District Attorney of
New York County

November 17, 2017

The CUNY Institute for State and Local Governance (ISLG) appreciates your interest in the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Evaluation of Increase Access to Services for Survivors of Crime Initiative.

This addendum includes answers to questions submitted via CJII Application Portal to ISLG by October 27, 2017.

This addendum was revised on November 27, 2017. Changes are highlighted.

ANSWERS TO APPLICANT QUESTIONS
Evaluation of the *Increase Access to Services for Survivors of Crime* Initiative

EVALUATION DESIGN

QUESTION: In situations where the description of particular programs does not indicate specific evaluation design constraints, how much input may the evaluator have in the selection of program participants, in order to allow for the most rigorous evaluation designs possible? When randomization is not possible, will the evaluator have the opportunity to guide program selection to allow for other rigorous outcome evaluation designs such as a regression discontinuity design?

> **ANSWER:** Each provider will identify participants for programming based on their own selection and/enrollment processes. Each provider will maintain its own inclusion and exclusion criteria and processes for selection. Current recruitment/outreach processes are described in *Section IV.B.4* of the RFP. These processes are subject to change.
>
> Providers will be required to work with the evaluator, including providing the evaluator with information regarding selection criteria and processes, as necessary for evaluation of the initiative. Following the selection of the evaluator(s), ISLG will convene the provider(s) and the evaluator(s) to discuss and finalize the evaluation approach. However, providers will also have discretion to implement their programs to best support participant outcomes. Some providers may be amenable to altered enrollment/selection processes, but others may not. In addition, some providers may have already begun implementing their programs by the time the evaluator's contract begins (see question below in this section on anticipated start dates).
>
> Current outreach/enrollment processes are as follows. These processes are subject to change:
> - Barrier Free Living (BFL) - BFL will conduct a variety of outreach and education activities with members of the Deaf community, social service and healthcare providers, and criminal justice personnel to highlight the unique needs of Deaf survivors, with the long-term goal of increasing referrals of Deaf survivors to Freedom House and Secret Garden. These activities will include: workshops for social service providers, healthcare providers, and government personnel on the dynamics of abuse and trauma in the Deaf community and the cultural and communication needs of Deaf survivors; tabling at City-sponsored and Deaf community events to share program information and raise awareness about domestic violence (DV); training healthcare professionals to appropriately screen and refer Deaf survivors; educating law enforcement and criminal justice personnel on Deaf communication needs and strategies for ensuring effective communication; and strengthening relationships with Deaf educators and service providers on the importance of addressing DV in the community. BFL has strong existing partnerships with City agencies and community-based service providers, and through this grant BFL will increase Deaf-focused outreach for the purposes of referral and collaboration.

- Center for Court Innovation (CCI) - CCI's Men's Empowerment Program (located at the Harlem Community Justice Center; MEP) expects to garner a sizeable number of participants from existing Justice Center programs such as the Harlem Parole Reentry Court. The Justice Center will also reach out to community partners (including faith-based organizations) and city agencies like the New York City Department of Probation (which has referred probationers to other Justice Center programs) to identify and recruit potential participants. MEP will also collaborate with DANY's CJII Community Navigator program to accept referrals.
- Crime Victims Treatment Center (CVTC) - CVTC will dedicate a full-time outreach worker to its Trans Trauma Program (TTP). Participants will be identified through numerous avenues. The outreach worker will conduct targeted community outreach, visiting areas where transgender persons (particularly those of color) reside, including popular NYC sex work strolls, in order to provide education and awareness about trauma and victimization, describe TTP services, and offer free rapid HIV/Hepatitis C/Syphilis testing. The outreach worker will also take part in community health and testing events across the City, engaging transgender persons in brief conversations about TTP and providing relevant educational materials. In addition, the outreach worker will routinely visit CBOs that provide care to transgender persons to educate about TTP offerings and link persons to care.
- New York Committee for Occupational Safety and Health (NYCOSH) - NYCOSH and its subcontractors, which together constitute the Manhattan Justice for Worker's Collaborative (MJWC), will conduct targeted outreach and training on wage theft and health and safety crime reporting to at least 13,000 Latino immigrant workers and their families per year. Training topics will include wage theft prevention, wage and hour rights, the ABCs of reporting on wage theft, common health and safety hazards that result in injury and death, instructions on how to file health and safety complaints, and instructions on how to report companies with hazards of imminent death. Outreach and training methods and activities will include mini-trainings and outreach to day laborers on street corners where they seek work, and at membership and committee meetings within the community. MJWC will also supplement mandatory OSHA 10 construction health and safety trainings and ESL classes with a curriculum on reporting. Through this outreach, MJWC member organizations will also publicize their case management services for victims of wage theft and those involved in health and safety cases.
- Sanctuary for Families (SFF) - SFF's Economic Empowerment Program (EEP) staff currently conduct comprehensive outreach in the community to nonprofits, CBOs, as well as to shelter staff via presentations conducted at HRA headquarters; these methods currently result in more than 200 annual referrals to the Career Readiness Training Program (CRTP) each year. For the DANY-funded expansion of the program, staff will conduct additional outreach at regularly scheduled Manhattan Family Justice Center (MFJC) partner trainings to ensure that all on-site nonprofit and governmental partners are aware of the available career training program. EEP will also collaborate with CBO partners and

