



District Attorney of
New York County

Criminal Justice Investment Initiative

**Request for Proposals to
Evaluate Programs for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood**

No. 018

Expires Friday, June 15, 2018

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| I. | Cover Sheet..... | 3 |
| II. | Key Terms..... | 5 |
| III. | Summary of the Request for Proposals | 7 |
| IV. | Anticipated Scope of Services | 8 |
| V. | Deliverables | 14 |
| VI. | Proposal Content and Format..... | 14 |
| VII. | Proposal Evaluation and Contract Award..... | 21 |
| VIII. | Appendices..... | 22 |

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 two programs funded under the *Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood* initiative.

Beginning in February 2018, the New York County District Attorney's Office (DANY) is committing \$3.75 million under its Criminal Justice Investment Initiative (CJII) to the *Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood* initiative, which funds two service providers over a period of 3.25 years (consisting of three months for a Planning Phase and three years for an Implementation Phase). (The providers will be funded for one additional year for the purposes of providing final performance data to ISLG and of working with the selected evaluator, as appropriate.) The initiative aims to enhance and scale up innovative programs and approaches for foster youth who will soon transition to adulthood or who have recently transitioned to adulthood from the child welfare system (ages 16 to 24). Those who age out of foster care without a permanent family arrangement are at significantly elevated risk of criminal justice system involvement and other negative life outcomes. The investment is part of DANY's broader investments in prevention, which collectively aim to prevent crime, improve public safety, and reduce involvement in the justice system. Both of the programs selected under the *Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood* ("FYTA") initiative will be evaluated as part of this solicitation.

This solicitation reflects DANY's broad commitment to data-driven decision-making and to informing the research and practice field in New York and more widely. Specific evaluation goals include an understanding of how the programs are implemented and factors key to program success, whether they are effective in reducing risk factors for criminal justice involvement (e.g., disconnection from both education and employment, participation in criminal behavior), and whether they are cost-effective. Thus, evaluation applicants should propose a research design that facilitates a process evaluation and outcome evaluation, and an optional cost-benefit analysis (CBA), of the programs funded through the *FYTA* initiative and selected for evaluation as part of this solicitation. Applicants must propose to evaluate both programs.

B. Timeline and Submission Instructions

1. **Release Date of RFP:** Wednesday, April 11, 2018
2. **Questions:** Questions about this RFP and/or about individual programs/providers listed in this solicitation may be submitted in writing through the CJII application portal at <http://cuny-islg.fluidreview.com>. Questions and requests for clarification must be submitted by 11:59pm EST on Wednesday, May 9, 2018. All questions should be submitted to the link above, and not directly to the programs/providers listed in this solicitation. ISLG will coordinate with programs/providers, as necessary, to provide answers to program-specific questions.
3. Answers to all questions will be available as an addendum to this RFP by 11:59pm EST on Friday, May 25, 2018. It will be the responsibility of the proposers to check

the CJII website to remain up-to-date regarding all addenda issued for the current RFP. Any addenda will be posted alongside the RFP here: <https://cjii.org/request-proposals-evaluate-programs-foster-youth>.

4. **Proposal Due Date:** Proposal submissions are due Friday, June 15, 2018, 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: Summer 2018

C. Funding and Number of Awards

DANY anticipates awarding one contract for the evaluation of both programs through this solicitation, with total funding up to \$600,000 over a contract period of up to four years.

D. Contact Information

Questions regarding RFP content should be submitted in writing at <http://cunyislg.fluidreview.com> by the date and time specified above. Questions regarding technical difficulties should be sent to cjii@islg.cuny.edu.

II. Key Terms

Programs for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood (FYTA) Initiative: A \$3.75 million investment funded via the CJII which funds two service providers to enhance and expand innovative programs for youth who are transitioning out of the foster care system. The two organizations are expected to serve approximately 500 young New Yorkers annually, ages 16- to 24-years-old, who will soon transition or who have recently transitioned from foster care.

Criminal Justice Investment Initiative (CJII): Established by the New York County District Attorney's Office in 2014 to invest funds¹ in impactful projects that will improve public safety and promote a fair and efficient criminal justice system.

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

CUNY Institute for State and Local Governance (ISLG): The technical assistance consultant to DANY for CJII. ISLG provides input to DANY, manages and provides guidance to CJII contractors, and conducts oversight and performance measurement throughout the lifetime of the initiative.

The Research Foundation of the City University of New York (RFCUNY, or Research Foundation): Under CJII, all funds will be administered through the Research Foundation of CUNY. The Research Foundation is a non-profit educational corporation that provides CUNY and non-CUNY clients with the administrative infrastructure that supports sponsored program activities. The Research Foundation acts as DANY's fiscal agent for CJII.

Administration for Children's Services (ACS): The Administration for Children's Services (ACS) protects and promotes safety and well-being of New York City's children and families by providing child welfare, juvenile justice, and early care and education services.ⁱ

Cost-benefit analysis: Assesses the cost of a program relative to the benefits that are accrued by participants and/or society as a result of program outcomes.

Outcomes: The results and impact of program activities (e.g., graduation rates, family reunification, employment/earnings).

Outputs: Measurements of program activities (e.g., number of families served, types of interventions offered).

Outcome evaluation: Assesses whether a program or approach achieves its hypothesized or intended results with the focus population or participants.

¹ These are asset forfeiture funds, derived from settlements with international banks that violated U.S. sanctions.

Permanency: A legally permanent, nurturing family for every child and youth. As defined in the federal Child and Family Services Reviews,² permanency occurs when: (1) A child in foster care is discharged from foster care to reunification with their family, either a parent or other relative; (2) the child is discharged from foster care to a legally finalized adoption; or (3) the child is discharged from foster care to the care of a legal guardian.

Permanency Planning: Permanency planning involves efforts to achieve permanency for young people with foster system involvement. These efforts may include services that address family issues in an attempt to reunite foster youth with their family; services for families to prevent foster care placement; kinship guardianship (KinGap program) to support permanent placement of youth with relatives; or adoption.ⁱⁱ

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

² See <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/monitoring/child-family-services-reviews>

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 \$3.75 million under CJII to fund the *Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood* initiative, which funds two different service providers to enhance and expand innovative programs for youth who are transitioning out of the foster care system. The investment is part of DANY's investments in prevention, detailed in the *CJII Strategic Plan*, which collectively aim to prevent crime, improve public safety, and reduce involvement in the justice system.

