



Reducing Violence Research RFP

Arnold Ventures

Criminal Justice Initiative

Policing || Community Safety

June 2022

Table of Contents

Background	3
Research Methods	7
Outcomes	7
Commitment to Racial Equity and Diversity	8
Statement on Transparency and Research Integrity	8
Grant Term	9
Budget	9
Responding to this RFP	9
Application Step 1: Submit a Letter of Interest	10
Application Step 2: Proposal Submission	11
Collaboration within Project Teams and with Arnold Ventures	12
Project and Award Timeframe	13
Optional Conference Call	13
Review Process	13
Additional Questions	13

Background

Violent crime rates have been and continue to be unacceptably high in the United States. In 2020, there were almost 5,000 more homicides than in 2019, representing a 29 percent year-over-year increase—a new record.¹ The rise in homicides occurred in small, midsize, and large cities across the country. Notably, an analysis of the 2020 data estimates that [77 percent of those homicides](#) were committed with a firearm—the largest share ever reported. In 2021, though the rate of increase slowed, many cities continued to experience high levels of violence as the number of homicides [remained elevated](#) across the country. The distribution of these violent incidents—and thus, the direct experience of them—is highly concentrated, predominantly in communities that have long been subject to chronic underinvestment. A significant proportion of violence involves a very small number of individuals (whether as perpetrators or victims). Homicide is the [number one cause of death](#) for Black males ages 15 to 34 years-old and the second leading cause of death for young Hispanic males.

The lived experience of residents in marginalized communities has cast a spotlight on policing practices that have left residents simultaneously over-policed and under-served while police are inconsistent in solving crimes in these same communities.² Other government actors—in criminal justice, public health, social services, and mayor's offices—also play a role in maintaining safe communities, but their roles are not often defined, coordinated, or well-resourced. Non-governmental organizations—from large social service nonprofits to grassroots violence interrupter programs—and community groups are also active participants in the effort to reduce violence. How these various actors interrelate and individually and collectively develop strategies that *successfully and sustainably* reduce violent crime in a given locale is underexplored.

The current administration has made significant funding available to support community safety through both legislative and executive action, giving states, counties, and cities access to an extraordinary increase in resources to address this pressing problem. Yet, policymakers, law enforcement, and community-based organizations all continue to grapple with the challenging question: “What works to reduce violence?” The need to answer that question has only become more urgent.

The Arnold Ventures (AV) Reducing Violence portfolio aims to reduce community violence, support a safe future for all community members, and minimize the fear that comes from living in communities without effective responses to violence. To advance this vision, this portfolio focuses on the development of a rigorous evidence base on violence reduction strategies and programs to support communities, policymakers, and law enforcement agencies in their efforts. Specifically, Arnold Ventures supports research to better understand effective strategies to reduce community violence by focusing on the most high-risk people and places and promoting effective policing, and ensuring that what is learned leads to scalable results. Five overarching goals motivate our work:

¹ Asher, J. (2021, September 22). *Murder Rose by Almost 30% in 2020. It's Rising at a Slower Rate in 2021*. The New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/09/22/upshot/murder-rise-2020.html>

² Li, W. & Lartey, J. (2022, January 12). *As Murders Spiked, Police Solved About Half in 2020*. The Marshall Project.

1. Reduce community violence perpetration and victimization, especially among young Black and Brown males;
2. Increase community involvement in reporting and preventing crime;
3. Increase police effectiveness in preventing and investigating violent crime;
4. Promote justice and fairness for all members of communities impacted by violence; and
5. Strengthen decisionmakers' ability to plan, launch and sustain effective violence reduction strategies.

We seek to advance these goals by developing research under three main pillars: addressing immediate crises of violence, identifying and addressing the underlying causes of violence, and promoting effective police investigations to solve violent crime. This approach recognizes that decisionmakers facing an urgent demand to act in response to emergent violence need to pinpoint the particular problem of violence in their community quickly and accurately and identify effective solutions to stop the shooting. We also underscore that longer-term approaches to tackle the underlying causes of community violence are needed to sustain reductions in violence and build a more durable peace. Finally, where violence does occur, we seek to develop research that supports more effective, timely investigations that deliver justice for victims of crime and their families.

In this Request for Proposals (RFP), we prioritize funding research to address immediate crises of violence.

When violence surges, such as the record increase in homicides in 2020, policymakers must meet the demand both to explain and solve the immediate crisis of violence in their community. Yet, the complexity of the problem of violence continues to leave mayors, law enforcement and community leaders struggling to diagnose the particular drivers of violence afflicting a given locale as well as identify which interventions to pursue in what contexts.

