



District Attorney of  
New York County



CUNY INSTITUTE  
FOR STATE & LOCAL  
GOVERNANCE

# **Criminal Justice Investment Initiative**

## **Request for Proposals for Evaluation of College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative**

No. 005

Expires 09/06/2016

## Table of Contents

Cover Sheet.....	1
Key Terms.....	2
Summary of the Request for Proposals.....	4
Anticipated Scope of Services .....	5
Deliverables .....	7
Proposal Content and Format.....	8
Proposal Evaluation and Contract.....	11
Appendices.....	13

# **I. Cover Sheet**

## **A. Goal of the RFP**

The goal of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to solicit proposals from applicants to evaluate the College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative across multiple sites in New York State. The Ford Foundation has contributed funding for this purpose.

Starting in Fall 2016 and over a period of five years, the New York County District Attorney's Office (DANY) is committing \$7.5 million under its Criminal Justice Investment Initiative (CJII) to fund 1) postsecondary, college-level instruction leading to industry-recognized certification or an Associate's or Bachelor's Degree; and 2) the establishment of an Education Coordinator to oversee and manage this work. Evaluation applicants should propose a research design that facilitates the process and outcome evaluation of the initiative, including student-level outcomes and the role of the Education Coordinator; as well as a cost-benefit analysis.

## **B. Timeline and Submission Instructions**

1. **Release Date of RFP:** Wednesday, July 13, 2016
2. **Questions:** Questions about this RFP may be submitted in writing at <http://cuny-islg.fluidreview.com>. Questions and requests for clarification must be submitted by **Friday, July 29, 2016, at 11:59pm EST.**
3. Answers to all questions will be available as an addendum to this RFP by 11:59pm on **Monday, August 8, 2016.** It will be the responsibility of proposers to check the CJII website to remain up-to-date regarding all addenda issued for the current RFP. Any addenda will be posted here: <http://cjii.org/category/opportunities/>.
4. **Proposal Due Date:** Proposal submissions are due on **Tuesday, September 6, 2016, at 11:59pm EST.** Proposals should be submitted via <http://cuny-islg.fluidreview.com>.
5. Failure to submit a proposal by the due date and time will result in the proposal being considered non-responsive to this RFP and not considered for award. Unless an addendum to this RFP is issued extending the due date and time, all proposals must be submitted prior to the time and date set forth above.
6. Anticipated Contract Start Date: October 2016

## **C. Amount and Number of Awards**

ISLG anticipates awarding one contract, with total funding up to \$900,000.

## **D. Contact Information**

Questions regarding RFP content should be submitted in writing at <http://cuny-islg.fluidreview.com>. Questions regarding technical difficulties should be sent to [cjii@islg.cuny.edu](mailto:cjii@islg.cuny.edu).

## II. Key Terms

**College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative:** A \$7.5 million investment funded via the CJII which expands access to college in prison in New York State and supports the creation of an Education Coordinator to oversee and manage college-in-prison programming and reentry in New York.

**Criminal Justice Investment Initiative (CJII):** CJII was established by the New York County District Attorney's Office in 2014 to invest funds<sup>a</sup> in impactful projects that will improve public safety and promote a fair and efficient criminal justice system.

**CUNY Institute for State and Local Governance (ISLG):** ISLG is the technical assistance consultant to the Manhattan District Attorney's Office for CJII. ISLG oversees CJII on behalf of the Manhattan District Attorney's Office, manages and provides guidance to award recipients, and conducts oversight and performance measurement throughout the lifetime of the initiative.

**Education Coordinator:** The College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative's Education Coordinator will oversee and coordinate educational programming among funded college-in-prison providers and work with providers to deliver reentry support, including enrollment support, referrals for appropriate services, and monitoring post-release from prison. Funded providers will be required to collaborate with the Education Coordinator in implementing the programs, providing quality assurance of educational services, providing centralized reporting and accountability, and developing articulation and transfer agreements.

**Federal Pell Grant:** Federal Pell Grants are awarded to undergraduate students with financial need, as determined by a family's Expected Family Contribution (EFC).<sup>1</sup> Since 1994, incarcerated individuals have been ineligible for Pell grants, though the U.S. Department of Education recently launched a limited pilot program (Second Chance Pell Program) to expand eligibility to incarcerated individuals.<sup>2</sup>

**Ford Foundation:** A private philanthropic foundation, headquartered in NYC, which distributes more than \$500 million in funding annually. The Ford Foundation will assist in providing funding to support the evaluation of the College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative.

**New York County District Attorney's Office (DANY):** Manhattan District Attorney's Office. The Criminal Justice Investment Initiative was established by DANY.

**Outcomes:** The results and impact of program activities (e.g., recidivism rates, employment/earnings).

**Outputs:** Measurements of program activities (e.g., number of inmates served, number of classes offered).

**Process evaluation:** Process evaluations assess how a program or approach is being implemented, including with respect to program operation, fidelity of implementation, and client experience. Process evaluations illuminate challenges and success in the implementation of a program or approach, and can also shed light on why program activities contribute or do not contribute to outcomes.

**The Research Foundation of the City University of New York (RFCUNY, or Research Foundation):** Under CJII, funds will be administered by the Research Foundation of CUNY.

---

<sup>a</sup> These are asset forfeiture funds, derived from settlements with international banks that violated U.S. sanctions.

The Research Foundation is a not-for-profit educational corporation that provides CUNY and non-CUNY clients with the administrative infrastructure that supports sponsored program activities. The Research Foundation acts as CUNY's fiscal agent and administers funds and signs certain contracts on behalf of ISLG.

### **III. Summary of the Request for Proposals**

#### **A. Purpose of the RFP**

The Manhattan District Attorney's Office (DANY) has committed to investing funds through its Criminal Justice Investment Initiative (CJII) to support impactful projects that improve public safety and promote a fair and efficient justice system in New York City. DANY recently committed \$7.5 million under CJII to fund the [College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative](#) (see *Appendix 4* for the College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative RFP), which supports postsecondary, college-level instruction leading to certification or an Associate's or Bachelor's Degree in New York State for a period of five years; and the establishment of an Education Coordinator to oversee and manage this work.

#### **The Ford Foundation will assist in providing funding for an evaluation of the College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative.**

The City University of New York Institute for State and Local Governance (ISLG) is the technical assistance consultant to the Manhattan District Attorney's Office for CJII. ISLG oversees CJII on behalf of the Manhattan District Attorney's Office, including managing the solicitation process, managing and providing guidance to award recipients, and providing oversight and performance measurement throughout the lifetime of the initiative. In accordance with these responsibilities, ISLG will oversee the evaluator selected through this RFP. Proposals will be submitted and funds awarded through the Research Foundation of CUNY (Research Foundation).

#### **B. Anticipated Contract Term**

ISLG anticipates awarding one contract for up to 6.5 years, beginning in Fall 2016. Funding for the full 6.5 years would support an evaluation of the College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative over the five-year funding of the investment itself, as well as an additional year for follow-up data collection for students still enrolled in college-in-prison programming at the end of the five years, and 6 months for completion of a final report.

ISLG anticipates that any agreement entered into as a result of this RFP will be with the Research Foundation as the contracting party on behalf of ISLG. An example contract template is attached as *Appendix 5*. In the event that a selected applicant is unable to fulfill the requirements of the contract awarded pursuant to this RFP, ISLG reserves the right to have the Research Foundation enter into contract negotiations at a later date with other providers who are available to fulfill the services specified in this RFP.