Both programs funded under the *Programs for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood* investment will be evaluated as part of this solicitation. Specifically, DANY is interested in understanding how the programs are implemented and factors key to program success, whether they are effective in reducing risk factors for criminal justice involvement (e.g., disconnection from both education and employment, participation in criminal behavior), and whether they are cost-effective.

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 will manage the grantees funded under CJII, and provide 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 to DANY, which makes all decisions regarding the funding of awardees, and funds will be administered through the Research Foundation of CUNY (Research Foundation).

B. Anticipated Contract Specifications

The Manhattan District Attorney's Office anticipates awarding one contract for up to four years, beginning in Summer 2018. Funding for the full four years would support an evaluation of the programs funded under the *FYTA* initiative over the three-year implementation of the investment itself, as well as an additional year for follow-up data collection and preparation of a final evaluation report. As part of this contract, the selected evaluator will be responsible for producing several deliverables (see *Appendix 2* for anticipated deliverables). Deliverables will be finalized in the course of contract negotiations.

As provided for in the key contract terms (*Appendix 4*), the "Final report" and possibly other deliverables (*Appendix 2*) will be produced for public dissemination. The evaluator will be required to submit all deliverables to ISLG and DANY for review and comment before they are made public.

The Manhattan District Attorney's Office anticipates that any agreement entered into as a result of this RFP will be with DANY as the contracting party and ISLG as DANY's agent. Key

contract terms are attached as *Appendix 4*. In the event that the selected applicant is unable to fulfill the requirements of the contract awarded pursuant to this RFP, DANY reserves the right to enter into contract negotiations at a later date with other providers available to conduct the evaluation.

C. Anticipated Available Funding

The Manhattan District Attorney’s Office anticipates total funding for the evaluations to be up to \$600,000 over the contract term.

D. Performance Measurement

The Manhattan District Attorney’s Office 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. These metrics will be finalized during the contracting phase or during the term of any contract awarded from this RFP. (See *Section VI.C. Performance Measurement* and *Appendix 1* for more information about performance measurement.)

IV. Anticipated Scope of Services

A. Background

In New York City, approximately 600 young adults “age out” of foster care (i.e., reach the age of adulthood without a permanent family) each year.ⁱⁱⁱ Youth transitioning out of foster care and into young adulthood face tremendous barriers to success.^{iv} Many children and youth who enter the foster care system have experienced at least one incident of caregiver-related trauma, such as neglect or abuse,^v and most have endured several traumatic events.^{vi} Therefore, many youth enter and/or leave the child welfare system with complex trauma histories. Maltreated youth in general exhibit higher rates of attachment disorders, and many lack secure relationships as they reach adolescence and adulthood.^{vii} Because many foster youth have experienced maltreatment, they are, in turn, also susceptible to mental health problems, substance abuse, and crime.^{viii} One Midwestern study of young adults with previous foster care involvement found that approximately 25% demonstrated symptoms of depression, 20% met criteria for substance use dependence, and nearly 40% had at least one jail stay in the past few years.^{ix}

Foster youth often experience multiple home placements while in care, effectively disrupting school attendance and decreasing school performance. Half of foster youth who had aged out in 2015 had experienced four or more placement moves while in care.^x Approximately 15 percent of New York City 8th graders in foster care achieve grade standards in English and Mathematics; by comparison, 38 percent and 46 percent of their peers perform at grade level in English and Mathematics, respectively.^{xi} Of the 1,890 foster youth ages 16 to 18 enrolled in New York City public high schools for the 2015-2016 school year, only 15% were on track to graduate.^{xii} Consequently, many foster youth struggle to find a job and achieve financial independence. Indeed, only half of young adults ages 21 to 24 with former foster care involvement in New York City are employed at any given time.^{xiii} Lastly, many youth aging out of care struggle to maintain

safe and secure housing. According to the New York City Administration for Children’s Services (ACS), one of five foster youth entered a homeless shelter within three years of leaving care in the mid-2000s.^{xiv} These experiences severely inhibit young adults’ successful transition from care to independence, and there is growing recognition of the need to intervene in and prevent these challenges. The recent Report of the Interagency Foster Care Task Force specifically recommended additional investment in services to support the career, educational, and housing goals of youth aging out of foster care.^{xv} The Task Force report also called for further investment in the evaluation of this and other recommendations, including several related to the two programs to be evaluated as part of this initiative, such as counseling/mentor models, trauma-informed supports, flexibility in housing regulations, and wraparound models.

B. Description of the Programs to be Evaluated

Each of the two programs should be evaluated through this solicitation. Descriptions of the programs to be evaluated are listed below. See *Appendix 3* for additional information on each of the programs.

1. Program 1. The Door: Manhattan Academy Plus (MAP).

- a. *Overview.* The Door—A Center of Alternatives, Inc. (or “The Door”) plans to expand its Bronx-based Academy model to a new site in its Manhattan headquarters. Thus, The Door will continue to operate its existing site in the Bronx and, with CJII funding, will open a new program site known as *Manhattan Academy Plus (MAP)*.

Both sites will be based on a wraparound service delivery model, including the provision of academic, employment/career, and supportive services for transition-age foster youth. Academic and career staff will help youth develop individualized service plans and provide support throughout program participation. Staff will provide Adult Basic Education/High School Equivalency and pre-college instructional courses; test preparation; work readiness and occupational skills training; and internship, job, and college placement assistance. Lastly, a wide array of supportive services will be offered to youth depending on need, including: healthcare; legal representation and know-your-rights seminars; mental health counseling; arts and leadership programs; financial literacy training; and workshops on nutrition, hygiene, and self-care.

Nonetheless, the sites will differ in two important ways:

- i. Centralization of services:
 1. The Bronx Academy provides career and education services for transition-age foster youth on-site, but uses a referral-based model to connect youth with The Door’s suite of additional services, as needed.
 2. MAP will concentrate most services on-site.
- ii. Housing:
 1. The Bronx Academy does not offer housing services.
 2. At MAP, two Housing Specialists will work with youth individually to assess housing needs, assist with housing applications, and provide referrals to shelters or transitional

housing if necessary. In addition, transition-age foster youth at both sites are eligible to apply for The Door's Supportive Housing program, which includes 95 units across two sites in the Lower East Side.

