



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 Evaluation of the *Family and Youth Development Programs* initiative.

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

This addendum was revised on November 20, 2017. Changes are highlighted.

**ANSWERS TO APPLICANT QUESTIONS**  
**Evaluation of the *Family and Youth Development Programs* initiative**

**PROGRAM DETAILS**

**QUESTION:** Please clarify the number of youth who will be served annually in the Osborne Association's YES program, and the number of caregivers who will be served annually in the Healthy Relationships component. Specifically:

- A. Will the Healthy Relationships component serve only caregivers who have children in the YES program (i.e., 20 total caregivers per year as stated on p. 20)? Or will there be additional caregivers enrolled?**
- B. If only 20 total caregivers and 65-80 youth per year (as stated on pages 19 and 20), please clarify the statement on p. 18 that Osborne and HRP estimate that will serve 125 families annually.**

**ANSWER:** As the first point of service, a child's parent or guardian completes Osborne's intake process to provide information on the family's needs. Families are referred to Osborne's programs/services as needed, including, if appropriate, YES, Healthy Relationships and various intergenerational enrichment activities including book club, martial arts, visual arts, family movie nights, monthly informational lectures, and monthly family trips. Families also receive a variety of confidential offsite referrals based on specific needs of the family or the needs of individuals within the family.

The YES program is structured to serve up to 105 youth per year, including up to 15 youth in each of seven annual cohorts: five cohorts of YES during the school year and two cohorts of Camp YES in the summer. Healthy Relationship is offered six times a year for up to 15 participants each cohort, or 90 participants total. Although together that would allow for programming for a maximum of 195 unique individuals, Osborne estimates that approximately 20 of the adults participating in Healthy Relationships will also have a child/children enrolled in YES, thus reducing the total number of families served to approximately 175 families. Osborne considers a family served if either the parent/caretaker or at least one child completes one cycle of YES or Healthy Relationships.

In addition, although cohorts are designed for 15 participants, they can operate with a minimum of 10. Thus, the minimum enrollment would be 70 youth and 60 adults each year, for a minimum total of 130 unique families served each year. But, given that there is some anticipated overlap between YES and Healthy Relationships, the more realistic minimum is 125 families.

**EVALUATION DESIGN**

**We received several questions regarding enrollment/selection of participants for the programs to be evaluated, and what extent, if any, the evaluator may be involved in shaping these procedures. This explanation serves to address those questions.**

**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 information below on anticipated start dates).

Anticipated outreach/enrollment processes are as follows. These processes are subject to change:

- **Joe Torre Safe at Home Foundation (J TSAH):** Students for the school-based services will be drawn from the two partner middle/high schools. A select group of students will be referred to the targeted (i.e., not school-wide) *Margaret's Place in Communities Impacted by Trauma-exposed Youth* (MP-CITY) services by school staff, caregivers, or self-referral for such program components as individual and group counseling/workshops/art-based groups, and Peer Leadership. *Youth Empowered to Speak* (YES) will be provided to 7<sup>th</sup> or 9<sup>th</sup> grade classrooms as determined by the principal. Outreach to the school staff/administration and parents/caregivers will be facilitated by the MP Counselor through multiple pathways, including but not limited to training/workshops, newsletters, and meetings/events at which staff and parents/caregivers are present.

The J TSAH Family Outreach Coordinator will connect parents in the community who are currently or have previously experienced violence to services at the Dominican Women's Development Center (DWDC). MP-CITY families will likely include English language learners, and families affected by incarceration, poverty, immigration status, lack of resources, and exposure to violence. In addition to building parent relationships and making connections to services, the Coordinator will create bilingual materials, foster relationships with other community organizations to create holistic resources for families including additional civil legal, case management, and advocacy services with local providers. The Coordinator will use a blend of school referrals, interviews, community connections, and word of mouth to reach parents.

