ABDUL LATIF JAMEEL POVERTY ACTION LAB

Crime and Violence Initiative (CVI) Application Instructions
Pilot and full RCT proposals: Round 8 (Fall 2022)

Instructions
Pilot study[1] and full RCT proposals consist of a (i) cover sheet and narrative; (ii) budget form and narrative; and (iii) letters of support. Please submit these materials separately, *as well as in a combined PDF*, to cvi@povertyactionlab.org by **Friday, September 23, 11:59 PM US Eastern Time**.

Cover sheet and narrative
Please use the template found on the CVI RFP webpage.

Budget
You will be asked to submit a detailed project budget to cvi@povertyactionlab.org using the Excel template available on CVI's website, under Application Materials. To reduce processing time, please keep the following in mind when developing your budget:

1. If there is co-funding for the project, you must complete both the "Total Project Budget" and "Initiative Budget" sheets in the budget template.
2. Awards are normally paid on a cost-reimbursable basis.
3. Applications must include budget notes in the column provided in the budget template, detailing the major costs within the budget. For example, "Travel Costs" should include a breakdown of how many trips are planned, the estimated cost per trip, etc. "Field Costs" should include a breakdown of the number of respondents, cost per respondent, etc.
4. Universities in high-income countries, generally defined as OECD member countries, can charge up to 10% in indirect costs, applied to total direct costs. Independent non-profits from any location and universities from mid- or low-income countries may charge up to 15% in indirect costs, applied to total direct costs.
5. We understand that the cap on overhead or indirect costs under CVI is low and that grantees may have reasonable project support costs included in budgets as direct costs. Such costs should be reasonable and explained in the budget notes.
6. Any computer/equipment purchases should include a breakdown of what is being purchased, (e.g. how many laptops), as well as the project staff that will be assigned to the equipment.
7. Applicants should review J-PAL best practices on questionnaire design and data collection/management in the J-PAL Research Protocol Checklist, to ensure they have budgeted for expenses associated with piloting and surveyor training, survey translation, field spot checks, and back checking.
8. Unallowable costs include those labeled as "incidental," "miscellaneous," or "contingency." Any costs for rent should be explained in the budget narrative.
9. Please note that CVI generally does not cover PI salaries or direct program implementation costs. **New exception:** CVI allows for budgets requesting funding to cover the time of PIs on proposals, as long as:
   1. The PI is based in an academic institution in a low-or middle-income country;

---

[1] Please note that full evaluations requesting less than $75,000 are considered full research projects and evaluated accordingly.

2. *For Full RCT proposals*: The request does not exceed $8,000 per year for each PI in the proposal, and does not exceed $20,000 per year for all PIs in the proposal in total.
3. *For Pilot proposals*: The request does not exceed $8,000 per year for each PI in the proposal, and does not exceed an amount equivalent to 25% of the total budget per year for all PIs in the proposal in total.
4. *For Travel/Proposal Development Grants*: No PI time allowed in budgets.
5. CVI may consider a deviation from these caps in exceptional circumstances, as long as the PI is still based in an academic institution in a low-or middle-income country.

10. It is your responsibility that your budget follows your host institution's policies for costs. As part of your proposal, you must submit a letter from the institution to receive the award that states that they have reviewed your proposal and accepted your budget. Please see detailed instructions under Letters of Support below. If the organization allows you to submit your proposal without such a letter (due to time constraints or some other reason), please note this on the proposal cover sheet (under the "Institution to receive grant funds" field). Please note that this applies to all projects, including those going through J-PAL and IPA offices. You should contact them in advance to make sure you are aware of their policies for proposal review and give them enough time to meet the proposal deadline.

11. (Full RCTs only) Policymakers are interested in program costs, as it is one of the key factors in their decision to support a program. Cost data also allows for cost-effectiveness analyses (CEA), which J-PAL may conduct (with permission from the researchers) even if such an analysis is not part of an academic paper. To offset the cost of collecting program cost data, the budget template includes a $1,000 line item. CVI will provide a costing worksheet for grantees to update annually. If researchers are unable to collect detailed cost data, researchers are still required to provide estimates of total program cost, average cost per beneficiary, and marginal cost to add another beneficiary.

Requirements

If your proposal is accepted for award, the actual funds will be provided under a subaward from MIT to the Institute to receive the award indicated on your cover sheet. This will require, in addition to your proposal:

1. Formal submission approval of the proposal from your institution to CVI. This approval should be provided in your proposal to CVI.
2. IRB approvals from your host institution, the reviewing IRB must have a Federalwide Assurance Number and be willing to establish a reliance agreement, accepting review for the project, unless the project has been deemed exempt. MIT requires proof of IRB approval prior to executing the award with your institution and releasing funding. We also ask that you provide us with any local IRB approvals for our records.

Process

We aim to set up the subaward within 60 days of receiving all your forms. Assuming IRB approval is in place, we set the period of the award to start from the start date indicated on the submitted proposal. The process MIT follows for these awards is:

1. The CVI Review Board sends official award notification letter.
2. If not already submitted, J-PAL requests your institution's approval of the proposal and your institutional IRB approval.