The model as a whole, as well as the individual MAP and Bronx Academy sites, should be evaluated through this solicitation. Thus, the evaluation should consider the effectiveness of The Door's wraparound model for foster youth relative to treatment as usual. In addition, the evaluation should consider how differences in the two sites—and therefore, differences in participants' experiences—may affect program implementation and outcomes.

- b. *Focus Populations and Number Served.* MAP will serve approximately 200 transition-age (16-24) youth annually, and 500 unique youth over the course of the initiative, who are close to transitioning or have recently transitioned to adulthood from the child welfare system across New York City. The Bronx Academy will serve approximately 200 youth annually, and 500 unique youth over the same time period.
- c. *Dosage.* The Bronx Academy and MAP program will operate on an ongoing basis with rolling enrollment throughout the year. Youth may begin and end service engagement at any time.

At both MAP and the Bronx Academy, each youth will participate in an intake process and learn about the site, staff, and available services. Afterwards, participants will develop their individual service plan with support from staff, and will be connected with a suite of Career and Education Services. MAP participants will also be connected with Housing Services, as appropriate.

Although program flexibility is emphasized, some program components will be more defined, with structured curricula and durations. For instance, the Young Adult Internship Program is designed to last 14 weeks, and each Bridge to College program cycle encompasses five weeks. Various supportive services, such as legal education and structured recreational activities, will be offered on a more regular, drop-in basis. When considering the program model more globally, rather than at the level of specific program components, youth will be permitted to access these services until they achieve their academic or career goals, regardless of the length of time required to do so.

- d. *Recruitment/Outreach and Enrollment/Selection of Participants.* The Door will use on-site recruitment, street outreach, and referrals from partner agencies in order to recruit foster youth to the two sites. The Door's Street Outreach Program directs staff to areas in New York City where runaway and homeless youth are known to gather. These outreach workers will interact with youth on the street, offer emergency supplies, and invite youth to return to The Door for additional assistance. Furthermore, a Peer Leadership Team, which is an initiative of the Door's Adolescent Health Center, develops and facilitates health related in-reach and out-reach activities for public schools, community centers, foster care agencies, and other community-based organizations. The Door has also formed partnerships and referral streams

with various city agencies that may help connect transition-age youth to the program sites. Additional outreach activities will include social media marketing, agency emails, community events, open houses, and referrals from current or former clients of The Door.

2. Program 2. Graham Windham: Graham SLAM (Support, Lead, Achieve, Model).

- a. *Overview.* Graham Windham plans to expand its existing Graham SLAM (Support, Lead, Achieve, Model) program to focus more on education and workforce development/employment goals. At intake, participants will be paired with a Coach who will assist in the development of individual educational and career-focused goals as well as action plans to achieve them. The Coach will provide college readiness assistance (e.g., selecting schools, applications, scholarships, financial aid), conduct specialized workshops on topics such as the college admissions process, and lead *College Crew*, a support group for youth navigating the challenges of the college application process and eventual enrollment and continuation in college. Similarly, if participants are interested in a vocational certification, coaches will help youth apply for and continue in post-secondary vocational programs. Tutors will also be available to provide homework assistance as well as standardized test and High School Equivalency/Test Assessing Secondary Completion preparation.

Coaches will also help youth prepare for job interviews, complete job applications, and provide support while engaged in internships, vocational programs, and part-time or full-time employment. A career readiness and employment support curriculum, known as *Career Club*, will also be offered. It includes eight weekly career-focused peer group sessions designed to engage youth in supportive discussion around career goals, challenges, disappointments, and successes. Youth will develop a portfolio, resume, and sample cover letter as well as learn skills such as managing conflict within the workplace. Youth will also have the opportunity to participate in a work-study program at Graham Windham sites in order to gain work experience while earning an income towards school-related expenses.

In addition, Graham Windham offers a variety of additional supportive services available on site or through referral partners. Graham SLAM Education, Employment, and Internship Specialists provide help with high school advocacy, school transfers, college applications, and college guidance; and job placement and internship placement and support. They also ensure that youth obtain financial assistance, housing support, substance use treatment, and mental health treatment. Two peer support groups are offered: the Network Emotional Support Group and the Bengals Peer Leadership Group. The Network Support Group, based on the Network Therapeutic Community Model, is facilitated by Coaches and encompasses 90-minute weekly sessions designed to help youth support one another in regulating stress and behavior. The Bengals Peer Leadership Group focuses on skills training related to healthy communication, positive peer relationships, dealing with peer pressure, and service learning. Each young person completes an

eight-session training and then participates in a graduation ceremony and is awarded Bengals gear, signifying their membership in the group (a positive alternative to the support that gangs offer many young people). The group plans and completes community service projects and recreational activities, to help connect with the community and as a group.

Lastly, Coaches will connect with family members of youth on a monthly basis to engage them in supporting the goals outlined in the youth's action plan and in order to address any issues related to family dynamics. This component may include in-person visits and/or phone calls to the family's residence as well as FedCap's PrepNOW! initiative.^{3,xvi} Graham SLAM partners with Foster Care and Preventive Case Management staff who take the lead in helping youth connect to a permanent family through reunification or adoption. Other permanency services to be provided included assistance with KinGap agreements,^{4,xvii} family permanency pacts,^{5,xviii} child-specific family recruitment,^{6,xix} and family-finding services.^{7,xx}

- b. *Focus Populations and Number Served.* Graham Windham's Graham SLAM program plans to serve 300 New York City youth per year in foster care ages 16 to 24 annually (it currently serves between 150 and 200 annually) with CJII funding as well as other funding sources, including youth who are over-age and under credited, who are close to transitioning from, or have recently transitioned from, foster care. Graham Windham expects to serve approximately 700 unique participants over the course of the initiative as a result of funding through CJII and other sources.
- c. *Dosage.* Services will vary in type and level of intensity based on the young person's needs as they move through different phases of the Graham SLAM program. Program Phases include: Intensive (i.e., new participants or those struggling in high school), Supportive (i.e., high school or vocational students), Stability (i.e., at least two years following high school graduation, such as college students or those with employment), and Launching (i.e., college graduates with a stable job or students in graduate school). The total length of program engagement can extent to up to eight years.
- d. *Recruitment/Outreach.* Outreach and programming will take place primarily within Graham Windham's existing foster care programs in Harlem, the Bronx, and Brooklyn. Referrals will also be accepted by partners such as city and state agencies, nonprofit organizations, and educational/academic institutions to recruit participants.