Notwithstanding these challenges, there is significant momentum—and unprecedented resources—for innovation. A broad range of stakeholders, including community members, advocates, practitioners, policymakers, and researchers, have developed and implemented a variety of innovative approaches to reducing violence. These programs look to community, hospitals, and/or family units to take the lead in efforts to intervene and prevent violence, and have emerged as a popular alternative to police-led responses in many jurisdictions. While many of these interventions are promising, most have not yet been rigorously studied, leaving a gap in our understanding of how they work as well as an opportunity to learn how to further expand these efforts where they are having the hoped-for effects.³ Police-led interventions also remain prevalent, though historically there has been limited rigorous assessment of law enforcement approaches to violence reduction. In the context of both greater scrutiny of policing practices in the aftermath of George Floyd's murder *and* support for more police resources in response to rising violent crime,⁴ the need for better evidence to inform what the role of police *should* be is significant. Given the current political salience, widespread demand to try such efforts,

³ John Jay College Research Advisory Group on Preventing and Reducing Community Violence. (2020). [Reducing Violence Without Police: A Review of Research Evidence](#).

⁴ See, for example, The White House. (2022, March 28). [Statement by President Joe Biden on the FY23 Budget](#). President Biden's FY23 budget proposal includes an additional \$30 billion for law enforcement over the next 10 years.

resources available to invest in these programs, and limited systematic evidence available on program efficacy, high-quality program evaluations are essential to increasing knowledge and informing policy and practice.

Following a robust review of the available violence reduction literature as well as expert input from a range of stakeholders, including practitioners in the field of violence reduction, **Arnold Ventures will fund research on the following priority interventions under this RFP:**

1. Street outreach/violence interruption.

The literature consistently shows that violence is concentrated among a small subset of the population and in a small subset of geographies in a given jurisdiction. Most often, these people and places are marginalized, hard to reach, and lack institutional touchpoints with the state (outside of carceral contact). Street outreach programs (also known as violence interruption or credible messenger strategies) are designed to connect at-risk individuals with a member of their community who can relate to and guide them through the challenges and risks they face each day. Outreach workers are also a key component of focused deterrence programs that are associated with meaningful reductions in crime.

2. Hospital-based Violence Intervention Programs (HVIPs).

Prior violent victimization is one of the strongest predictors of one's future risk for firearm homicide, with one study showing gunshot wound survivors having 21 times the risk of future involvement as a victim or perpetrator compared to others with similar backgrounds.⁵ Healthcare providers and hospital systems, who are on the frontlines of providing treatment to victims, have a stake in reducing violence given the enormous cost burden they face for providing treatment to victims, who are often uninsured or under-insured. Hospitals thus present an opportunity for intervention, since immediately after a serious assault, victims are "particularly receptive to efforts to help them make changes in their lives," including efforts to reduce the risk of future involvement in violence.⁶

3. Therapeutic supports to families (e.g., functional family therapy).

Researchers find that familial influence can be a valuable pathway to reducing or averting negative behaviors.⁷ Functional Family Therapy (FFT), modified for use with

⁵ Rowhani-Rahbar, A., Zatzick, D., Wang, J., Mills, B.M., Simonetti, J.A., Fan, M.D., & Rivara, F.P. (2015). Firearm-Related Hospitalization and Risk for Subsequent Violent Injury, Death, or Crime Perpetration. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 162(7), 492-500. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M14-2362>

⁶ Johnson, S.B., Bradshaw, C.P., Wright, J.L., Haynie, D.L., Simmons-Morton, B.G., & Cheng, T.L. (2007). Characterizing the teachable moment: is an emergency department visit a teachable moment for intervention among assault-injured youth and their parents? *Pediatric Emergency Care*, 23(8), 553-559. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PEC.0b013e31812c6687>; Cunningham, R. Knox, L., Fein, J. Harrison, S., Frisch, K., Walton, M. Dicker, R., Calhoun, D., Becker, M., & Hargarten S.W. (2009). Before and after the trauma bay: the prevention of violent injury among youth. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 54(3), 490-500. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annemergmed.2008.11.014>

⁷ Hashimi, S., Wakefield, S., & Apel, R. (2021). Sibling Transmission of Gang Involvement. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 58 (5), 507-544. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427820986592> They find that individuals with a current or former street group-affiliated sibling have substantially higher odds of joining a street group.

those at high risk for street group involvement or already involved in street groups (FFT-G), shows promise, especially as it is one of the few interventions that directly addresses the risk of having siblings and other family members who are (or were) involved in criminal activity.⁸ The initial evidence suggests the potential of this intervention, though further research is necessary to determine the program's robustness to implementation in different contexts. Notably, the program is eligible for Medicaid funding, lowering barriers to implementation and scalability.