The MP will also engage with the local community to fully understand the resources available and create a resource directory. The MP Counselors will use these resource directories and leverage the relationships that they have developed

with the community organizations to make referrals for services including: CONNECT, Sanctuary for Families, Safe Horizon, Violence Intervention Program, Steps to End Family Violence, NYC Family Justice Centers, Harlem Children's Zone, The Door, Street Work, Child Center Of New York, Planned Parenthood, Day One, Grand Street Settlement, Youth Communication, and the Possibility Project. In addition, SAH will collaborate with CJII Community Navigators (if applicable) around making necessary referrals connecting individuals to resources and services they need in the community.

- **Legal Aid Society:** The Society will be receiving direct referrals from Mount Sinai St. Luke's Child and Family Institute (CFI), specifically, the families of children who are receiving intensive mental health services from CFI. These families will be referred for legal screenings as the need arises throughout the course of their children's treatment. Fliers and sign-up sheets are distributed to CFI facilities and their clinicians to inform patients of Know Your Rights sessions at Legal Aid Society. The Society will not be conducting additional outreach to the community to obtain additional clients as part of this program.
- **Osborne Association:** In collaboration with Harlem Restoration Project, Osborne will deploy a multipronged outreach and recruitment approach. Recruitment strategies/sources will include, but are not limited to: presenting at Manhattanville's Community Board 9 and Community Board 10 meetings; posting bright and attractive program materials, pamphlets, and flyers in various high traffic locations in the community, including laundromats, bus stops, building lobbies, and community centers; discussing the program at tenant meetings at the Harlem Restoration Project (HRP); providing information on the program on "The Ricky Jones Show"; tabling at Harlem Restoration Project Bookstore Event; informing local schools and school administration about programming and disseminating program materials and speaking with young people at these schools; developing relationships with existing CBOs and offering to provide programming to members of their communities in need of Osborne's expertise; hosting an open house and reception to introduce community members to Osborne staff members, program goals, and highlights; engaging community residents in face-to-face contact in public settings such as at bus stops and street corners; recruiting from parenting programs "inside" eight men's and one women's prisons; and engaging participants and potential participants in the "Chain Referral" process by asking individuals to suggest the program to friends, neighbors and family members who have been impacted by incarceration and may be in need of programming.
- **Sanctuary for Families (SFF):** Sanctuary reached over 40,000 community members citywide through community outreach, education, and advocacy last year. Sanctuary and STEPS' will conduct outreach through existing, broad strategies, including events for children and parents at schools, houses of worship, community centers, foster care facilities, hospitals, clinics, and schools—including within STEPS' Relationship Abuse Prevention Program (RAPP) which is offered at 15 New York City middle and high schools. FamilySafe will accept referrals from city agencies and CBOs with which Sanctuary and STEPS partner, including various relevant city agencies and more than 20 CBOs based at the

Manhattan Family Justice Center, where both agencies have active staff presences. Additionally, SFF accepts referrals on a regular basis from city agencies including the New York District Attorney's Office, NYPD, and Human Resources Administration, and from providers with Upper Manhattan offices, including Safe Horizon, Northern Manhattan Improvement Corporation, Violence Intervention Program (VIP), African Services Committee, and many others.

Anticipated program phase start and end dates are as follows:

- Joe Torre Safe at Home Foundation (JTSAH): Planning Period: starting July 1, 2017, ending December 31, 2017; Implementation Period: starting July 1, 2017, ending June 30, 2020.
- Legal Aid Society: Planning Period: starting July 1, 2017, ending December 31, 2017; Implementation Period: starting January 1, 2018, ending December 31, 2020.
- Osborne Association: Planning Period: starting July 1, 2017, ending December 31, 2017; Implementation Period: starting January 1, 2018, ending December 31, 2020.
- Sanctuary for Families (SFF): Planning Period: none; Implementation Period: starting July 1, 2017, ending June 30, 2020.

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, schools, 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 providers.