³ FedCap's PrepNOW! initiative was designed to support foster parents in creating a college-bound environment for foster youth.

⁴ The Kinship Guardianship Assistance Program (KinGap) aids foster children in achieving a permanent placement with a family member who has been the youth's foster parent for a minimum of six months.

⁵ Permanency pacts are formal agreements wherein foster parent youth link with a supportive adult who pledges to provide some form of support on a regular basis as youth transition to adulthood and beyond.

⁶ Child-specific recruitment methods aid in identifying foster, adoptive, and kinship families for a particular child or youth in care.

⁷ Family finding services offer myriad strategies to identify and engage relatives of children and youth in the child welfare system.

C. Evaluation Framework

This request seeks proposals to evaluate the two programs funded under the *FYTA* initiative. Broadly, DANY is interested in understanding how the programs are implemented, whether they are effective in reducing risk factors for criminal justice involvement (e.g., disconnection from both education and employment, participation in criminal behavior), and whether they are cost-effective. Applicants should propose a design for a process evaluation and outcome evaluation, and an optional CBA, as specified in *Sections IV.C* and *VI.B*. Applicants must propose to evaluate both of the programs.

The evaluation will focus on participants throughout the three-year implementation in each of the programs listed in *Section IV.B*. Applicants should propose a design that permits an initial understanding of program implementation and effects within two years of the start of the evaluation. These initial results will be especially important for adjusting the implementation of the programs. Ideally, the evaluation design should also allow for an understanding of short-term (≤ 1 year following program completion) outcomes for the entire sample, and longer-term outcomes (1-2 years following program completion) for a subset of the sample.

1. **Eligibility Criteria:** Applicants should have experience and success partnering with relevant community-based organizations and government agencies to collect and interpret data; and experience conducting process, outcome, and/or CBA evaluations of programs that serve foster youth. Finally, applicants should ideally have experience conducting multi-site evaluations.
2. **Collaboration and Partnership:** Applicants must work closely with ISLG and programs funded through the *FYTA* initiative throughout all phases of the evaluation.
3. **Evaluation Types/Components:** Applicant should propose an evaluation design for each of the following evaluation types. Applicants may choose to address each program separately or as part of a broader plan. However, the evaluation proposal should enable an understanding of each program independently.
 - a. **Process Evaluation:** Applicants should propose a design that aids understanding of program implementation and factors key to the programs' success.
 - b. **Outcome Evaluation:** Applicants should propose an outcome evaluation design that facilitates understanding of the individual programs, including participants' engagement with the programs and relevant outcomes such as education, employment, and justice system involvement. Applicants should anticipate a quasi-experimental design rather than an experimental design and compare program participants to those who do not engage in programming, i.e., treatment as usual. In addition, the outcome evaluation should include a stratified analysis of program effects based on participant differences in age, race, dosage, justice system involvement, and other characteristics.
 - i. For The Door, applicants should propose an outcome evaluation that assesses the overall program model, as well as the individual MAP and Bronx Academy sites. Thus, the evaluation should consider the effectiveness of The Door's wraparound model for foster youth relative to treatment as usual. In addition, the evaluation should

consider how differences in the two sites—and therefore, differences in participants’ experiences—may affect program implementation and outcomes

- ii. For Graham SLAM, applicants should propose an outcome evaluation of the Graham SLAM program relative to treatment as usual.
- c. **Cost-benefit Analysis:** Applicants may, but are not required to, propose a plan to collect and gather program data necessary to analyze the economic benefits and costs of the programs and initiative. Whether an applicant proposes a CBA is a factor that will be considered when scoring the proposals.

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 anticipated deliverables.

VI. Proposal Content and Format

Applicants are asked to structure their submission in multiple parts, listed below. Each lettered item (except item *I. Proposal Formatting and Length Requirements*) should be included as 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 (20 page maximum)

Applicants should propose an evaluation design that allows for understanding of the individual programs. Applicants may structure their proposal as they prefer, but it is recommended that each program be addressed separately, i.e., divided into two sections (one for each program) of approximately 10 pages each. In any case, each program will be subject to a process evaluation and outcome evaluation. Therefore, the applicant should address the research design, sources and methods of data collection, and measures of the process evaluation and outcome evaluation, as indicated below. Applicants may also propose a cost-benefit analysis for one or both of the programs.

The applicant should upload a single Evaluation Proposal file in the CJII Application Portal addressing the following components for the two programs to be evaluated.

1. **Research Review.** Applicants should conduct a review of relevant research, including notable gaps with regard to intervention components as well as methodological approaches.
2. **Design and Justification of Design**

- a. *Process evaluation.* Applicants should propose a process evaluation, outlining the design and key research questions. The process evaluation should aid understanding of program implementation and factors key to program success. Applicants should justify the proposed process evaluation design in light of the research in *Section VI.B.1*, including how the proposed process evaluation will add to understanding and knowledge in/of the field. Applicants are advised to provide a logic model connecting their proposed approach with the research questions and activities.
- b. *Outcome evaluation.* Applicants should outline their specific research questions, approach/design, and anticipated analytical techniques for the outcome evaluation, which should facilitate understanding of each program independently. The outcome evaluation should compare program participants to those who do not engage in programming, i.e., treatment as usual, as well as program completers to non-completers. The outcome evaluation should also include a stratified analysis of program effects based on participant differences in age, race, dosage, justice system involvement, and other characteristics. Applicants should justify the proposed outcome evaluation design in light of the research in *Section VI.B.1*, including how the proposed outcome evaluation will add to understanding and knowledge in/of the field. Applicants are advised to provide a logic model connecting their proposed approach with the research questions and activities. Graham Windham conducted an initial outcome analysis of the first cohort of 85 Graham SLAM participants who began programming in 2014; these initial findings will be shared with the evaluator to refine the design of the outcome evaluation.^{xxi}
 - i. *Approach to address selection bias.* Applicants are expected to develop a design to control for selection bias, as randomization will likely not be possible. Providers will likely exercise some authority in the selection of program participants/employees, which could introduce selection bias (e.g., from an application process). Selection bias should be mitigated by constructing a comparison group that is as similar as possible to the treatment group to best estimate the true effect of the program on the target population.
 - ii. *Power analysis.* Applicants should conduct a power analysis for the outcome evaluation as a whole, as well as for any specific program components or subpopulations for which outcomes would be evaluated. The power analysis should include a description of the minimum sample sizes and estimated power assuming small, medium, and large program effects.
- c. *Cost-benefit analysis (optional).* Applicants may propose specific research questions and an approach for a CBA. Applicants may propose a CBA that calculates the cost of the program and weighs that against the financial value of programming young people receive through the program (e.g., education, employment assistance, housing) as well as any other benefits arising from the program. If submitting a proposal for a CBA, applicants should justify the proposed cost-benefit analysis design in light of the research in *Section VI.B.1*,

including how the proposed CBA will add to understanding and knowledge in/of the field.