#### **C. Anticipated Available Funding**

It is anticipated that up to \$900,000 in total funding will be available for the evaluation, to be spread across the contract term.

#### **D. Performance Measurement**

ISLG is committed to measuring outcomes for this initiative and disseminating that information so that others may learn from and build on those outcomes. The funded applicant will be required to provide performance measurement data to ISLG throughout the duration of the contract. Performance measurement data will include both process/implementation data and outcome/impact measures and may be subject to change during the term of the contract. The selected applicant will work with ISLG during the contracting process and throughout the term of the contract to determine appropriate metrics. (See *Appendix 1* for more information about performance measurement.)

## **IV. Anticipated Scope of Services**

### **A. Background**

The exponential growth of the U.S. prison population during the past 20 years—as well as a corresponding increase in the number of prisoners released and re-arrested annually—constitutes a major problem and challenge for our justice system. High recidivism rates underscore the need to better prepare inmates for release by adequately planning appropriate reentry support, particularly given the exorbitant costs of prisons that taxpayers incur each year.<sup>3</sup> There is strong evidence that correctional education, including postsecondary education (PSE) programs as well as adult basic education (ABE), high school equivalency (HSE)/GED programs, and vocational/career and technical education (CTE) programs, reduces recidivism and improves employment outcomes. The most recent and largest meta-analysis to date found that inmates who participated in correctional education programs had 43% lower odds of recidivating and 13% higher odds of post-release employment compared to non-participants.<sup>4</sup> For postsecondary education specifically, students who participated in such programs had approximately half the odds of recidivating compared to peers who did not.<sup>5</sup> Other recent literature has documented evidence of the effectiveness of such programming in New York State prisons, specifically with regard to longer-term recidivism.<sup>6</sup>

In the context of the strong body of evidence supporting college-in-prison programming, as well as recent pilot expansions of Pell Grant funding to include incarcerated individuals in federal or state prisons (via Federal Student Financial Assistance Programs Under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as a means of improving student outcomes),<sup>7</sup> there is an additional need for understanding the College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative specifically. The initiative seeks to understand the role of college-in-prison programming on both recidivism and employment, among other outcomes; in both newly-funded and existing programs; within both current and additional facilities where such programming will be provided; via management and oversight from an Education Coordinator; and with regard to both process and outcome measures. Thus, the selected applicant will evaluate the College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative funded by CJII, including:

- A process evaluation of the initiative, including the role of the Education Coordinator in developing standards (e.g., quality of curriculum, transferability of credits; see *Appendix 4* for a list of those requirements) and coordinating student placement in eligible programs; college-in-prison providers' delivery of services; and investments in college-in-prison in the context of greater national attention to the issue (e.g., Pell Grant waivers)

- An outcome evaluation of students in the newly-funded programs and from among the existing college-in-prison program sites that are determined to meet standard guidelines developed by the initiative’s Education Coordinator; and
- A cost-benefit analysis (CBA) to determine whether the potential economic benefits of college-in-prison programming outweigh its cost.

Students are eligible for up to 30 credits (i.e., 8-10 classes) per year. Each course will support a maximum of 20 students, and program sites will be eligible to maintain multiple courses simultaneously. College-in-prison funding supports the education of the same students each year until they earn their degree or certificate, exit a program for whatever reason, or five years pass, whichever occurs first. As students exit a program, new students become eligible for college education. Following release from prison, college programs are required to provide enrollment support and coordination to students for at least six months.

It is anticipated that the investment will serve 300-500 students each year, with a focus on students to be released within 1.5 to 5.5 years.<sup>b</sup> The earliest possible release date will determine program eligibility, even if the actual release date is subsequently extended and participants no longer fit within the originally anticipated release window. Of the 300-500 students served each year, many will be retained in programming for multiple years, until they are released from prison. Thus, the total number of students served over five years is anticipated to be approximately 600-1,000, reflecting both multi-year participation and some attrition each year due to research design (e.g., groups or cohorts), changes in students’ desire or ability to participate in a program, and other logistical issues.

## **B. Evaluation Framework and Implementation**

This request seeks proposals to evaluate the College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative across geographically diverse New York State prisons (see “Eligible Facilities” below). The evaluation will focus on participants within 1.5 to 5.5 years of their earliest possible release dates. This distribution of students is anticipated to permit an analysis of program effects for students who will not finish their degree programs in prison; students who, upon release, will be close to finishing their degree programs; and students who, upon release, will have finished their degree programs. Thus, this structure will allow for understanding of shorter, medium, and longer-term program participation. Applicants should propose evaluation designs which permit understanding of program effects for these different types of students.

As students are released from prison, complete a program, or drop out, their program slots will be filled by students at least 1.5 years from release, again focusing on a mixture of students who will not finish their degree programs in prison; who, upon release, will be close to finishing their degree programs; and who, upon release, will have finished their degree programs. Thus, the evaluation design should anticipate rolling eligibility windows rather than a single determination of eligibility at program commencement. This design will also allow for consistent program

---

<sup>b</sup> For the Fall 2014 Semester, there were 467 enrollments in Associate’s Degree programs across 19 sites (average of 39 per program) and 326 enrollments in Bachelor’s Degree programs (average of 36 per program). See “Degree Type by Region of Commitment: 2014 Releases from DOCCS”. Data provided by DOCCS on October 8, 2015.

More than half of the 13,554 releases from DOCCS in 2014 had a HSE, HS diploma, or Associate’s Degree and therefore, were potentially eligible for such a program. See “College Education in the NYS”. Data provided by DOCCS on October 8, 2015.

funding across all five years of the initiative rather than disproportionate funding in early years, since new participants will be distributed across different anticipated release dates.

Finally, applicants should propose a design which permits an understanding of initial program findings within two years of program commencement. These initial results will be especially important to assessing the efficacy of the program and adjusting implementation.

1. **Eligibility Criteria:** Applicants should have prior experience and success partnering with relevant organizations or agencies (e.g., New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision, or DOCCS; Department of Labor) to collect and interpret data; experience conducting evaluations related to the justice system as well as (ideally) to college/higher education; and experience conducting multisite evaluations, (ideally) across New York State.
2. **Collaboration and Partnership:** Applicants must work closely with the New York State DOCCS, which operates the correctional facilities in which the classes will be offered. Applicants will also be required to collaborate with the Education Coordinator and individual providers to conduct the process and outcome evaluations.
3. **Program sites:** Individual providers will be located in a selection of facilities across NY State, chosen from the following:
  - Albion
  - Attica
  - Auburn
  - Bare Hill
  - Bedford Hills
  - Cape Vincent
  - Cayuga
  - Clinton
  - Collins
  - Coxsackie
  - Eastern
  - Elmira
  - Fishkill
  - Five Points
  - Franklin
  - Gouverneur
  - Gowanda
  - Great Meadow
  - Green Haven
  - Greene
  - Groveland
  - Livingston
  - Marcy
  - Mid-State
  - Mohawk
  - Ogdensburg
  - Orleans
  - Otisville
  - Ossining
  - Riverview
  - Shawangunk
  - Sullivan
  - Taconic
  - Upstate
  - Wallkill
  - Wyoming
  - Woodburne
  - Watertown
  - Wende

## V. Deliverables

Funded applicants will be required to submit regular deliverables throughout the duration of the term of any contract awarded via this RFP. Please note that deliverables, frequency, and dates are subject to negotiation. See *Appendix 2* for a list of example deliverables.