hospitals in Upper Manhattan and the Lower East Side for presentations in English, Spanish, and potentially East Asian languages—promoting the availability of the (CRTP) at the MFJC. Lastly, information about this program will also be added to training and awareness-building presentations conducted by dozens of other Sanctuary staff, which annually reach over 40,000 New Yorkers, to ensure that a broad cross-section of potential victims, concerned community members, professionals likely to encounter domestic violence and trafficking victims, and others are made aware of the CRTP's availability.

Thus, the evaluator should not anticipate the same enrollment process for each program. Applicants should propose the strongest possible design, based on the information available in the RFP and described above. Any outcome evaluation design is possible, provided that it provides for comparison to similar individuals (and/or families, etc.), including a means of addressing selection bias. That said, applicants should anticipate a quasi-experimental design rather than a randomized design given the anticipated constraints for most or all of the programs. Applicants' proposed timeline for the evaluation should account for a short planning period to discuss and finalize the evaluation approach with ISLG and the provider.

QUESTION: Are the grantees required to participate in the evaluation?

ANSWER: All funded providers under the *Increase Access to Services for Survivors of Crime* initiative who have been selected for evaluation are required to work with the evaluator throughout the duration of the planning period (if applicable), implementation period and up to an additional year following the implementation period.

QUESTION: During the 4.5-year period for this evaluation, is 1 year for data collection after 3-year program implementation optional or mandatory?

ANSWER: The evaluation RFP is intended to identify an evaluator(s) for five of the programs funded under the *Increase Access to Services for Survivors of Crime* initiative, specifically including providers' six-month planning period (if applicable), three-year implementation period (to the extent possible), as well as an additional year for follow-up data collection and six months for preparation of the final report. ISLG will expect that any evaluation with an outcome evaluation component include <u>at least</u> one-year follow-up on outcomes for program participants. (The evaluator could propose different follow-up periods for different groups in order to examine longer-term versus shorter-term outcomes, but a minimum one-year follow-up is required.) For participants who begin and finish a program early on in the implementation period, the minimum one-year follow-up period will likely conclude before the end of the implementation period itself and, therefore, may not rely on the one-year follow-up period of the grant that will immediately follow the implementation period. However, given that some participants will not complete their participation until the end of the implementation period (or even afterwards), this one-year follow-up data collection period within the evaluation contract is required to ensure there is some time to study outcomes post-intervention for all participants, regardless of whether they complete programming early or late in the

implementation period. Applicants should incorporate this requirement into their evaluation proposal.

As context, each of the five programs identified for evaluation is required to provide performance data on participants supported through CJII funding for up to one year following the end of their three-year program implementation period. For instance, because provider funding is capped at six months for planning and three years for implementation, participants who begin a program toward the end of the three-year implementation period may only have one portion of their programming supported by CJII, with the remainder not supported by CJII directly. Nonetheless, the provider is responsible for providing performance data to ISLG for up to an additional year on such participants.

In addition, providers are required to cooperate with the evaluator during their contract terms, including during their six-month planning period (if applicable), three-year implementation period, and this additional year following the end of the implementation period. This additional year could support the evaluator's additional data collection and/or assistance in interpreting or clarifying data and materials collected earlier.

QUESTION: Have the grantees started implementing/delivering the funded programs/services? If not, what is the planned start date?

> **ANSWER:** The anticipated start date of the programs funded under the *Increase Access to Services for Survivors of Crime* initiative is December 1, 2017. Some of the providers (grantees) have planning periods of up to 6 months, whereas others proceed directly into the implementation period. For the five providers selected for evaluation, currently anticipated start and end dates, which are <u>subject to change</u>, include:
> - BFL: Planning Period: none. Implementation Period: starting December 1, 2017, ending November 30, 2020.
> - CCI: Planning Period: starting December 1, 2017, ending May 31, 2018; Implementation Period: starting June 1, 2018, ending May 31, 2021.
> - CVTC: Planning Period: starting December 1, 2017, ending May 31, 2018; Implementation Period: starting June 1, 2018, ending May 31, 2021.
> - NYCOSH: Planning Period: starting December 1, 2017, ending May 31, 2018; Implementation Period: starting June 1, 2018, ending May 31, 2021.
> - SFF: Planning Period: none. Implementation Period: starting September 1, 2017 (so as to include a Fall 2017 cohort, as described in *Section IV.B.4.e.i* of the RFP to Evaluate Programs to Increase Access to Services for Survivors of Crime), ending August 31, 2020.