- 3. Data: Sources and Collection.** Applicants should anticipate that they will have access to program-related data (e.g., enrollment, attendance, services received) from the programs while clients are enrolled in and participating in the program. Applicants will also have access to program documents, such as those pertaining to program implementation (e.g., training manuals) as well as those produced for DANY and ISLG as a result of the initiative (e.g., implementation reports). In addition, applicants should identify additional sources of data (e.g., baseline survey, follow-up survey, interviews, administrative data) they propose to collect as part of the evaluation. The applicant will be responsible for collecting or securing such data. Such data may pertain to program participants, comparison group members, or both. Applicants should anticipate challenges associated with data collection and reporting (e.g., lack of expertise or software) and how they plan to address them. The cost of data collection and analysis should be incorporated into the budget and explained in the project narrative. Applicants should also include a research timeline with specific activities (e.g., survey of clients) for each quarter.
 - a. *Process evaluation.* For each of the proposed data sources, applicants should describe the specific sources (e.g., participants, program staff) from whom the data will be collected; sampling information, as relevant; and how each of the sources is relevant to the research questions.
 - b. *Outcome evaluation.* For each of the proposed data sources, applicants should describe the specific sources (e.g., agencies, people) from whom the data will be collected; sampling information, as relevant; and how each of the sources is relevant to the research questions.
 - c. *Cost-benefit analysis* (optional). For each of the proposed data sources, applicants should describe the specific sources (e.g., agencies, people) from whom the data will be collected; sampling information, as relevant; and how each of the sources is relevant to the research questions. If a CBA is not possible, (e.g., case management services vary greatly and the number of participants who complete the standard length of case management is lower than anticipated, or varies by focus population), what methods could be used to provide some indication of the program's value?
- 4. Measures.** Applicants should propose questions and relevant measures as part of their proposals. These preliminary measures will be finalized with feedback from the program, ISLG, and other relevant stakeholders.
 - a. *Process evaluation.* Sample measures are included below:
 - Clients served
 - Attendance rates
 - Client satisfaction
 - Client demographics
 - Program responsiveness
 - Dosage
 - Barriers to access
 - b. *Outcome evaluation.* Measures should include both short-/medium- term outcomes (e.g., service engagement) and long-term outcomes (e.g., well-

being). The outcome evaluation should examine outcomes related to health and well-being; education and employment; housing, and any other relevant domains. Sample outcome measures are included below:

- Education and Employment
 - Graduation from high school or college
 - Job placement and retention
 - Certifications earned
- Health
 - Emotional well-being
 - Physical well-being
- Social functioning
 - Sense of belonging
 - Secure attachments/relationships
- Justice system involvement
 - Arrest
 - Engagement in illegal activity
- Housing
 - Stable housing placements
 - Shelter stays

c. *Cost-benefit analysis* (optional). Sample measures are included below:

- Tangible and intangible costs and benefits, including the financial value of programming clients receive through the program.

5. Publication and Dissemination Strategy. Applicants should propose a plan for reporting on the findings of the process evaluation and outcome evaluation. Applicants may also propose a plan for reporting on the findings of a CBA, if they propose to conduct one for one or both programs. Anticipated deliverables, including publications, are listed in *Appendix 2*. Deliverables will be finalized in the course of contract negotiations.

C. Performance Measurement (6 page maximum)

Applicants should describe their current capacity and proposed methods for collecting performance data (see *Appendix 1* for more information on performance measurement) on their evaluation activities and progress. The selected applicant will be required to provide performance data to ISLG. Initial metrics will be finalized during the contracting phase and may be subject to change during the grant term, after discussion among all parties, based on evaluation implementation concerns, availability of data, and/or research needs.

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

1. Activities for each of the evaluation components (i.e., process and outcome, and optional CBA; see Exhibit 1 in *Appendix 1*);
2. Anticipated process and output measures for each activity for each quarter for the first year (sample information is included in Exhibit 1 in *Appendix 1* only as an example);
3. Methods of data collection for performance measurement (any costs related to data collection/analysis should be incorporated in the budget and explained in the budget narrative); and

4. Challenges associated with data collection and reporting (e.g., lack of expertise or software) and the way the applicant plans to address them.

The Performance Measurement section should not exceed six pages (double-spaced), including any tables and/or charts.

D. Organizational and Staff Capacity (8 page maximum)

Applicants should describe their organizational (i.e., technical, managerial, and financial) capacity to perform the work set forth in *Section VI*. The applicant should upload a single Organizational and Staff Capacity file for items 1 and 2 below in the CJII Application Portal. Nonetheless, applicants should address the following items in a way that provides evidence of organizational and staff capacity:

1. Resources that the applicant would use to conduct the evaluation, including partnerships (if applicable), the number of staff members, the proportion of each staff member's time that would be dedicated to the proposed evaluation, and technology (if applicable).
2. Description of the applicant's ability to collect and analyze data for all evaluation components, including the:
 - a. Process evaluation (as described in *Section VI.B*), such as interviews, surveys, observations/site visits, and other methods.
 - b. Outcome evaluation (as described in *Section VI.B*), such as interviews, surveys, administrative data analysis, and other methods.
 - c. CBA (optional, as described in *Section VI.B*), such as program expenditures, opportunity costs, and expected benefits of foster youth programs based on a set of assumptions about programs' goals, population flows, and outcomes.
3. Letters of support/commitment from partners, consultants, subcontractors, and/or other funders, as appropriate. Letters should be addressed to DANY and uploaded as a single file in the CJII Application Portal. Note that applicants should not request letters of support from ACS as part of this proposal.
4. A copy of the applicant's latest audit report or certified financial statement, or a statement as to why no report or statement is available. The audit report or financial statement should be uploaded as a single file in the CJII Application Portal.