4. Youth cognitive behavioral therapy and summer employment.

Randomized evaluations of programs that prioritize young people, including the “Becoming a Man” cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) program in Chicago⁹ and summer youth employment efforts,¹⁰ have found that these interventions yield positive outcomes. Further study of these interventions can provide further evidence on the robustness of these programs to implementation in different contexts, as well as further insight on the program components that are critical to success.

5. Focused deterrence.

A police-led strategy that “attempts to deter specific criminal behavior through fear of specific sanctions (or ‘levers’), as well as anticipation of benefits for not engaging in crime,”¹¹ over 15 years of research on this approach suggest the efficacy of this strategy in reducing crime.¹² However, research on a broader range of outcomes remains lacking, including measurement of potential harms arising from various implementations of this strategy. Investing in rigorous process and outcome evaluations of focused deterrence programming can directly address how and why this intervention appears to work in reducing violence.

6. Improving the physical environment (e.g., greening vacant lots, improving lighting).

Research has shown that, “environmental strategies can reduce violence and address accumulated structures of poverty, fear, and stress, while increasing social integration and resident well-being... Researchers should identify the strategies ready to be scaled-up and identify best processes, relative dosages, and thresholds of intervention needed to reduce violence.”¹³ With much of the current evidence base for interventions such as

⁸ Thornberry, T. P., Kearley, B., Gottfredson, D. C., Slothower, M. P., Devlin, D. N., & Fader, J. J. (2018). Reducing crime among youth at risk for gang involvement: A randomized trial. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(4), 953-989. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12395>. FFT is a “brief and widely disseminated evidence-based treatment for youth presenting with problem behaviors including delinquency and substance abuse” (Thornberry et al., 2018, p. 960). The largest source of referrals to FFT is the juvenile justice system. The program typically “involves 12–15 face-to-face sessions of approximately one hour (delivered over a three-month period) during which trained therapists work with the targeted youth as well as with his or her caregivers, usually in a home setting.”

⁹ Heller, S. B., Shah, A. K., Guryan, J., Ludwig, J., Mullainathan, S., & Pollack, H. A. (2017). Thinking, fast and slow? Some field experiments to reduce crime and dropout in Chicago. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 132(1), 1-54.

¹⁰ Heller, S. (2021). When Scale and Replication Work: Learning from Summer Youth Employment Experiments (No. w28705). National Bureau of Economic Research; Heller, S. B. (2014). Summer jobs reduce violence among disadvantaged youth. *Science*, 346(6214), 1219-1223. <https://www.science.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.1257809>

¹¹ RAND Corporation. [Focused Deterrence in Depth](#). Better Policing Toolkit.

¹² Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2018). [Focused deterrence strategies and crime control: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence](#). *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(1), 205-250.

¹³ John Jay College Research Advisory Group on Preventing and Reducing Community Violence. (2020). [Reducing Violence Without Police: A Review of Research Evidence](#).

greening vacant lots, improving lighting, and increasing tree canopy relying primarily on natural experiments, the next phase of this work should embrace randomized controlled trials that facilitate manipulation of various place-based features and examine how long effects persist.

Research Methods

We are primarily interested in rigorous outcome evaluations that focus on the core question of whether the selected intervention works to reduce violence and build community safety. We will support experimental and non-experimental approaches that facilitate estimates of causal effects. We are also interested in understanding the mechanisms associated with changes and welcome mixed-method and multilevel data collection strategies. Cost-benefit analyses are also recommended where feasible.

In addition, our review of the evidence and engagement with practitioners has made clear the importance of not only assessing *what* interventions work to reduce violence, but also the key role of the “*how*”—how a jurisdiction identifies its problem of violence, how it selects and resources an intervention, how it designs and implements that approach—in attaining the core goal of violence reduction. We are thus interested in building a more systematic understanding of best practices in problem identification, or the process and analyses undertaken to identify the particular problem of violence in a given locale and determine which interventions are best suited to address that problem. We are also interested in documenting and examining the design and composition of intervention programs, and the process by which they are implemented.

