

Comprehensive Early Childhood Mental Health in Alaska”;

- Arizona Department of Health Services— “Arizona Diabetic Patient Self-Management Project”;
- Arkansas Department of Human Services— “Improving Transitions from the Institutions into the Community”;
- Delaware Health and Social Services— “Self-Directed Supports for Community Living”;
- District of Columbia Department of Health— “DC Youth Violence Prevention Initiative-”;
- Iowa Department of Human Services— “Healthy Marriage/ Responsible Fatherhood”;
- Kansas Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services— “Child Welfare Wrap Around Service Delivery”;
- Maryland Department of Aging— “Changing Interagency Service Delivery Systems to Help Older Public Housing Residents”;
- New Hampshire State Department of Health and Human Services— “Granite State Data Archive”;
- South Carolina Department of Social Services— “Keep Them Home: An Adult Protective Service Program.”

C. Purpose

ASPE has determined that building on the efforts already underway is the most efficient use of the Fiscal Year 2003 state innovative grant funds. Since fiscal limitations prevent use from funding all ten planning grantees to move into a second-year, transitional planning/ demonstration phase, we plan to conduct a limited competition among the planning grantees in order to select 2–3 that will receive second-year resources. ASPE’s goal in supporting this phase is to enable some states to implement their innovative ideas, as well as to improve our understanding of the process of successful innovation. Planning grantees that receive additional funding will be expected to strengthen their activities and begin implementation. We anticipate that lessons learned from the planning and implementation process will assist program directors and state officials across the country in planning and implementing innovative projects. We plan to provide additional funding to 2–3 grantees. Each applicant may request funds in the range of \$300,000–\$500,000 per year for a maximum of three years. Decision on subsequent funding will be made on a noncompetitive basis based on the availability of funds, the adequate progress of the grantee, and such other similar criteria as the Department determines. Any requested additional funding will be reviewed to

determine that the continuation of the project is consistent with the purposes of the announcement.

D. Technical Assistance and Process Evaluation

The Lewin Group will provide a limited amount of tailored technical assistance to the states. The independent process evaluation begun in the FY2002 phase of the State Innovation Grants initiative will be expanded to document the progress of the FY2003 grantees. The process evaluation will, at a minimum, address key research questions:

1. What are the issues and challenges associated with implementing and operating the funded projects?
2. What are the expected short and long-term implications of this intervention for clients, as well as for agencies involved?
3. What other innovative ideas/ projects may grow out of each funded project and the program as a whole?

We expect that the work undertaken through this evaluation will result in important operational lessons and sound information about implementing innovative approaches. ASPE expects that this investment will benefit low-income clients and families, state and local health and human service administrators, others who work with low-income people, and the general public.

Part II. Project and Applicant Eligibility

A. Eligible Applicants

This grant competition is limited to the FY2002 State Innovation Grant recipients (see Part I B).

B. Available Funds

Approximately \$1 million is expected to be available from ASPE funds appropriated for fiscal year 2003. We estimate that this level of funding will support between 2–3 grants.

C. Budget and Project Period

Awards under this announcement will be made for 12-month budget periods. States may propose projects up to 36 months in duration. Subject to the availability of funds, grantees with projects which last longer than 12 months may be allowed to submit subsequent applications for additional funding, at a lower funding level, for additional budget period(s). Decisions on subsequent funding will be made on a noncompetitive basis based on the availability of funds, the adequacy of grantee progress, and such other similar criteria as the Department may determine. Any requests for additional funding also will be reviewed to ensure

that the continuation of the project is consistent with the purpose of the announcement.

After a grant award is made, any purchase of computer hardware or software needs to be requested in writing by the grantee and approved in writing by the ASPE project officer and the grants officer. Purchases of computer hardware or software for routine uses will not be considered. See Part IV, Section II for more information on review criteria for MIS/Data System proposals.

No funds may be paid as profit to grantees or subgrantees, *i.e.*, any amount is excess of allowable direct and indirect costs of the recipient (45 CFR 74.81). Grant monies can be used for client services to the extent that the cost of the services cannot be covered under existing programs.

D. Matching Requirements

Grantees must provide at least 10 percent of the total approved cost of the project. The total approved cost of the project is the sum of the Federal share and the non-Federal share. The non-Federal share may be met by cash or in-kind contributions, although applicants are encouraged to meet their match requirements through cash contributions. For example, a state with a project with a total budget (both direct and indirect costs) of \$500,000 may request up to \$450,000 in federal funds. Matching requirements cannot be met with funds from other federally-funded programs.

If a proposed project activity has approved funding support from other funding sources, the amount, duration, purpose, and source of the funds should be indicated in materials submitted under this announcement. If completion of the proposed project activity is contingent upon approval of funding from other sources, the relationship between the funds being sought elsewhere and from ASPE should be discussed in the budget information submitted as a part of the abstract. In both cases, the contribution that ASPE funds will make to the project should be clearly presented.

Part III. The Review Process

A. Intergovernmental Review

State Single Point of Contact (E.O. No. 12372)—DHHS has determined that this program is not subject to Executive Order 12372, “Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs.” Applicants are not required to seek intergovernmental review of their applications within the constraints of E.O. 12372.