## **VI. Proposal Content and Format**

**Applicants are asked to structure their submission in multiple parts, listed below. Each lettered item should be a separate document, which applicants will upload to the CJII application portal.**

### **A. Cover Letter**

The cover letter should indicate that the applicant is applying for funding through this RFP, propose an overall cost for the evaluation, and provide basic information about the applicant (e.g., location, contact information). The cover letter should be signed and dated by an authorized representative of the applicant.

### **B. Evaluation Proposal**

The evaluation proposal should include the following two sections:

#### **1. Research Design and Methods of Data Collection**

Applicants are expected to develop a design to control for selection bias, as randomization will likely not be possible. The cost of data collection and analysis should be incorporated into the budget and explained in the project narrative. Applicants should anticipate challenges associated with data collection and reporting (e.g., lack of expertise or software, simultaneous expansion of Pell funding) and how they plan to address them. Applicants should also include a research calendar with specific activities (e.g., survey of students) and deliverables (e.g., research briefs) for each quarter. Administrative data are expected to serve as baseline data for the evaluation.

#### **2. Clearly Articulated Process, Outcome, and Output Measures**

The evaluation should examine outcomes related to students' recidivism, employment and earnings, and cost savings to the state. In addition, it should include a stratified analysis of program effects for students with different characteristics, including with respect to risk, prior history, length of program participation, and degree attainment.

Preliminary measures will be finalized as part of the planning and design phase, with feedback from ISLG and other relevant stakeholders, and will include some data made available via DOCSS (e.g., criminal history, program participation, disciplinary record, Compass scores, demographic information) and other data collected by the evaluator. Administrative data are expected to function as baseline data for the evaluation. Sample outcomes and measures are included below, but applicants should propose outcomes and measures as part of their proposals.

- a. Process Measures
  - i. Course enrollment and attendance
  - ii. Course and program retention
  - iii. Adherence to course standards
  - iv. Quality of reentry services
  - v. Use of reentry services
- b. Outcome Measures

- i. Behavior during incarceration
    - Number of infractions/violent incidents
    - Positive use of time
    - Role model behaviors
  - ii. Education
    - Degree completion
    - Academic progress (e.g., number of credits attained)
    - Enrollment following release
    - Performance/GPA
    - Academic field/concentration/major
  - iii. Employment/earnings
    - Full-time, part-time employment
    - Hourly/monthly/annual earnings
    - Field of employment
    - Unemployment (occasional, chronic)
  - iv. Recidivism
    - Re-arrest at 3-month, 6-month and 1-year post-release
    - Reconviction
    - Re-incarceration
  - v. Stratification and differences by length of program participation, education, risk, likelihood/propensity of enrolling in classes, charge/conviction, age, socioeconomic status, race, prior record, length of incarceration, education provider, location of program, location of students upon release (e.g., Buffalo vs. New York City), Compass assessment, receipt/use of reentry services, and other factors
- c. Cost/benefit
- i. Criminal justice expenditures (e.g., lower recidivism and prison costs), mental health and/or substance use disorder treatment, government social support receipt (e.g., SNAP, Medicaid), and other service use.
  - ii. Tangible and intangible costs and benefits, which should be assessed to quantify the short- and long-term economic impact of the program at the participant level as well as to the government. Additionally, the CBA should capture marginal costs and benefits rather than average costs to avoid overstating the impacts of college-in-prison programs. The CBA should complement the evaluation by monetizing actual program impacts for participants with different lengths of program involvement. Similar to the evaluation, the CBA should value the reductions in recidivism (re-arrest, reconviction, and re-incarceration), as well as long-term cash flow projections for gains in employment and education.

### **C. Organizational and Staff Capacity**

Applicants should describe their organizational capacity to collect and interpret data for process and outcome evaluations. Specifically, applicants should address or include the items listed below:

1. Resources that the applicant would use to conduct the evaluation, including partnerships (if applicable), the number of staff members, and the proportion of each staff member's time that would be dedicated to the proposed evaluations.
2. Describe the applicant's ability to collect and analyze data on program expenditures, opportunity costs, and expected benefits of college-in-prison programming based on a set of assumptions about programs' goals, population flows, and outcomes.
3. Applicants should describe their current ability to collect and manage data for performance monitoring (see *Appendix 1* for more information on performance monitoring).

#### **D. Relevant Experience**

Describe the successful relevant experience of the applicant and proposed key staff in providing the work described in *Section IV*. Applicants should specifically address or include the items listed below:

1. Describe the applicant's experience working in prisons and corrections facilities, preferably with inmates.
2. Describe the applicant's experience partnering with relevant organizations or agencies (e.g., DOCCS, Department of Labor) to collect and interpret data.
3. Describe the applicant's experience conducting evaluations related to the justice system as well as (ideally) to college/higher education.
4. Describe the applicant's experience in multisite evaluations, (ideally) across New York State.
5. Describe the applicant's experience in collecting and analyzing data on program expenditures, opportunity costs, and expected benefits of college-in-prison programming based on a set of assumptions about the programs' goals, population flows, and outcomes.
6. Describe any relevant experience of individual staff members.
7. Attach resumes of key staff who will be involved in the evaluation.

#### **E. Evaluation Budget**

Applicants should provide a budget outlining their proposed use of funding. The budget should be broken out by each year of the evaluation.

#### **F. Evaluation Budget Narrative**

Applicants should provide a budget narrative that corresponds to the budget. Applicants should describe funding needs on an annual basis over the length of the funding period (funding may vary by year). The narrative should link the proposed costs to the proposed evaluation components and activities and outline any assumptions on which the budget is based.

#### **G. Proposal Formatting and Length Requirements**

Applicants should adhere to the following requirements:

- All submissions should be double-spaced, using standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with 1-inch margins.
- Pages should be paginated.

- The Research Design and Methods of Data Collection should not exceed 15 pages, excluding appendices and resumes. Other sections of the proposal are not restricted by length.
- Proposals should not contain hyperlinks. All relevant information should be included in the body of the proposal. Reviewers will not visit external websites when evaluating submitted proposals.

## **VII. Proposal Evaluation and Contract Award**

### **A. Evaluation Procedures**

All proposals will be reviewed to determine whether they are responsive to the requisites of this RFP. Proposals that are determined by ISLG to be non-responsive will be rejected. An evaluation team will evaluate and rate proposals based on the evaluation criteria prescribed below. The evaluation team may conduct interviews and/or request that applicants make presentations and/or demonstrations, as they deem applicable and appropriate. Although the evaluation team may conduct discussions with applicants submitting acceptable proposals, ISLG reserves the right to award contracts on the basis of initial proposals received, without discussions; therefore, the applicant's initial proposal should contain its best technical and price terms. A formal background check to assess the technical capacity, financial capacity, and operational integrity will be performed on applicants and subcontractors selected to receive funding through this RFP.

ISLG reserves the right not to fund applicants based on the proposals received in response to this RFP.

### **B. Evaluation Criteria**

Proposals will be evaluated with attention to each of the application components using the following criteria:

#### **1. Design and Implementation Plan – 55%**

Applicants should explain the proposed research design and sources of data, including their relation to the proposed process, outcome, and output measures. The proposal should be realistic in scope and reflective of potential obstacles, risks, and problems that could be encountered during the project's implementation and within the specified funding period. Applicants are also encouraged to provide current background or contextual data.