**QUESTION: Will applicants have access to decision makers at the program where the proposed evaluation will be conducted? This is critical because my approach to program evaluation includes the use of program staff and experts as part of the evaluation team. This approach is a "human rights and social justice" approach to program evaluation. It ensures optimal input and output of such evaluations.**

**ANSWER:** Providers will be required to work with the evaluator, 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. In this sense, ISLG anticipates that the provider(s) and evaluator(s) will work together to ensure that the evaluation approach is feasible and ethical.

However, the evaluator should not plan on providing funding to or for program staff. It is a priority that the evaluator be able to make independent decisions and be an independent entity. Thus, program staff should participate in the evaluation but should not be part of the evaluation team in any sense.

**QUESTION: While the required activities for these evaluations are well described, would it be considered acceptable or, even, desirable, to use this evaluation as a platform to also consider other possible outcomes or questions relevant to the field?**

**ANSWER:** Broadly speaking, the goals of the *Family and Youth Development Programs* are to expand the capacity of and/or implement family and youth development programs for populations at elevated risk of poor life outcomes, including eventual justice system involvement. And, by extension, the goals of the *Family and Youth Development Program* evaluations are to understand: how the programs are implemented, whether they are effective in reducing risk factors for criminal justice involvement (e.g., school drop-out and delinquent behavior), and/or whether they are cost-effective. Both of these investments are part of the Manhattan District Attorney's Office (DANY) Criminal Justice Investment Initiative (CJII), whose mission is to support impactful projects that improve public safety and promote a fair and efficient justice system in New York City. Thus, the evaluations should be situated within this broader framework and, to the extent possible, assess their contributions to these ends.

ISLG encourages applicants to propose additional outcomes or questions relevant to the field, provided that they do not interfere with the broad goals articulated above. In general, it would be helpful to discern additional benefits to the program beyond the constructs discussed in the RFP, but the funding and the priority will remain on the outcomes listed in the RFP, Section VI.B. sources of data, including follow-up data, to supplement the anticipated performance-related administrative data. 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).

**QUESTION: Could you clarify the intended purpose(s) for these evaluations, in order that the proposed design could be most responsive to that purpose?**

**ANSWER:** The purpose of the evaluations for this initiative is to supply a stronger evidence base for innovative or promising programs. Innovative programs have no rigorous or robust demonstration of effectiveness but are designed with current best practices in mind. Such approaches include completely new approaches or significant adaptations of evidence-based programs to new contexts or for different participant populations. Promising programs may have undergone limited evaluation (such as statistically controlled evaluations) suggesting effectiveness. Such approaches may also include replication of an evidence-based approach in a new context.

Specific evaluation questions and goals vary among the four programs, but include an understanding of how the programs are implemented, whether they are effective in reducing risk factors for criminal justice involvement (e.g., school drop-out and delinquent behavior), and 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 four programs eligible for evaluation in *Sections IV. B.4* and *VI.B* in the Request for

Proposals (RFP) to *Evaluate Family and Youth Development Programs*. Both the program and evaluation investments are part of the Manhattan District Attorney's Office (DANY) Criminal Justice Investment Initiative (CJII), whose mission is to support impactful projects that improve public safety and promote a fair and efficient justice system in New York City. Thus, the evaluations should be situated within this broader framework of preventing crime and increasing equity in New York City and, to the extent possible, assess their contributions to these ends.

**QUESTION: Given repeated references to cost effectiveness and ROI, we are interested to know whether there is an interest in trying to estimate true program impacts, that is, the changes in outcomes beyond what would have occurred in the absence of the program under evaluation. With this in mind, should the evaluation proposals aim at establishing some sort of comparison through quasi-experimental designs?**

**ANSWER:** Yes, DANY is interested in learning about program impacts. As detailed in *Sections VI.B.1.b.i., VI.B.3.b.i., and VI.B.4.b.i.2.*, applicants should propose approaches that allow for comparison to similar individuals (and/or families, schools, etc.), including a means of addressing selection bias. Thus, the evaluator should not anticipate the same enrollment process for each program and, as such, applicants should anticipate a quasi-experimental design rather than a randomized design. Applicants should propose the strongest possible design, based on the information available in the RFP.