E. Experience (8 page maximum)

Describe the successful relevant experience of the applicant, each proposed subcontractor or consultant (if any), and the proposed key staff in providing the work described in *Section VI.B*. The applicant should upload a single Experience file for items 1 through 7 in the CJII Application Portal. Applicants should specifically address or include the items listed below in a way that provides evidence of relevant experience for the programs the applicant is proposing to evaluate:

1. Explain how the applicant's current and/or previous work is relevant, and how its knowledge and experience will be leveraged in conducting the evaluation. How does the proposed evaluation relate to the applicant's overall mission and services?
2. Describe the applicant's experience working with current and former foster youth.

3. Describe the applicant's experience conducting evaluations related to the program approaches/models of the programs to be evaluated.
4. Describe the applicant's experience partnering with relevant community-based organizations and government agencies to secure administrative data, collect original data, and/or interpret data.
5. Describe the applicant's experience conducting multisite evaluations.
6. Describe the applicant's experience collecting and analyzing data for all evaluation components, including:
 - a. Process evaluations
 - b. Outcome evaluations
 - c. Cost-benefit analyses (optional), including with regard to collecting and analyzing data on program expenditures, opportunity costs, and expected benefits of foster youth programs on a set of assumptions about the programs' goals, population flows, and outcomes.
7. List the key program staff and the role(s) each will fill. What are the qualifications for staff in each role? Do staff have experience related to the population and/or type of programs to be included in this evaluation?
8. Attach resumes of key staff who will be involved in the evaluation. Resumes should be uploaded as a single file in the CJII Application Portal.

The Experience section should not exceed eight pages (double-spaced) total, excluding resumes of key staff.

F. Evaluation Budget

Applicants should provide a budget outlining their proposed use of funding. The budget should include a proposed breakdown of funds for process evaluation, outcome evaluation, and CBA (optional), broken down by year.

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 (see *Sections VII.B* and *VII.C*).

G. Evaluation Budget Narrative (3 page maximum)

Applicants should provide a budget narrative that corresponds to the budget. The Evaluation Budget Narrative should link the proposed costs to the proposed evaluation components and activities and outline any assumptions on which the budget is based. Applicants should specify the types of expenses included as indirect costs, and describe how they determine whether to charge an expense as an indirect versus a direct cost. Applicants should also describe funding needs on an annual basis over the length of the funding period (funding may vary by year).

The Evaluation Budget Narrative should not exceed three pages (double-spaced), including any tables and/or charts.

H. Fiscal Sponsorship Documentation (if applicable)

As noted, for-profits, non-profits, and government agencies are eligible to apply. Non-profits without 501(c)(3) status are required to have a fiscal sponsor in place upon proposal submission. In such instances, applicants should state the name of the fiscal sponsor; outline the responsibilities of the fiscal sponsor; and outline their obligations to the fiscal sponsor. Applicants should also submit any fiscal sponsorship agreement. If the applicant has a fiscal sponsor, any fees charged by the sponsor should be included and clearly labeled in the budget.

I. Proposal Formatting and Length Requirements

Applicants should adhere to the following formatting requirements:

- All submissions should be double-spaced, using standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with 1-inch margins. Applications submitted with single spacing will be converted to double spacing, and the length restrictions specified below will be applied to the documents reformatted for double spacing.
- Charts, figures, tables, footnotes, endnotes, and references do not need to be double-spaced, but are included in any restrictions on length described below, unless otherwise noted.
- Pages should be paginated.
- Length restrictions:
 - The Cover Letter (*Section VI.A*) is not restricted by length.
 - The Evaluation Proposal (*Section VI.B*) should not exceed 20 pages (double-spaced), including any tables and charts. Only the first 20 pages of the Evaluation Proposal will be read and scored by the proposal evaluation team.
 - The Performance Measurement Section (*VI.C*) should not exceed six pages (double-spaced), including any tables. Only the first three pages for each program will be read and scored by the proposal evaluation team.
 - Sections 1 and 2 of the Organizational and Staff Capacity Section (*VI.D*) should not exceed eight pages (double-spaced). Only the first eight pages will be read and scored by the proposal evaluation team. The letters of support/commitment and the applicant's latest audit report or certified financial statement are not restricted by length.
 - Sections 1 through 7 of the Experience Section (*VI.E*) should not exceed eight pages (double-spaced). Only the first eight pages will be read and scored by the proposal evaluation team. Resumes of key staff are not restricted by length.
 - The Evaluation Budget (*Section VI.F*) is not restricted by length.
 - The Evaluation Budget Narrative Section (*VI.G*) should not exceed three pages (double-spaced). Only the first three pages of the Evaluation Budget Narrative will be read and scored by the proposal evaluation team.
 - The Fiscal Sponsorship documentation (*Section VI.H*), if applicable, is 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 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 DANY to be non-responsive will be rejected. A proposal 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, DANY 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. Whether an applicant proposes a cost-benefit analysis component to their evaluation is a factor that will be considered will be considered by the evaluation team. 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.

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

B. Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria will be used to identify the winning proposal, alongside other goals/priorities of CJII and this initiative:

- Evaluation Proposal – 55%
- Organizational and Staff Capacity – 20%
- Experience – 20%
- Budget and Budget Narrative – 5%

C. Basis for Contract Award

The contract award will be made to the applicant whose proposal is determined by DANY 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 DANY and the selected applicant.

VIII. Appendices

Appendix 1: Performance Measurement

The funded applicant will be required to provide performance data to ISLG on a quarterly basis regarding their evaluation activities and progress. 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 as part of *Section VI.C. Performance Measurement*:

1. Activities for each of the evaluation components (i.e., process and outcome, and optional CBA);
2. Anticipated process and output measures for each activity for each quarter for the first year;
3. Methods of data collection for performance measurement (any costs related to data collection/analysis should be incorporated in the budget and explained in the budget narrative); and
4. 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 | Activity | Process Measure & Target | Output Measure & Target | Data Source(s) |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|--------------------------|
| Outcome Evaluation | 1a) Collect baseline survey with sample size of sufficient power | 1a) Q1: Percentage of participants for whom baseline survey data are collected prior to program enrollment: 85% | 1a) Q1: Number of program participants for whom survey data are collected prior to program enrollment: 128 | Administrative Data |
| | | 1a) Q2: | 1a) Q2: | |
| | | 1a) Q3: | 1a) Q3: | |
| | | 1a) Q4: | 1a) Q4: | |
| | 1b) | 1b) Q1: | 1b) Q1: | Program records; surveys |
| | | 1b) Q2: | 1b) Q2: | |
| | | 1b) Q3: | 1b) Q3: | |
| | | 1b) Q4: | 1b) Q4: | |
| Process Evaluation | 2a) Conduct interviews with representative sample | 2a) Q1: Percentage of interview sample who are high-risk adolescents: 55% | 2a) Q1: Number of interview sample members who are high-risk adolescents: 25 | Administrative Data |
| | | 2b) Q2: | 2b) Q2: | |
| | | 2b) Q3: | 2b) Q3: | |
| | | 2b) Q4: | 2b) Q4: | |
| Cost-Benefit Analysis (optional) | 3a) Collect program expenditure data with sample size of sufficient power | 3a) Q1: Percentage of participants for whom data on tangible and intangible expenses per participant are collected: 80% | 3a) Q1: Number of participants for whom data on tangible and intangible expenses per participant are collected: 120 | Administrative Data |
| | | 3a) Q2: | 3a) Q2: | |
| | | 3a) Q3: | 3a) Q3: | |
| | | 3a) Q4: | 3a) Q4: | |

Appendix 2: Anticipated Deliverables

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

Exhibit 2. Anticipated 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"> • Evaluation updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E.g., Changes to approach, progress in data collection and analysis at variable level ○ Outcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E.g., Changes to approach, progress in data collection and analysis at variable level ○ Cost-benefit analysis (optional) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E.g., Changes to approach, progress in obtaining cost data ○ Successes ○ Setbacks and challenges (e.g., instructor turnover) • Corrective action plans (as needed) to address specific challenges, ensure short-term goals and full implementation are achieved • Goals for next quarter | Twice per year |
| 3 | Operational costs status report | Financial reports | Quarterly |
| 4 | Mid-evaluation report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synthesis of status reports from first two years of the evaluation, including summary of status reports at variable level • Initial and ongoing findings of process, outcome, and cost-benefit (optional) evaluations • Outstanding challenges and plans to address them | End of 2 years |
| 5 | Final report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full findings from process, outcome, and cost-benefit (optional) evaluations • Recommendations for foster youth development policy and practice, as informed by the evaluations | End of 4 years |

Appendix 3: Additional Information on Programs to be Evaluated

Program 1. The Door: Manhattan Academy Plus (MAP)

Evidence Base

Positive Youth Development

Adolescence is defined by complex and far-reaching biological, cognitive, emotional, and social changes.^{xxii} The positive youth development framework (PYD)^{xxiii} emphasizes the importance of assets, opportunities, and resources to healthy adolescent development. PYD approaches facilitate the prevention of undesired behaviors and outcomes in a way that also supports holistic youth development by focusing on young people's strengths rather than solely or predominantly on risk and delinquency. As such, PYD approaches support youth in developing a sense of competence, self-worth, and empowerment, thereby supporting positive behavior throughout life.^{xxiv}

One meta-analysis of PYD interventions included 24 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with 23,528 total participants ages ten to sixteen.^{xxv} The studies varied with regard to programs/interventions (e.g., mentoring, community service projects, academic assistance), control groups (e.g., standard alcohol and drug education, alternative treatment, wait lists), and outcome measures (e.g., problem behaviors⁸; academic improvement and school adjustment; and sexual risk behaviors/pregnancy). The meta-analysis found that PYD interventions had a small but significant positive effect on academic achievement and psychological adjustment; but no significant effect on unsafe sexual activity, problem behaviors or positive social behaviors. These findings, however, are limited by the performance, selection, and detection biases in the studies; and the heterogeneity of the samples, outcomes, and intervention types included in the meta-analysis. In addition, the meta-analysis did not examine foster care populations specifically.

Wraparound Approaches

Current best practices for working with young people emphasize the importance of wraparound approaches,^{xxvi} which coordinate family, community, school, and agency resources based on a young person's individualized needs and strengths. This collaboration can be reflected in specially-tailored service plans which prevail upon local resources, interventions, and other community based supports in conjunction with assistance from friends, family, and other members of youth's social networks.^{xxvii} Although evidence for wraparound models tailored to youth aging out of foster care is not yet available, such approaches have been found to be effective for the foster youth population as a whole.

One study randomly assigned foster youth ages 7 to 15 to the Fostering Individualized Assistance Program (FIAP; *n*=54), a wraparound effort including clinical case management and individualized service strategies, or to standard practice (SP; *n*=78) foster care.^{xxviii} After 15 months of participation, FIAP youth were significantly less likely than SP youth to have experienced placement disruptions while in care. In addition, FIAP youth spent significantly fewer days as runaways and as incarcerated compared to those in SP. The evidence, fidelity to

⁸ Problem behaviors in this meta-analysis included, but were not limited to, dropping out of school, substance abuse, antisocial attitudes, and violence.

the wraparound model varied over time due to weaknesses identified during implementation and subsequent modifications to the program. The study authors noted that disparities across program staff weakened fidelity to the wraparound model. Moreover, the foster care system (i.e., the basis of the SP group) underwent statewide reorganization halfway through the study, resulting in a high caseworker turnover rate but also the receipt of millions of dollars by the child welfare system.

In addition, a quasi-experimental study examined the pilot of Project WIN (Wraparound in Nevada), a program designed to involve families and other support systems in a strengths-based plan for foster youth with severe emotional disturbances (SED).^{xxix} Thirty-three youth were enrolled in Project WIN and matched with 32 youth receiving traditional casework and mental health services. Results demonstrated that 27 of the 33 Project WIN youth transferred to less restrictive living arrangements after 18 months compared to only 12 of the 32 youth receiving traditional services. Furthermore, family members became permanent caregivers for 11 of wraparound youth, but only 6 of the 32 youth receiving traditional care. The wraparound group also demonstrated greater improvements in mental health after six months compared to those participating in traditional programming. Despite these positive results, the small sample sizes and lack of long-term measurement must be considered. Nevertheless, the results support the use of wraparound strategies for foster youth, particularly those with emotional or behavioral challenges.