DATA

QUESTION: What if any metrics are the grantees required to collect?

ANSWER: Providers (grantees) will submit regular performance data to ISLG, based primarily on administrative data maintained by the providers. These metrics commonly pertain to total volume of participants, participant characteristics, efficiency of program enrollment, and program dosage and completion. Of course, the metrics vary by provider, and some providers also provide other types of performance data to ISLG, e.g., on coordination with external providers. These data are expected to be provided to ISLG in aggregate form, though in some cases they may be provided in case-level, non-identifiable form.

ISLG anticipates that many of these data will also be of interest to the evaluator, albeit in personally identifiable form. As such, ISLG anticipates that the performance data could also be provided to the evaluator in identifiable, case-level form, pursuant to data use agreements (DUAs) to be negotiated between providers and the evaluator.

In addition, providers are required to work with ISLG and the evaluator for purposes of the evaluation. The evaluator(s) will be responsible for identifying and negotiating any additional sources of data beyond the administrative data described above. Some providers already collect follow-up data, and they may agree to make such data available to the evaluator. However, many providers do not collect such data. ISLG does not expect that providers will provide non-administrative data as part of their responsibility to submit regular performance data to ISLG.

Thus, ISLG encourages applicants to propose additional sources of data and data collection activities, including follow-up data, to supplement the anticipated performance-related administrative data. The evaluator(s) will be responsible for obtaining any such additional data. The cost of any additional data collection and analysis should be incorporated into the budget and explained in the budget narrative. Applicants should anticipate challenges associated with data collection and reporting (e.g., lack of expertise or software) and how they plan to address them. Following the selection of the evaluator(s), ISLG will convene the providers and the evaluator(s) to discuss and finalize the evaluation approach. Any additional data will also be addressed in the DUAs to be negotiated between the evaluator(s) and the provider(s).

Due to the variety of programs funded under the *Increase Access to Services for Survivors of Crime* initiative, specific evaluation questions and goals vary among the five programs selected for evaluation. Nonetheless, global questions include an understanding of how the programs are implemented, whether they are effective in increasing access to and use of services (e.g., rates of reporting victimization, rates of soliciting services following victimization, reduced disparities in reporting/access across demographic groups), and/or whether they are cost-effective. Applicants should propose a design for a process evaluation, outcome evaluation, and/or ROI, as specified for each of the five programs eligible for evaluation in *Sections IV. B.4* and *VI.B* in the Request for Proposals (RFP) to *Evaluate Programs to Increase Access to Services for Survivors of Crime.*

QUESTION: Do the grantees have funding allocated to support the evaluations?

ANSWER: Providers (grantees) were instructed to consider the costs related to data collection and reporting throughout the contract term within their initial proposals. All providers funded under the initiative have dedicated staff time and, in some cases, additional resources necessary to provide performance data to ISLG and to work with the evaluator. This funding applies during the six-month planning period (if applicable), three-year implementation period, as well as for one additional year following the implementation period.

PROPOSAL FORMAT

QUESTION: If an organization chooses to respond to evaluate two or three of the programs (but not all 5), should these be wholly separate applications, or are some sections combined (specifically, the Organizational and Staff Capacity and Experience sections, as would be the case if applying for all 5 programs)?

ANSWER: Applicants (organizations) should submit a single proposal (i.e., one proposal maximum per organization/entity), regardless of how many programs they propose to evaluate—i.e., an applicant should submit a single proposal, whether they are proposing to evaluate one, two, three, four, or all five of the programs. This single proposal will have multiple sections, as described below. Each of those sections may correspond to the applicant as a whole, or to the specific programs the applicant proposes to evaluate.

Applicants should adhere to the Proposal Content and Format requirements as described in *Section VI* of the RFP. Each section of the proposal should be uploaded separately in the CJII Application Portal. Some of the proposal sections are to be uploaded with a single file, i.e., regardless of the number of programs to be evaluated; these sections include the Cover Letter, Organizational and Staff Capacity, Experience, Evaluation Budget, Evaluation Budget Narrative, and Fiscal Sponsorship. Thus, an applicant should submit a single Cover Letter, regardless of whether they are proposing to evaluate one, two, three, four, or all five of the programs. Likewise, the applicant should submit a single file on Organizational and Staff Capacity, a single file on Experience, a single file on the Evaluation Budget, a single file on the Evaluation Budget Narrative, and a single file on Fiscal Sponsorship (if applicable).

Others sections are to be uploaded with a separate file for each of the programs being evaluated; these include the Evaluation Proposal and Performance Measurement. For these sections, for instance, an applicant proposing to evaluate two programs would submit two Performance Measurement files in the Performance Measurement section of their proposal.