Proposals for impact studies that incorporate formative and process evaluations of how violence reduction interventions are developed, resourced, and implemented will receive priority in our funding decisions.

In addition, we are interested in understanding the scalability of these interventions, especially in studies of focused deterrence and strategies to improve the physical environment. With a substantial body of evidence supporting the efficacy of these two intervention types, we are not only interested in understanding whether earlier findings replicate in different contexts but also in learning about how these efforts scale across place (e.g., from a few neighborhoods to citywide implementation) and time (e.g., how sustained are the effects). We are especially interested in multi-site studies of these two strategies (though we welcome multi-site applications to study any of the above interventions).

Outcomes

AV's Reducing Violence research agenda is guided by our [research philosophy](#) and [our mission](#) of maximizing opportunity and minimizing injustice. We aim to fund research that is both multi-faceted and inclusive. Though the reduction of violence is a primary outcome of interest for research funded through this RFP, we underscore that *sustaining* reductions in violence requires both the absence of violence and the active creation of the conditions that increase individual wellbeing and community safety. Research that addresses the underlying causes of violence—the social and economic inequities that characterize the communities most impacted

by violence—is of great interest. We thus encourage studies that document changes in crime as well as a broader set of metrics to understand how violence reduction strategies promote success and behavior change for individuals and communities receiving them. Relevant indicators may include measures of employment, economic stability and mobility, training and skills development, housing and residential stability, family stability and functioning, health, mental health, and wellbeing, as well as access to treatment services and public benefits. We also consider outcomes across multiple levels of analysis, including individuals (and families), community, and systems. More detailed discussion of priority outcomes is included in the Reducing Violence research agenda.

In response to this RFP, research teams must include **policy-relevant research questions** and clearly indicate which proposed outcomes/levels will be studied, as well as the anticipated time horizons for study (e.g., short-term, with a 12-24-month follow-up period, and/or longer-term, with a 36-48-month follow-up period). We invite research teams to describe the relevance of the proposed research in the context of ongoing policy debates or public narratives.

Commitment to Racial Equity and Diversity

Promoting diversity and equity in research practice is a key facet of AV's mission of maximizing opportunity and minimizing injustice. While racial disparities and bias persist at key decision-making points throughout the criminal justice system, there are too few researchers of color leading studies that are intended to result in successful policies and outcomes for children, adults, and communities of color. We are committed to funding work conducted by research teams that are diverse and not only represent affected communities, but actively include community members in shaping and developing research. We believe that research should be conducted *with*, not for or to, the community.

We strongly encourage research teams (universities, researchers, agency and/or program staff) to include members of groups who are disproportionately impacted by the criminal justice system. The voices and expertise of practitioners and researchers of color as well as those directly impacted by the criminal justice system are fundamental to finding solutions that will be most beneficial for individuals most impacted and should therefore be actively and meaningfully included in all proposed work. Research teams are encouraged to integrate community and impacted voices into all phases of the planning and research process: developing and defining the research questions, methods, outcomes of interest, and in describing the policy implications of the research results.

In addition, AV's commitment to building the field of scholarship means that applicants should propose teams that include early-career researchers and scholars with meaningful and active roles in the work. AV also equally welcomes new potential partners and existing grantee partners to apply to this RFP.

Statement on Transparency and Research Integrity

AV is strongly committed to the principles of research transparency and integrity, as explained in our [Guidelines for Investment in Research](#). To ensure the utmost in rigor, we require all

funded research projects to be pre-registered on the [Open Science Framework website](#), and all non-confidential materials be open and freely available. In the case of confidential data, proposals should address the feasibility of publicly sharing a de-identified dataset for public use.

Grant Term

We recommend that teams submitting proposals develop their budget around a feasible timeline that does not exceed 72 months in length. The design and full-scale implementation of a new violence reduction intervention can be a complex, time-intensive process requiring coordination of multiple stakeholders. Further, it is our expectation that these program evaluations will have longer timelines, to ensure sufficient time elapsed for the intervention to take effect. We thus encourage prospective grantees to consider—and budget for—timelines that account for early involvement of evaluators (e.g., to facilitate process evaluation and ensure the intervention is implemented in a manner that allows for rigorous evaluation) as well as sufficient time to track outcomes, both in the short-term (12-24 months follow-up) and longer-term (24-48 months follow-up). We anticipate that a six-year period of performance accommodates these implementation and evaluation objectives and allows the emerging evidence to inform ongoing debates in the field.

Projects that exceed these timeline recommendations will be considered if a compelling case can be made for an extended grant term.