#### **2. Capacity– 20%**

The organization's and project staff's capacity and expertise should be described in relation to the proposed scope of work. Applicants are also encouraged to specify whether additional resources are needed (e.g., staff, technology, and space) to implement this work. Note that the staffing plan and the budget narrative should specify whether the project includes current staff and/or new hires.

#### **3. Relevant Experience – 20%**

The organization's and project staff's experience should be described in relation to the proposed scope of work.

#### **4. Budget Summary and Narrative – 5%**

The proposed budget should be realistic and reasonably split across the proposed activities. Grantees' ability to leverage additional financial, human, or other resources will be considered as well.

**C. Basis for Contract Award**

The contract award will be made to the applicant whose proposal is determined to be the most advantageous, taking into consideration the factors and criteria set forth in the RFP (see *Section VII.B. Evaluation Criteria*) and outlined above. The contract awards shall be subject to the timely completion of contract negotiations between the Research Foundation and the selected applicant.

## VIII. Appendices

### Appendix 1: Performance Measurement

The funded applicant will be required to provide data on performance measurement to ISLG on a quarterly basis. Initial metrics will be finalized during the contracting process and may be subject to change during the grant term, after discussion among all parties, based on programmatic implementation concerns, availability of data, or research needs.

As part of the application, applicants should provide the following information:

1. Objectives for each of the three components of the evaluation (i.e., process, outcome, CBA).
2. Anticipated process and output measures for each objective for each quarter;
3. Challenges associated with data collection and reporting (e.g., lack of expertise or software) and the way the applicant plans to address them.

Applicants should use the format in Exhibit 1 to specify their plans for performance measurement, including how their project goals relate to outcomes. Sample information is included in Exhibit 1 only as an example.

#### Exhibit 1. Performance Measurement Plan

Evaluation Type	Objective	Process Measure & Target	Output Measure & Target	Data Source(s)
Outcome Evaluation	1a) Collect data with sample size of sufficient power	1a) Q1: Percentage of participants for whom data are collected regarding post-release employment: 85%	1a) Q1: Number of program participants for whom data are collected regarding post-release employment: 800	Surveys
		1a) Q1: Percentage of program participants surveyed and/or interviewed regarding satisfaction with re-entry support: 85%	1a) Q1: Number of program participants surveyed and/or interviewed regarding satisfaction with re-entry support: 800	
		1a) Q2: Etc.	1a) Q2: Etc.	
		1a) Q2: Etc.	1a) Q2: Etc.	
	1b)	1b) Q1:	1b) Q1:	Program records; surveys
		1b) Q2:	1b) Q2:	
		1b) Q3: Etc.	1b) Q3: Etc.	
		1b) Q4: Etc.	1b) Q4: Etc.	
Process Evaluation				
Cost-Benefit Analysis				

## Appendix 2: Deliverables

The contractor will be required to submit regular deliverables to ISLG throughout the term (see Exhibit 2 for examples). Please note that deliverables, frequency, and dates are subject to negotiation.

### Exhibit 2. Example Deliverables for Applicants

#	Name	Description	Frequency/Due Date
1	Evaluation Plan	Detailed plan for evaluation design	Once
2	Status Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation updates               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Process                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ E.g., Changes to approach, progress in data collection and analysis at variable level</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Outcome                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ E.g., Changes to approach, progress in data collection and analysis at variable level</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Cost-Benefit                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ E.g., Changes to approach, progress in obtaining cost data</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Successes</li> <li>○ Setbacks and challenges (e.g., instructor turnover)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Corrective action plans (as needed) to address specific challenges, ensure short-term goals and full implementation are achieved</li> </ul> <p>Goals for next quarter</p>	Quarterly
3	Operational costs status report	Financial reports	Twice per year
4	Implementation report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Synthesis of quarterly reports from previous year, including summary of quarterly reports at variable level</li> <li>• Initial and ongoing findings of process, outcome, and cost-benefit evaluations</li> <li>• Outstanding challenges and plans to address them</li> </ul>	Yearly
5	Final report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full findings from process, outcome, and cost-benefit evaluations</li> <li>• Recommendations for College-in-Prison policy and practice, as informed by the evaluations</li> </ul>	End of 6.5 years

### Appendix 3. References

- <sup>1</sup> Federal Pell Grants. (2016). Retrieved from <https://studentaid.ed.gov/sa/types/grants-scholarships/pell#how-much-money>
- <sup>2</sup> Notice inviting postsecondary educational institutions to participate in experiments under the Experimental Sites Initiative; Federal Student Financial Assistance Programs under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended; Notice. (2015). *Federal Register*, 80(148), 45964-45966. Retrieved from <https://federalregister.gov/a/2015-18994>
- <sup>3</sup> Henrichson, C., & Delaney, R. (2012). *The price of prisons: What incarceration costs taxpayers*. New York, NY: Vera Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.vera.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/price-of-prisons-updated-version-021914.pdf>
- <sup>4</sup> Davis, L. M., Bozick, R., Steele, J. L., Saunders, J. & Miles, J. N. V. (2013). *Evaluating the effectiveness of correctional education: A meta-analysis of programs that provide education to incarcerated adults*. Washington, DC: RAND Corporation. Retrieved from [www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR266](http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR266)
- <sup>5</sup> Davis et al., 2013
- <sup>6</sup> Kim, R. H., & Clark, D. (2013). The effect of prison-based college education programs on recidivism: Propensity score matching approach. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41(3), 196-204.
- <sup>7</sup> Notice inviting postsecondary educational institutions to participate in experiments under the Experimental Sites Initiative; Federal Student Financial Assistance Programs under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended; Notice. (2015). *Federal Register*, 80(199), 62047-62053. Retrieved from <https://federalregister.gov/a/2015-26239>



District Attorney of  
New York County



CUNY INSTITUTE  
FOR STATE & LOCAL  
GOVERNANCE

# Criminal Justice Investment Initiative

## Request for Proposals College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative

No. 001 **(REVISED 2/11/2016)**

Expires **March 31, 2016**

## **Table of Contents**

I.	Timetable .....	1
II.	Summary of the Request for Proposals .....	2
III.	Anticipated Scope of Services .....	3
IV.	Deliverables .....	9
V.	Proposal Content and Format .....	9
VI.	Proposal Evaluation and Contract Award .....	11
VII.	Appendices .....	12

## Appendix 4. College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative RFP

### I. Timetable

#### A. Release Date of this Request for Proposals: January 10, 2016

**Release Date of REVISED Request for Proposals: February 11, 2016**

#### B. Questions

Questions about this Request for Proposals (RFP) may only be asked in writing to the e-mail address listed below.

##### **Questions/Clarification Deadline:**

1. Date: January 29, 2016 **(February 26, 2016 – see below)**
2. Time: 11:59pm EST

**E-Mail Address:** [cipp@rfcuny.org](mailto:cipp@rfcuny.org)

Answers to all questions asked via e-mail will be available online as an addendum to this RFP at **11:59pm on February 12, 2016**. It will be the responsibility of applicants to check the Research Foundation's website for addenda pertaining to the current RFP.

**REVISION: The question period for this RFP has been extended. Applicants may submit questions not already addressed in the first set of answers. Questions must be submitted in writing to [cipp@rfcuny.org](mailto:cipp@rfcuny.org) by 11:59pm EST on February 26, 2016. Answers to new questions, if any, will be posted by 11:59pm EST on March 4, 2016.**

#### C. Proposal Due Date:

1. Date: March 11, 2016 **(March 31, 2016 – see below)**
2. Time: 11:59pm EST

Proposals should be in an electronic PDF format and should be e-mailed to the above e-mail address. Failure to submit a proposal by the due date and time will result in the proposal being considered non-responsive to this RFP and not considered for award. Unless an addendum to this RFP is issued extending the due date and time, all proposals must be submitted prior to the time and date set forth above.