3. A reliance agreement is established between MIT and the IRB of record which must have a Federalwide Assurance Number. Instructions will be included in the award letter.
4. J-PAL establishes an account with award funds at MIT.
5. MIT establishes a subaward under that account with your institution.

Letters of support
Please provide the following letters of support:

1. Full projects are required to provide a letter of support from the implementing partners. Applicants for pilot funding are encouraged to submit letters of support, if available.
2. If available, applicants should also include letters of support from potential scale-up partners.
3. PhD students are required to include a letter of support from a J-PAL affiliate or invited researcher adviser on their thesis committee. The letter should indicate the adviser's willingness to remain involved over the project's lifetime and should generally come from the same adviser who supported the student's initial CVI exploratory grant application if applicable.
4. Graduate students who have not previously applied for travel/proposal development grants must also include documented evidence of successful pilot activities. Please note that in some cases, due to restrictions at the institution that will receive the funding awarded, the adviser may be asked to add his/her name to the subaward and IRB documents. Letters can be sent separately by advisers or included in the applicant's submission packet.
5. Graduate students with a J-PAL affiliate or invited researcher adviser who does not reside at the student's host university must also include a formal letter of confirmation from the student's department head confirming that the adviser is a member of the student's official thesis committee.
6. Applicants must provide a letter from the receiving institution of the award to show that they have reviewed your proposal and accept your budget. Please follow the MIT approved language for the Letter of Transmission as follows:
   1. **Example language for Letter of Transmission when there is <u>is</u> a PI at the ITRA:** (On ITRA letterhead)
      <ITRA> is pleased to support the <Name of research> proposal and will plan on carrying out the work in accordance with the submitted budget. <NAME OF PI at ITRA> will serve as <ITRA's> Principal Investigator for this work. In this role, he/she is responsible for the implementation of this project in accordance with this proposal and with appropriate research and data protection practices. Please contact him/her with any concerns which may arise related to project implementation.
   2. **Example language for Letter of Transmission when there is <u>no</u> PI at the ITRA:** (On ITRA letterhead)
      <ITRA> is pleased to support the <Name of research> proposal and submitted budget. <ITRA> takes full responsibility for the appropriate and responsible conduct of the proposed research activities related to the scope of work for this project under the academic direction of the co-PIs: <names of co-PIs plus their affiliation - eg: Jane Doe from Duke University>. Please contact me <this will be the person who signs the letter> with any concerns which may arise related to project implementation

Submission instructions
Email cvi@povertyactionlab.org with the following attachments:

1. Cover sheet and narrative saved as a single .docx file titled *[PI last name]_[Proposal title].docx*.
2. Budget form saved as a single .xlsx file titled *[PI last name]_budget.xlsx* and budget narrative saved as a single .docx file titled *[PI last name]_[Proposal title]_budget narrative.docx*.
3. Letter(s) of support from implementing partners saved as .pdf files titled *[PI last name]_[Partner name]*.
4. One single .pdf file, **combining all the documents above**, titled *[PI last name]_[Proposal type].pdf*.
5. [Graduate students only] Advisor letter of support saved as a .pdf file titled *[PI last name]_[Adviser last name]*, sent separately by adviser or included in the applicant's submission packet.
6. [Graduate students with adviser not located at host university only] A letter from the student's department head confirming the adviser is a member of the student's thesis committee saved as a .pdf file titled *[PI last name]_[Host university]*.

Evaluation criteria

CVI strategic priority	Does this research embody CVI's guiding principles (CVI RFP overview section I)? Does this study fall within the scope of CVI's research priorities (CVI RFP overview sections II—IV)? Is the study based in CVI focus countries (CVI RFP overview section V)?
Academic contribution	Does the study make a significant contribution toward advancing knowledge in the field? Does it answer new questions or introduce novel methods, measures, or interventions? Is there academic relevance? How does the study compare with the existing body of research? Does the research strategy provide a bridge between a practical experiment and underlying economic theories?
Policy relevance	Does the study address questions crucial to understanding pressing issues on crime and violence in developing countries? Will results from the intervention have broader implications? How, if at all, will the "lessons learned" have relevance beyond this test case? Is there demand from policy makers for more/better information to influence their decisions in this area? Is there potential for the implementing partner to scale up this intervention?
Technical design	Does the research design appropriately answer the questions outlined in the proposal? Are there threats that could compromise the validity of results? If so, does the proposal sufficiently address those threats? What changes could the researchers make to improve the design? For full study proposals, are there sufficiently detailed power calculations?
Project viability	Is the relationship with the implementing partner strong and likely to endure through the entire study? What is the credibility and policy influence of the implementing partner? Are there any other logistical or political obstacles that might threaten the completion of the study, for example, government authorization or Human Subjects review? For pilots, do researchers describe how piloting activities would inform a full-scale randomized evaluation?
Research ethics	Are the risks of unintended negative consequences for program participants, staff and/or community members minimal? Has the team taken proactive measures to assess, monitor, and mitigate/prevent any such potential risks?

Value of research	Is the cost of the study commensurate with the value of expected lessons learned? Does the study leverage funding from other sources?