respondents are encouraged to check the site and adhere to any changes made to the RFP.

Eligibility

Competitive respondents will assemble a diverse team of experts to accomplish the breadth of work required under this RFP. Project teams will identify and establish a primary project director and fiscal agent for all subcontracts.

Advisory Board

In order to ensure a comprehensive evaluation, an advisory board comprised of scholars and pretrial experts will conduct an independent and objective review of each proposal. The advisory board will make recommendations to LJAF on awards for proposals that demonstrate quality and rigor based on the following criteria: (1) study design, (2) analytical strategy, (3) feasibility, (4) research expertise, (5) benefit to the field and advancement of research and policy, and (6) costs.

Term

All research projects funded under this RFP will be for two years in length with the expectation to extend to five years upon LJAF approval.