#### D. Anticipated Contract Start Date: Spring 2016

## II. Summary of the Request for Proposals

### A. Purpose of the RFP

The New York County District Attorney (DANY) has committed to investing \$250 million through its [Criminal Justice Investment Initiative \(CJII\)](#) to support impactful projects that improve public safety and promote a fair and efficient criminal justice system in New York City.

The City University of New York Institute for State and Local Governance (ISLG) is the technical assistance consultant to DANY for CJII. ISLG manages CJII on behalf of DANY, including managing the solicitation and contracting process, providing guidance to award recipients, and providing oversight and performance measurement throughout the lifetime of the initiative. Proposals will be submitted and funds awarded through the Research Foundation of CUNY (Research Foundation).

The goals of this initiative are to

1. increase the availability of educational programming to inmates in select New York State prisons;
2. develop standards for prison education curricula and develop articulation and transfer agreements so that credits may be efficiently transferred across institutions to enable students to complete their degrees; and
3. develop reentry support plans for participants.

A separate evaluation of this initiative will examine a) program effects for students with different types of profiles, for example with respect to risk, prior history, cohort, and likelihood of degree attainment; b) the effect of the programming on students' recidivism for up to three years post release; and c) cost savings to the state. By supporting in-prison education, the development of standards and reentry support, and evaluation, this initiative has the potential to inform future policy and funding choices regarding college in prison reentry programs in New York State and nationwide.

ISLG is seeking proposals from educational institutions to provide college-level classes in prisons operated by the New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision (DOCCS).

See the "Program Description" below for more information about target population, eligibility criteria, and eligible facilities.

### B. Anticipated Contract Term

The length of program funding will not exceed five years, beginning in fall 2016. Funded applicants will be required to provide ongoing performance data (see "Performance Measurement" below) to ISLG and a third party evaluator. Funded applicants will be required to continue providing performance data for one to two additional years beyond the period of the program funding.

## **Appendix 4. College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative RFP**

DANY and ISLG anticipate that any agreement entered into as a result of this RFP will be with the Research Foundation as the contracting party on behalf of ISLG and DANY. The contract template is set forth in Appendix 3. In the event that a selected applicant is unable to fulfill the requirements of the contract awarded pursuant to this RFP, ISLG reserves the right to have the Research Foundation enter into contract negotiations at a later date with the next highest rated applicant who is available to implement the program.

### **C. Anticipated Available Funding**

DANY is committing \$5 million dollars over five years to fund college in prison programs at multiple sites in New York State and to prepare students for successful reentry.

In order to reach more students, this funding opportunity is structured as a public/private partnership. Applicants must be able to provide a 1:1 match; existing program funding is eligible to be considered for match funding. Students educated through the match will be included in the evaluation of this initiative as well, and the educational standards listed below must apply to courses offered through the match as well as those offered through CJII funding. (See the “Partnering with a Research Organization” section below for more details about the evaluation.)

### **D. Performance Measurement**

DANY and ISLG are committed to measuring outcomes for all CJII initiatives and disseminating that information so others can learn from the outcomes of this College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative. In addition to the educational outcomes listed in Appendix 1, “Performance Measurement,” all funded applicants will be required to provide performance measurement data to ISLG throughout the duration of the contract. Performance measurement data will include both process/implementation data and outcome/impact measures and may be subject to change during the term of the grant. Applicants will work with ISLG, the Education Coordinator (a partnership between the State University of New York and the City University of New York), and the third-party evaluator during the contracting phase and throughout the term of the contract to determine appropriate metrics. (See “Collaborating with the Initiative’s Education Coordinator,” below, for more detail about the Education Coordinator, and see Appendix 1 for more information about performance measurement.)

## **III. Anticipated Scope of Services**

### **A. Background**

The exponential growth of the U.S. prison population during the past 20 years—as well as a corresponding increase in the number of prisoners released and re-arrested annually—is a major problem and challenge for our justice system. In 2014, there were more than 1.5 million individuals in U.S. state and federal prisons, and 636,346 prisoners were released from these

#### Appendix 4. College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative RFP

facilities.<sup>3</sup> In New York State alone, approximately 52,400 prisoners were incarcerated and nearly 23,000 released from Department of Corrections and Community Supervision (DOCCS) facilities last year.<sup>4</sup> These release rates are deceiving, however, as a large portion of those released eventually return to prison due to re-arrest or violation of parole or probation. (For example, in 2005, more than three-quarters of prisoners released from 30 state facilities were rearrested within five years.<sup>5</sup>) High recidivism rates underscore the need to better prepare inmates for release by adequately planning appropriate reentry support, particularly given the exorbitant costs of prisons that taxpayers incur each year.<sup>6</sup>

One approach to reducing recidivism that has proven particularly effective is education programming in correctional facilities. There is strong evidence that correctional education, including postsecondary education programs as well as adult basic education, high school/GED programs, and vocational training programs, reduces recidivism and improves employment outcomes. The most recent and largest meta-analysis to date found that inmates who participate in correctional education programs are 43% less likely to return to prison and 13% more likely to obtain post-release employment than those who do not participate.<sup>7</sup> For postsecondary education specifically, students who participate in such programs have approximately half the odds of recidivating compared to peers who do not.<sup>8</sup> Results also reveal the cost-effectiveness of investing in correctional education programs: on average, a \$1 investment in correctional education reduces incarceration costs by \$4 to \$5 during the first three years post-release.<sup>9</sup> These findings, among many others, highlight the utility and benefits of such programming, not just fiscally but also with respect to reducing crime, increasing public safety, and strengthening communities.

Despite this strong evidence, government and public support for correctional education programs is limited. Congress' passage of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act in 1994 eliminated Pell grant funding for incarcerated students, making them ineligible to receive this support.<sup>10</sup> However, in July 2015, the U.S. Department of Education launched a pilot program that would test new models for allowing incarcerated individuals who meet certain requirements to receive Pell grants.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Carson, E. A. (2015, Sept). *Prisoners in 2014*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/p14.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Durose, M. R., Cooper, A. D. & Snyder, H. N. (2014, Apr). *Recidivism of prisoners released in 30 states in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/rprts05p0510.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> Henrichson, C., & Delaney, R. (2012). *The price of prisons: What incarceration costs taxpayers*. New York, NY: Vera Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <http://www.vera.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/price-of-prisons-updated-version-021914.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> David, L. M., Bozick, R., Steele, J. L., Saunders, J. & Miles, J. N. V. (2013). *Evaluating the effectiveness of correctional education: A meta-analysis of programs that provide education to incarcerated adults*. Washington, DC: RAND Corporation. Retrieved from [www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR266](http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR266)

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.) *Students with criminal convictions*. Retrieved from <https://studentaid.ed.gov/sa/eligibility/criminal-convictions>.

<sup>11</sup> U.S. Department of Education, <http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-department-education-launches-second-chance-pell-pilot-program-incarcerated-individuals>.