Some programs will also be subject to a cost-related analysis, as detailed in *Section VI.B.* Although DANY is interested in stronger analyses such as cost-benefit analyses, given that some of the programs identified for evaluation are not yet ready for a full cost-benefit analysis, ISLG instead requests a simpler return-on-investment (ROI) analysis, which would calculate the cost of the program and weighs that against the financial value of services participants receive as a result of the program. It would not, however, include any more distal benefits of the program, nor would it consider program benefits relative to any costs other than the program costs themselves.

**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 four of the programs funded under the *Family and Youth Development* initiative, specifically including providers' 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 at least 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 four 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 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.

## **DATA**

**QUESTION: Could additional information be provided on the kinds of data that will be made available to the evaluators in order that we might better plan additional data collection activities and their cost?**

**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 *Family and Youth Development* initiative, specific evaluation questions and goals vary among the four 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 four programs eligible for evaluation in *Sections IV. B.4* and *VI.B* in the Request for Proposals (RFP) to *Evaluate Family and Youth Development Programs*.

**QUESTION: Have the agencies providing the programs to be evaluated been provided with resources to compensate them for the time and resources that they will need to 'host' the evaluation? Here we think of staff time for interviews and focus groups, space and assistance in facilitating interviews and focus groups with clients, and the provision of information on program participation.**

**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 planning period (if applicable), three-year implementation period, as well as for one additional year following the implementation period.

## **BUDGET**

**QUESTION: Has a cap been set in regard to indirect costs?**

**ANSWER:** This solicitation does not specify a maximum allowable rate or maximum amount for administrative or indirect expenses, but the preferred rate is 17% or below. The applicant should provide justification for the budget and any rate(s) requested, and consider that contract awards will be made to the applicants whose proposals are determined to be the most advantageous by the proposal evaluation team, taking into consideration the price and such other factors and criteria as are set forth in the RFP.

## **PROPOSAL FORMAT**

**QUESTION: If an organization chooses to respond to evaluate two or three of the programs (but not all 4), 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 4 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, or all four 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.

**QUESTION: We note that proposals should include letters of support from government agencies. Please clarify, are these letters intended to provide evidence of our past collaborations and our team's ability to work well with local government? Or should those letters be indication of support for the proposed evaluation activities including, perhaps,**

## **willingness to share data?**

**ANSWER:** Applicants may, but are not required, to submit letters of support. These letters may come from government agencies, consultants, subcontractors, and/or other funders, but are not restricted in their form or content. For instance, these letters could detail past collaboration, speak to the strengths of the applicant in general, or speak to the applicant’s ability to conduct an outcome evaluation in particular. Note that applicants do not need and should not request letters of support from providers who will be evaluated as part of this initiative.

## **PROPOSAL SCORING**

**QUESTION:** Could you please clarify the criteria against which the proposals will be assessed?

**ANSWER:** Each applicant will be evaluated on the quality of the:

- Evaluation Design and Plan: 55%
- Level of Organizational Capacity: 20%
- Relevant Experience: 20%
- Budget Summary and Narrative: 5%

These criteria correspond to the evaluation components specified in the Proposal Content and Format requirements, as specified in *Section VI* of the RFP. Both the Evaluation Proposal (*Section VI.B*) and the Performance Measurement (*Section VI.C*) sections will be scored under the “Evaluation Design and Plan” section, per above.

The Organizational and Staff Capacity Section (*Section VI.D*) will be scored under the “Level of Organizational Capacity” section, per above.

The Experience Section (*Section VI.E*) will be scored under the “Relevant Experience” section, per above.

The Evaluation Budget (*Section VI.F*), Evaluation Budget Narrative (*Section VI.G*), and Fiscal Sponsorship Documentation (*Section VI.H*) sections will be scored under the “Budget Summary and Narrative” section, per above.