Budget

- We anticipate funding 2-3 projects per intervention type (street outreach/violence interruption, HVIPs, therapeutic supports to families, youth CBT and summer employment, focused deterrence, environmental strategies).
- We anticipate that project budgets will depend on a variety of factors, including program complexity, specifics of the intervention, rigor and comprehensiveness of the evaluation (e.g., does it include process, economic, and impact evaluation?), data collection requirements, outcomes studied, study timeline, and number of sites under study. In light of these variables, there is no set budget range for proposals received under this RFP. We encourage applicants to provide detailed budget justifications as part of their submission.

Responding to this RFP

Project teams are strongly encouraged to incorporate robust researcher-practitioner partnerships to strengthen both the quality and relevance of the evidence produced.

Project teams may involve partnerships among universities, researchers, justice-involved persons, community members, scholars, policymakers, practitioners, and/or subject-matter experts to ensure a highly qualified team. Justice system policymakers or practitioners and community-based organizations are also highly encouraged to initiate a potential research study, coordinate the formation of the research team, and apply for funding.

We are aware of the National Institute of Justice FY22 solicitation on [Research and Evaluation on Violent Crime and Firearm Violence in the Community](#) and are encouraged by the multiple sources of funding available to support this line of research. As applications to NIJ will not be notified of the status of their proposals at the time this RFP is open, we welcome project teams submitting proposals to NIJ to apply to this RFP as well (please make a note of this in your application materials). Should an applicant receive both awards, we will coordinate with the project team to update the proposed work and budget under the AV award, as appropriate.

Application Step 1: Submit a Letter of Interest

Teams interested in responding to this RFP should first submit a Letter of Interest (LOI) by 11:59 p.m. PT on July 11, 2022. Please submit your LOI via email to reducingviolenceRFP@arnoldventures.org with the subject line, “Reducing Violence LOI Submission - [insert intervention strategy here].” In the body of the email, please note the name of the project and principal investigator(s), and submit the LOI as a PDF attachment with contents listed in the order shown in the table below.

All LOIs must adhere to the specifications detailed in the table below. Failure to meet any of these criteria within the specified timeframe may result in disqualification for further consideration of proposal submission. AV may contact the project point of contact with questions following the LOI submission. Letters of support are not required as part of the LOI submission.

Teams selected to submit full proposals will be notified on or about July 25, 2022.

LOI Specifications:

Page Length	LOIs are not to exceed 4 single-spaced pages.
Cover Page	<p>All LOIs should include a cover page with names of primary investigators, organizational/agency affiliation, contact information, and title of proposed project.</p> <p>Please also indicate whether you have also submitted a proposal to the NIJ solicitation noted above.</p> <p><i>Cover page does not count toward total page length.</i></p>
Intervention Strategy	Identify which of the six intervention strategies the study will examine and provide a brief description of the specific intervention (location, target population, etc.)
Why this intervention?	Provide a brief description of how the intervention was selected for implementation in this jurisdiction. What data/analyses were used to inform this decision? Why is the selected intervention expected to address the particular problem of violence in this jurisdiction?
Research	Clearly state your policy-relevant research objective(s); how your

Objectives	research plan will address these objectives; why those questions are important to the field; and how your findings may contribute to policy change at the legislative or agency level.
Advancing Racial Equity and Justice	Provide a brief explanation of how the project adopts a racial equity framework or advances racial justice (e.g., how does the project incorporate voices/perspectives of impacted communities, either directly on the research team or as part of the study design?)
Study Design and Plan	Provide a brief summary of the study design and describe data necessary to conduct the study, listing of independent and dependent variables, and an overview of the analytical strategy.
Deliverables	Provide a brief list of project deliverables. Arnold Ventures encourages research teams to include at least 2-3 short, non-technical briefs for a general audience that summarize policies and practices; findings; and policy implications. Recommended deliverables include pre-analysis plans, report on findings from formative and/or process evaluations (where applicable), report on findings from impact evaluation, as well as different formats of these materials suitable for use by a wide range of stakeholders. Respondents are strongly encouraged to explain how their proposed deliverables will provide the greatest benefit for target audiences, including researchers, community members, criminal justice agency stakeholders, policymakers, and practitioners, and in a timely manner over the course of the grant term.
Team biographies	Provide a brief biography for all project team members, specifying their roles and responsibilities for the project. <i>Team biographies do not count toward the total page length. Please start this section on a new page.</i>
Budget + Timeline	Specify the overall project cost and project timeline and provide some detail on the anticipated drivers of this cost. Some examples include personnel time, data acquisition, and travel and administrative costs. Offer a budget that reflects the scope of the work proposed. <i>The budget and timeline do not count toward the total page length. Please start this section on a new page.</i>

Respondents who want to conduct multiple studies must submit a separate LOI for each study (unless the studies are related whereby information learned in one study directly informs or complements the methods of the next study). If respondents are invited to submit full proposals, they must submit separate proposals that align with the separate LOIs, if applicable.