## Appendix 4. College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative RFP

A key obstacle to the provision of correctional education is lack of funding.<sup>12</sup> (There are currently 19 DOCCS facilities offering college education<sup>13</sup>; these are privately-funded and carry a waitlist.) Moreover, there is little information about the standards governing the programs that do exist.<sup>14, 15</sup> This may contribute to variation in the quality of instruction and content that are currently offered by programs across the state, preventing many inmates from making adequate progress or completing a degree. (This is especially true for those who are transferred to other NYS DOCCS facilities and, as a result, lose credits or become subject to different or new requirements.) Transfer of credits earned while in prison, provided students wish to continue towards a degree post-release, is often a complicated process as well. Last, more research is needed to examine the relative importance of specific program elements (e.g., type of curriculum, mode of instruction, dosage, type of instructors) as well as the effectiveness of different types of programs for different types of students (e.g., high-risk vs. low-risk).<sup>16</sup>

Given the current state of correctional education and, in particular, postsecondary educational opportunities available, CJII's College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative is a unique opportunity to expand such offerings, reap the positive benefits of this programming, and advance research and best practices for correctional education.

### **B. Program Description**

This request seeks proposals from postsecondary education providers to deliver postsecondary, college-level instruction at one or more sites for a period of five years. Applicants will be selected to provide instruction in geographically diverse New York State prisons (see "Eligible Facilities" below). DANY will commit \$5 million over five years. Awards will be based on the number of classes offered and students served, with a maximum of up to \$5,000 per student for a full-time course load of 30 credits (eight to 10 classes) per year. Smaller course loads per student will be funded proportionally. The funding will support the education of the same students each year until they earn their degree or certificate, exit the program for whatever reason, or five years pass, whichever occurs first for each student. As students exit the program, applicants may use funding to educate new students until the end of the funding period. Applicants will be required to demonstrate students' academic progress through quantitative and qualitative measures (See Appendix 1, "Performance Measurement," for more detail).

---

<sup>12</sup> Westervelt, E. (2015). Measuring the power of a prison education. *National Public Radio*. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2015/07/31/427741914/measuring-the-power-of-a-prison-education>

<sup>13</sup> New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision. (2015). College in prison. Retrieved from [http://www.doccs.ny.gov/DoccsNews/2015/College\\_in\\_prison.pdf](http://www.doccs.ny.gov/DoccsNews/2015/College_in_prison.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> U.S. Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools. (2004.) *Correctional education: Assessing the status of prison programs and information needs*. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED543577.pdf>

<sup>15</sup> Spangenberg, G. (2004). *Current issues in correctional education*. Retrieved from [http://www.caalusa.org/correct\\_ed\\_paper.pdf](http://www.caalusa.org/correct_ed_paper.pdf)

<sup>16</sup> David, L. M., Bozick, R., Steele, J. L., Saunders, J. & Miles, J. N. V. (2013). *Evaluating the effectiveness of correctional education: A meta-analysis of programs that provide education to incarcerated adults*. Washington, DC: RAND Corporation. Retrieved from [www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR266](http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR266)

## Appendix 4. College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative RFP

Before release, applicants will be required to work with the initiative's Education Coordinator (see "Collaborating with the Initiative's Education Coordinator," below, for more details) to develop reentry support plans for participating students. Upon release, applicants will be required to work with the initiative's Educational Coordinator to provide transfer and enrollment support for students who have not yet completed their degrees. Finally, applicants will be required to participate in an evaluation of their post-secondary educational program with an independent third party evaluator (see "Partnering with a Research Organization," below, for more details). Post-secondary programs eligible for funding under this initiative include:

- Bachelor's degree programs
- Associate's degree programs
- Credit-bearing, college-level instruction that leads to an industry-recognized certificate or certification

This proposal seeks to fund programming distributed among three cohorts of current DOCCS inmates enrolled in postsecondary education over the next five years: those to be released in approximately two years, those to be released in three to four years, and those to be released in approximately five years.

### 1. Target population

Inmates in select New York State facilities (detailed under "Eligible Facilities," below) with a high school diploma or equivalent, and who are within two to five years of completing their sentences, will be eligible for the program. In 2014, DOCCS released 22,927 people from its facilities,<sup>17</sup> and more than a third of them had a high school diploma or equivalent or an associate's degree, and thus potentially would have been eligible for this program.<sup>18</sup> Inmates will also be subject to each program's admissions process.

Students are eligible for up to 30 credits (i.e., eight to 10 classes) per year. Each course will support a maximum of 20 students, and program sites will be eligible to maintain multiple courses simultaneously. As students exit the program (i.e., complete the program, drop out, or are released), new students can enroll for college education. The total number of students served over five years is anticipated to be approximately 800 to 1,000.

### 2. Eligibility criteria

Postsecondary education providers with prior experience teaching college in prison are preferred, but prior experience is not required. In order to ensure that all funded institutions provide a similar baseline of instructional quantity and quality, applicant institutions must agree to the following standards, which will be monitored by the program's Educational Coordinator. Applicant institutions must:

- a) Be a registered and accredited, degree-granting institution recognized by the New York State Education Department.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Carson, E. A. (2015, Sept). *Prisoners in 2014*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/p14.pdf>

<sup>18</sup> New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision. (2015). *College education in the NYS* [data file]. Data provided by DOCCS on October 8, 2015.

<sup>19</sup> See <http://www.highered.nysed.gov/ocue/accred/>.

#### Appendix 4. College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative RFP

- b) Offer classes that are part of a program of study leading to an associate's or bachelor's degree and/or an industry-recognized certificate or certification.
- c) Offer classes that constitute core components of a post-secondary education, including, but not limited to, written expression, mathematics and social sciences or humanities (e.g., history, psychology, business fundamentals).

Offer classes that meet the academic standards set forth by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) and the New York State Education Department (NYSED). In particular, applicants must articulate how the classes they deliver will meet the same quality of instruction, academic rigor, and educational effectiveness of comparable institutional offerings.

- d) Maintain standards and processes for ensuring academic program quality,<sup>20</sup> including:
  - i. Providing in-person instruction by instructors who have the same level of qualification as those who teach classes on the applicant's home campus;
  - ii. Meeting standards for quality of instruction, academic rigor, and educational effectiveness that are comparable to those of the other institutional offerings;
  - iii. Ensuring that all activities and offerings meet all appropriate standards, including those related to learning outcomes;
  - iv. Ensuring adequate and appropriate support services; and
  - v. Performing periodic assessment of the impact of the instructional site on the institution's resources and its ability to fulfill its institutional mission and goals.
- e) Offer at least four classes per year, and each class must be three to five credits.
- f) Offer courses that are responsive to emerging workforce occupational skill requirements. Applicants should list potential occupations for which students completing their course of study are prepared and demonstrate projected job openings in these occupations by geographical region of New York State.
- g) Be able to supply all instructional materials, including computers, books, and supplies (see "Partnering with the New York State Department of Corrections," below, for more detail).
- h) Provide a 1:1 match of the total award. Existing program funding is eligible to be considered for match funding. If applicants have applied for and are selected for the Second Chance Pell Pilot Program,<sup>21</sup> they should articulate the purposes for which CJII and Pell funding each would be used.

---

<sup>20</sup> Middle States Commission on Higher Education. (2011). *Characteristics of excellence in higher education: Standards for accreditation*, 51-62. Retrieved from <https://www.msche.org/publications/CHX-2011-WEB.pdf>

<sup>21</sup> See <http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/us-department-education-launches-second-chance-pell-pilot-program-incarcerated-individuals>

## Appendix 4. College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative RFP

### 3. Collaborating with the Initiative's Education Coordinator

The College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative's Education Coordinator is a partnership between the State University of New York and the City University of New York. The Education Coordinator will oversee and coordinate educational programming among funded applicants and work with applicants to provide reentry support, including enrollment support, referrals for appropriate services, and monitoring post release from prison. Applicants will be required to collaborate with the Education Coordinator in implementing the programs, providing quality assurance of educational services, providing centralized reporting and accountability and developing articulation and transfer agreements.

