

use of SJI scholarship funds to include reasonable lodging costs. *See* section VI.F.

In addition, the Final Guideline adopts the proposed policy to exempt recipients of JBE TA Grants from the requirement to provide cash match.

### Recommendations to Grantwriters

Recommendations to Grantwriters may be found in Appendix A.

The following Grant Guideline is adopted by the State Justice Institute for FY 2004:

#### Table of Contents

I. The Mission of the State Justice Institute
II. Scope of the Program
III. Definitions
IV. Eligibility for Award
V. Types of Projects and Grants; Size of Awards
VI. Applications
VII. Application Review Procedures
VIII. Compliance Requirements
IX. Financial Requirements
X. Grant Adjustments
Appendix A—Recommendations to Grant Writers
Appendix B—Answers to Grantees' Frequently Asked Questions
Appendix C—SJI Libraries: Designated Sites and Contacts
Appendix D—Illustrative List of Technical Assistance Grants
Appendix E—Illustrative List of Model Curricula
Appendix F—State Justice Institute Application (Forms A, B, C, C1, D, and Disclosure of Lobbying Activities)
Appendix G—Line-Item Budget Form (Form E)
Appendix H—Scholarship Application Forms (Forms S1 and S2)

### I. The Mission of the State Justice Institute

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

- Direct a national program of financial assistance designed to assure that each citizen of the United States is provided ready access to a fair and effective system of justice;
- Foster coordination and cooperation with the Federal judiciary;
- Promote recognition of the importance of the separation of powers doctrine to an independent judiciary; and
- Encourage education for judges and support personnel of State court systems through national and State organizations, including universities.

To accomplish these broad objectives, the Institute is authorized to provide funds to State courts, national

organizations which support and are supported by State courts, national judicial education organizations, and other organizations that can assist in improving the quality of justice in the State courts.

The Institute is supervised by an 11-member Board of Directors appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate. The Board is statutorily composed of six judges, a State court administrator, and four members of the public, no more than two of whom can be of the same political party.

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

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

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

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

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

E. Encourage and assist in furthering judicial education;

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

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

### II. Scope of the Program

As set forth in Section I., the Institute is authorized to fund projects addressing a broad range of program areas. However, during FY 2004, the Institute will consider applications for funding support that address only the topics included in the following five program categories designated by the Board as being of special interest. Funds will not be made available for the ordinary, routine operation of court systems or programs in any of these areas.

#### A. Special Interest Program Categories

The Institute is interested in funding both innovative programs and programs of proven merit that can be replicated in other jurisdictions. The Institute is especially interested in funding projects that:

- Formulate new procedures and techniques, or creatively enhance existing procedures and techniques;
- Address aspects of the State judicial systems that are in special need of serious attention;
- Have national significance by developing products, services, and techniques that may be used in other States; and
- Create and disseminate products that effectively transfer the information and ideas developed to relevant audiences in State and local judicial systems, or provide technical assistance to facilitate the adaptation of effective programs and procedures in other State and local jurisdictions.

A project will be identified as a *Special Interest* project if it meets the four criteria set forth above and it falls within the scope of the *Special Interest* program categories designated below.

The Board has designated the areas set forth below as *Special Interest* program categories. The order of listing does not imply any ordering of priorities among the categories. For a complete list of projects supported in previous years in each of these categories, please visit the Institute's Internet homepage at <http://www.statejustice.org/> and click on *Grants by Category*.

#### 1. Access to the Courts

This category includes demonstration, evaluation, research, and education projects designed to improve the responsiveness of courts to public concerns regarding the fairness, accessibility, timeliness, and comprehensibility of the court process.

The Institute is particularly interested in supporting innovative projects that:

- Test and evaluate approaches permitting self-represented litigants to file pleadings, responses, and other forms electronically;
- Test and evaluate new approaches to enhance public access to the courts, including demonstrations of innovative collaborative efforts between courts and community institutions (e.g., bar associations, legal service agencies, schools, and public libraries) to enhance access to the courts by people without lawyers (in this regard, however, Institute funds may not be used to directly or indirectly support legal representation of individuals in specific cases); and