Application Step 2: Proposal Submission

Project teams selected to submit full proposals will be contacted on or about July 25, 2022, at which time the AV team will provide proposal templates and schedule a brief meeting during the

week of July 25th to provide feedback on the letter of interest and guide development of the full proposal.

Full proposals are due by 11:59 p.m. ET on September 9, 2022, and should be submitted via email to reducingviolenceRFP@arnoldventures.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.*

- The proposal length is limited to 8 single-spaced pages (12-pt standard font, 1" margins).
- The proposal must be submitted using the provided templates. Please use the subject line "Proposal Submission - Project Name" to submit your materials to reducingviolenceRFP@arnoldventures.org.
- Letters of support from operational partners (e.g., entity[ies] implementing the intervention program, relevant government partners, others who will need to provide data for the evaluation) will be required with proposal materials.
 - Letters of support should document the operational partner(s)' assent to the study (including formative and process evaluations, random assignment, etc., as relevant), willingness to share necessary data and documentation, and a description of how they or others would use the study findings to inform program or policy decisions.

Collaboration within Project Teams and with Arnold Ventures

If selected for this award, as a stipulation of the grant agreement, AV expects all groups applying together (such as, but not limited to, researchers, sub-awardees, community-based providers, government partners) to work collaboratively with each other and in partnership with our organization.

Teams are expected to provide AV with regular updates, enlist us as necessary in solving problems and removing obstacles that may interfere with research objectives, and communicate with us about research results as they are obtained. The designated Primary Investigator(s) will be primarily responsible for organizing the agenda and updates for each call or meeting with AV.

Project teams are also expected to connect their research to policy and practice through strategic communications efforts to share their findings with a broad audience and development of deliverables designed for diverse stakeholders (e.g., journal articles *and* policy briefs). Where multiple teams are funded to assess similar interventions, we will encourage (and support) teams to collaborate on a synthesis of findings across their studies to inform the field.

Finally, in recognition of the urgent need to address crises of violence, AV will convene grantees at multiple stages during the period of performance to facilitate cross-pollination of ideas and timely dissemination of findings (e.g., from formative or process evaluations, interim reports, etc.) to inform policy and practice, where feasible.

Project and Award Timeframe

- June 3, 2022: RFP released
- June 16, 2022: Optional conference call at 2:00pm ET [RSVP [here](#)]
- June 17, 2022: FAQ document posted to AV Reducing Violence [webpage](#). Any updates to the RFP will also be made by this date and reflected on our website.
- July 11, 2022: Deadline to submit LOIs
- July 25, 2022: Notification of invitation to submit full proposal
- September 9, 2022: Deadline to submit full proposals
- Q4 2022: Notification of award

Optional Conference Call

The AV Team will answer questions related to this RFP during an optional informational call on Thursday, June 16, 2022, at 2:00pm ET. Potential respondents are encouraged to prepare for this conference call in advance by reviewing the full RFP, AV's Reducing Violence research agenda, and proposal requirements. Please RSVP to the call [here](#) to receive the dial-in information.

Respondents are welcome to submit questions in advance through the [RSVP form](#) and/or by emailing reducingviolenceRFP@arnoldventures.org with "Reducing Violence RFP Call" in the subject line. Following the call, all questions and responses will be posted on AV's website on or about June 17, 2022. Respondents are encouraged to check the site and adhere to any changes made to the RFP, which will also be posted by this date.

Review Process

Depending on the volume of proposals received, submissions will be reviewed over the course of the fall/early winter of 2022 (with funded project start dates anticipated to be in the same general window or into early 2023). To ensure a comprehensive evaluation of the proposals, a panel of reviewers composed of researchers, practitioners, and policymakers will conduct an independent and objective review of each proposal. This panel will make recommendations to AV 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/advancement of research, practice, and policy, and (6) advancement of racial equity and justice. All final funding decisions will be made by AV's Board of Directors.

Additional Questions

If you have questions that are not addressed here, please feel free to email us at reducingviolenceRFP@arnoldventures.org.