### 4. Post-Release Continuation of Education and Reentry Support

The Education Coordinator will assist providers in designing a plan to aid their students in making the transition from incarceration to living in the community. Applicants must demonstrate how they will facilitate, either directly or through service providers and other linkages, reentry support and post-release college enrollment guidance and support for interested students who are released from prison without completing their degree. This guidance and support must follow a student, wherever he or she resides in New York post-release, for at least six months.

### 5. Partnering with the New York State Department of Corrections

Applicants must work closely with the New York State DOCCS, which operates the correctional facilities in which the classes will be offered. All education instructors must complete DOCCS safety training before delivering education courses.

Applicants must supply all instructional materials, including computers, books, and supplies. Computers inside the classrooms and/or to which students have access cannot be connected to the internet. DOCCS will provide a room, electrical supply, blackboards or whiteboards, and security outside of the classroom.

### 6. Eligible facilities

Eligible programs include those already providing instruction in one of 22 facilities across NY State:

- Albion
- Attica
- Auburn
- Bedford Hills
- Cape Vincent
- Cayuga
- Coxsackie
- Eastern
- Fishkill
- Five Points
- Great Meadow
- Green Haven
- Greene
- Mohawk
- Otisville
- Ossining
- Sullivan
- Taconic
- Upstate
- Wallkill
- Wyoming
- Woodburne

## **Appendix 4. College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative RFP**

In addition, DOCCS is open to funding new college-in-prison programs in the following correctional facilities:

- Clinton
- Bare Hill
- Franklin
- Ogdensburg
- Riverview
- Gouverneur
- Watertown
- Mid-State
- Marcy
- Elmira
- Groveland
- Livingston
- Collins
- Gowanda
- Orleans
- Wende
- Shawangunk

### **7. Partnering with a Third-Party Evaluator**

Applicants must be willing to participate in an evaluation of this initiative by cooperating with an external evaluator selected by ISLG. In addition to providing data to ISLG and the Education Coordinator for monitoring purposes (see Appendix 1, “Performance Measurement,” below, for more detail), applicants will provide data about students applying to or participating in the funded programming, including but not limited to the following:

- Enrollment, attendance
- Concentration/major
- Performance, GPA
- Academic progress (e.g., number of credits accumulated)
- Degree completion
- Cost of providing education per student
- Reentry support offered
- Level of participation in reentry support

Applicants also will be asked to encourage instructors to participate in surveys and interviews.

## **IV. Deliverables**

Funded applicants will be required to submit deliverables throughout the duration of the term of any contract awarded from this RFP. Please note that deliverables, frequency, and dates are subject to negotiation. (See Appendix 2 for examples of what deliverables might include.)

## **V. Proposal Content and Format**

### **A. Cover Letter**

A cover letter that provides basic information about the applicant. The cover letter should be signed and dated by an authorized representative of the applicant.

### **B. Program Narrative**

## **Appendix 4. College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative RFP**

In addition to describing how the program meets the eligibility criteria detailed in Section III. “Anticipated Scope of Services,” the applicant should describe in detail the goals, objectives, and program design(s). In the description of the program, applicants should address how they plan to achieve the goals of this initiative, stated above. Applicants should also:

- State the number of students the program plans to serve in each year of the initiative
- Provide the curriculum for each degree or credit-bearing, college-level instruction that leads to an industry-recognized certificate or certification that will be offered and affirm that each program is accredited by NYSED

The program narrative should be double-spaced, using standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with 1-inch margins, and should not exceed 15 pages (excluding appendices and resumes).

### **C. Organizational Capacity**

Applicants should submit their organizational (i.e., technical, managerial, and financial) capacity to perform the work set forth above. Applicants should include a description of key program staff, including:

1. Position/title
2. Education (highest degree)
3. Level of experience (number of years teaching these classes)
4. Type of experience, including a list of all courses taught and description of any experience that illustrates capability of delivering courses in a correctional setting
5. Time commitment (how many classes and/or over what period of time will staff person be involved in this initiative)
6. Availability of teaching assistants

In addition, please attach the resumes of the key staff who will be providing the work and resumes of potential subcontractors (if applicable).

### **D. Program Budget Narrative**

Applicants should provide a budget outlining their proposed use of funding.

Applicants should also provide a budget narrative that corresponds to the budget. Applicants should describe funding needs on an annual basis over the length of the funding period (funding may vary by year). The narrative should link the proposed costs to the proposed program components and activities and outline any assumptions the budget is based on.

In addition, applicants should describe, in detail, the 1:1 match they will provide, including the source of the match (including Second Chance Pell grants) and any existing parameters on the matching funds.

## **VI. Proposal Evaluation and Contract Award**

## **Appendix 4. College-in-Prison Reentry Initiative RFP**

### **A. Evaluation Procedures**

All proposals accepted by the Research Foundation will be reviewed to determine whether they are responsive to the requisites of this RFP. Proposals that are determined by ISLG to be non-responsive will be rejected. An evaluation team will evaluate and rate proposals based on the evaluation criteria prescribed below. The evaluation team may conduct site visits and/or interviews and/or to request that applicants make presentations and/or demonstrations, as they deem applicable and appropriate. Although the evaluation team may conduct discussions with applicants submitting acceptable proposals, the Research Foundation reserves the right to award contracts on the basis of initial proposals received, without discussions; therefore, the applicant's initial proposal should contain its best technical and price terms.

### **B. Evaluation Criteria**

The following evaluation criteria will be used to identify the winning proposal(s):

- Quality of proposed program – 50%
- Level of organizational capacity – 25%
- Prior relevant experience – 20%
- Budget narrative – 5%

### **C. Basis for Contract Award**

Contract awards will be made to the applicants whose proposals are determined to be the most advantageous by the evaluation team, taking into consideration the price and such other factors and criteria as are set forth in the RFP (see "Evaluation Criteria") and outlined above. Awards will be made to the best technically rated proposal that offers a price that is determined to be both fair and reasonable. Contract awards shall be subject to the timely completion of contract negotiations between the Research Foundation and the funded applicants.

## Appendix 5. Contract Template

### INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR'S AGREEMENT (PRSY# [Click here to enter text.](#))

This Agreement is entered into this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2016 by and between The Research Foundation of the City University of New York on behalf of **The City University of New York**, hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation", located at **230 West 41<sup>st</sup> Street, 7th Floor, New York, New York 10036** and [Click here to enter text.](#), hereinafter referred to as "Contractor", located at [Click here to enter text.](#). The dates of performance are from [Click here to enter text.](#) **through** [Click here to enter text.](#).

This Agreement is entered into upon the following terms and conditions:

1. The Foundation engages the contractor to provide the services set forth in the Scope of Work attached hereto as Appendix A and incorporated herein, and the Contractor agrees to perform said services and to provide all necessary staff support and administrative services connected therewith.
2. In return for satisfactory performance of the services called for under this Agreement, the Contractor will receive the following sum in consideration: **An amount not to exceed** [Click here to enter text.](#) **Dollars (\$ )** to be paid according to the following schedule: **As services are rendered and as invoiced.**
3. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Agreement, the Contractor's status shall be that of an independent contractor and not that of an employee or agent of the Foundation. The Contractor will be expected to work, without the full complement of support facilities, working conditions, and supervision given to employees of the Foundation. All persons engaged by the Contractor to assist it shall at all times be deemed to be employees of the Contractor, and the Contractor shall be responsible for their work, direction, and compensation. Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to impose any liability or duties upon the Foundation for the performance of services by any third party hired by the Contractor.
4. Neither the Contractor nor any persons engaged by it will receive health insurance, sick leave, annual leave, pension, or any other fringe benefits associated with employment with the Foundation.
5. Nothing in this Agreement shall impose any tax liability upon the Foundation, including, but not limited to, federal, state, and local income taxes, unemployment insurance, or social security tax, incurred by the Contractor or persons engaged by it. The Contractor agrees to indemnify the Foundation and hold it harmless from any and all claims for such payments by taxing authorities, including but not limited to fines, penalties, levies, and assessments, for failure to withhold or remit such payments.

6. The Contractor affirms that to the best of its knowledge there exists no actual or potential conflict between the Contractor's family, business, or financial interests and its services under this Agreement. The Contractor will notify the Foundation of all changes in any of the interests listed above during the term of this Agreement and any amendments thereto. The Foundation reserves the right in its sole discretion to determine whether or not any of the interests required to be disclosed by this paragraph will disqualify the Contractor from performing the services called for by this Agreement.

7. The Foundation may upon five (5) days written notice terminate this Agreement with or without cause. Contractor will be paid on a prorated basis for those services rendered up to the date of termination.

8. Contractor shall indemnify Foundation against and hold Foundation harmless from any and all claims, actions, proceedings, expenses, damages, or liabilities, including attorney fees and court costs, resulting from any act, omission, fault or default of the Contractor, its directors, officers, employees, agents and subcontractors.

9. Any invention or discovery, whether or not patentable, conceived or reduced to practice by the Contractor during the course of its performance under this Agreement or any amendment thereto will be reported to the Foundation with complete information concerning such invention or discovery. The Foundation retains all right, title and interest to any such invention or discovery. The Foundation retains all right, title and interest to any such invention or discovery and retains the sole right to determine whether a patent application will be filed. The Contractor will cooperate fully with the Foundation to enable it to secure the rights retained under this paragraph and will execute all documents necessary to do so.

10. All copyrightable works (including but not limited to reports, compilations of data, software or pictorial or graphics) created or prepared by the Contractor in the course of its work shall be "works for hire" (as that term is defined in the copyright laws of the United States) for the Foundation and all copyright rights therein are expressly intended to be wholly owned and the copyright to be held by the Foundation. To the extent that any such copyrightable works may not, by operation of law, be works for hire, the Contractor hereby assigns to the Foundation the ownership of copyright in such items and the Foundation shall have the right to obtain and hold in its own name copyrights, registrations and similar protection which may be available in such items. The Contractor agrees to give the Foundation or its designees all assistance reasonably required to perfect such rights. The Contractor represents and warrants that he is sole author of any and all such materials, and that they are original works not subject to any prior agreement, lien or other rights. The Contractor further warrants that the materials do not contain libelous, plagiarized, injurious or other unlawful matter, and that they do not infringe on the copyright or violate any other right of any person or party whatsoever. The Contractor will indemnify and hold the Foundation harmless against any and all claims, damages or expenses, including, but not limited to, attorney's fees arising out of a breach of such warranties.

11. No action shall lie against the Foundation upon any claim based on this Agreement or arising out of this Agreement unless such action be commenced within one (1) year after the end of the term of this Agreement or its termination, whichever date shall occur first.

12. For each payment, an invoice reflecting services rendered to date shall be submitted by the Contractor to the Project Director. Each invoice should include the billing rate, amount due, dates of services, types of services, and Contractor's original signature. Project Director approved invoices will then be sent to the Research Foundation's Department of Procurement and Payables in the form of a payment request for further approval and processing.

13. A final invoice shall be submitted by the Contractor within thirty (30) days of the expiration or termination of this Agreement, unless this time is extended by the Foundation. If the final invoice is not received within thirty (30) days of expiration or termination, it may be processed at the sole discretion of the Foundation. Foundation shall not, under any circumstances, be liable for payment of invoices submitted for payment and received by Foundation greater than thirty (30) days from the expiration of this Agreement.

14. The Contractor certifies compliance with the New York City Administrative Code regarding VENDEX registration requirements, as applicable. Specifically, the City maintains information for every city contract and prospective vendor for awards over \$100,000 and for vendors or subcontractors doing more than \$100,000 in cumulative annual business with the City. Please note, VENDEX questionnaires are also required for sole sourced contracts valued at \$10,000 or more. More information can be found at: <http://www1.nyc.gov/site/mocs/resources/vendex.page>.

15. This Agreement shall be subject to, and the parties agree to comply and reasonably assist the other party, upon request, in complying with, all applicable U.S. Government export and import laws and regulations, including but not limited to U. S. Department of Commerce Export Administration Regulations (EAR), 15 CFR 730-774, as applicable, and the U.S. Department of State International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), 22 CFR 120-132, as applicable. The parties acknowledge that they may not directly or indirectly export, re-export, distribute or transfer any technology, information or materials of any value to any nation, individual or entity that is prohibited or restricted by ITAR, EAR, the Office of Foreign Assets Contracts (OFAC), the United States Department of State's State Sponsors of Terrorism, or by any other United States government agency without first obtaining the appropriate license.

The Contractor confirms that any confidential information disclosed during the course of the work herein does not contain export controlled technology or technical data identified on any U.S. export control list, including but not limited to the Commerce Control List (CCL), 15 CFR 774 and the U.S. Munitions List (USML), 22 CFR 121. In the event the Contractor intends to provide export controlled information, the Contractor will inform Foundation within thirty (30) days prior to the release of such export controlled technology or technical data. Export controlled information will not be released to Foundation or CUNY personnel without prior written consent of Foundation. If the U.S. government imposes a fine or penalty upon the Foundation because of the Contractor's

failure to notify the Foundation as described herein, Contractor agrees to indemnify and hold the Foundation harmless from any and all resulting fines and penalties from such omission.

16. The Contractor's obligations under this Agreement may not be assigned, sublet or transferred without the prior written consent of the Foundation.

17. This Agreement may be modified from time to time by the parties in writing only, executed by an authorized representative of the Foundation. The term of this Agreement may be extended by the submission of an acceptable Payment Request Form signed by the Project Director or if requested by the Contractor, an email from the Project Director extending the term of the Agreement. In no event shall the Agreement be extended beyond the term of the Prime Award from which it is funded.

18. This Agreement with its attachments embodies the entire understanding between the parties and there are no other agreements or understandings between the parties relating to the subject matter hereof.

19. Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts and will be considered as one executed Agreement and facsimile or electronic signatures (in pdf format) received by the appropriate party will be treated as originals.

20. If there are any special terms and conditions applicable to the Contractors' services under this Agreement not set forth in paragraphs 1 through 19 of this Agreement, they are attached hereto as Appendix B and incorporated herein by reference.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto, by their duly authorized representatives, have executed this Agreement as of the day and year first written above.

**CONTRACTOR**

**RESEARCH FOUNDATION OF CUNY**

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Signature)*

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Signature)*

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Printed Name)*

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Printed Name)*

TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Printed Title)*

TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_  
*(Printed Title)*