Mental Health Interventions

SPARCS

Structured Psychotherapy for Adolescents Responding to Chronic Stress (SPARCS) was designed to treat adolescents with multiple exposures to trauma and who are struggling to regulate emotions, control impulses, and form or manage social relationships. It aims to reduce PTSD symptoms by describing the effects traumatic stress has on the body, and by teaching adolescents effective coping, interpersonal, and problem-solving skills.^{xxx} One study sought to evaluate and compare three evidence-based treatments in a racially heterogeneous sample of 216 clients ages 3 to 18 from a foster care program in Illinois. The treatments included Child Parent Psychotherapy (CPP; $n=65$), Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT; $n=35$), and SPARCS ($n=33$), and included treatment lengths ranging from 12 weeks to one year. Clinician-administered assessment tools revealed that all three treatment modalities were effective across racial groups, with SPARCS having a greater impact for African American youth than for other racial groups. Specifically, SPARCS significantly improved trauma stress symptoms, life domain functioning, and risk behaviors. Although these results are promising, limitations of this study include lack of randomization to treatments, large age variation among participants, and small sample sizes. Future research should also examine SPARCS specifically among young adults transitioning to adulthood from the foster care system.

TF-CBT

Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT) is a mental health treatment approach for children and young adults with histories of trauma, including numerous foster care placements. Components of TF-CBT include trauma processing, psychoeducation, stress management, and coping strategies, among others.^{xxxi} As previously described, one study

examined TF-CBT, SPARCS, and CPP in a racially heterogeneous sample of 216 foster children and adolescents. Although data showed that all three treatment modalities were effective treatment options, TF-CBT had a larger impact for White and African American youth compared to Hispanic and Biracial youth. Specifically, TF-CBT was associated with significant improvements in trauma stress symptoms, behavioral and emotional needs, and identification of personal strengths.^{xxxii} As indicated, the results of this study are limited by the failure to randomly assign participants to groups, the age differences among participants, and small sample sizes.

STAIR/NST

Skills Training in Affective and Interpersonal Regulation/Narrative Story-Telling (STAIR/NST) is a mental health treatment model that primarily aims to lessen the severity of depressive, dissociative, PTSD and other symptomology related to trauma. STAIR/NST is comprised of two components: first, STAIR takes place in individual or group settings and emphasizes the development of skills associated with affect (i.e., emotion) regulation, communication, positive self-perception, and goal-setting. In the second component, NST, individuals describe their traumas in detail to allow for emotional processing and the personal development of long-term goals.^{xxxiii} One RCT evaluated three variations of the STAIR/NST model among a sample of 104 adult women with PTSD related to childhood abuse.^{xxxiv} Specifically, participants were randomly assigned to STAIR/NST, STAIR followed by supportive counseling (STAIR/SC), or supportive counseling with NST (SC/NST). STAIR/NST resulted in a greater and more rapid decline in dissociative and PTSD symptoms compared to STAIR/SC or SC/NST. In addition, those who participated in STAIR/NST continued to experience relief from their dissociative symptoms at six months follow-up whereas those in STAIR/SC remained at the same level of improvement, and the SC/NST group experienced a significant increase in symptoms. The small sample size, however, limits the generalizability of these results, and it is uncertain whether STAIR/NST could be an appropriate treatment option for those with more significant dissociative disorders. Future studies should also employ adolescent and young adult samples with histories of child welfare involvement in order to determine if STAIR/NST is an appropriate mental health intervention.

Another study examined the use of STAIR-A, an abbreviated treatment module designed for adolescents, among a racially heterogeneous sample of 46 girls ages 11 to 16 who, on average, had experienced nearly eleven distressing events in their lifetimes.^{xxxv} Half ($n=23$) of the participants received STAIR-A treatment in a school-based setting whereas the other half ($n=23$) did not participate in any treatment. Those in the STAIR-A condition began with psychoeducation, coping strategies, role-playing, emotion regulation, and communication skills, followed by the creation of individual trauma narratives. Data showed that those in the intervention condition reported a significant decline in depressive symptoms and a marginally significant reduction in anxiety. Girls in the STAIR-A intervention also demonstrated substantial enhancement in resilience at post-treatment. Notably, this study is limited by differences in racial demographics between groups, small sample sizes, lack of random assignment, and its reliance on self-report measures. Participants' prior involvement in foster care, if any, was also not discussed.

Program 2. Graham Windham: Graham SLAM (Support, Lead, Achieve, Model)

Evidence Base

Clinical Mental Health Interventions

Cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) is an evidence-based⁹ therapeutic model that has consistently shown to be effective in treating myriad emotional and behavioral challenges among adolescents and young adults.^{xxxvi} CBT aims to identify negative beliefs and transform them into healthier, more constructive thought patterns.^{xxxvii} CBT administered in group settings has become a common treatment option for adolescents experiencing a range of behavioral or mental health disorders, particularly those with attachment problems. One study sought to examine the effects of a brief cognitive-behavioral group treatment in enhancing skills related to coping and emotional regulation for child welfare-involved adolescents with a history of attachment challenges. Nine males and five females ages 10 to 17 were divided into one of four sex-segregated therapy groups for six weeks. Self-reported pre- and post-intervention measures indicated that CBT was associated with substantial improvements in anger management, anti-social conduct, and emotional difficulties.^{xxxviii} The small sample sizes, however, limit the generalizability of the results, and the large age ranges limit conclusions about CBT's efficacy in treating those in different stages of adolescence. Regardless, these results provide evidence that CBT is an appropriate treatment option for youth and young adults with former or current foster care involvement.

Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (TF-CBT), adapted from CBT, is a mental health treatment approach for children and young adults with histories of trauma, including numerous foster care placements. Components of TF-CBT include trauma processing, psychoeducation, stress management, and coping strategies, among others.^{xxxix} One study sought to evaluate and compare three evidence-based treatments in a racially heterogeneous sample of 216 clients ages 3 to 18 from a foster care program in Illinois. The treatments included Child Parent Psychotherapy (CPP; $n=65$), Structured Psychotherapy for Adolescents Responding to Chronic Stress (SPARCS; $n=33$), and TF-CBT ($n=35$), and encompassed treatment lengths ranging from 12 weeks to one year. Clinician-administered assessment tools revealed all three treatment modalities were effective across racial domains, with TF-CBT having the greatest impact on White and African American youth. Specifically, TF-CBT was associated with significant improvements in trauma stress symptoms, behavioral and emotional needs, and identification of personal strengths.^{xl} Although these results are promising, limitations of this study include lack of randomization to treatments, large age variation among participants, and small sample sizes. Future research should also examine TF-CBT specifically among young adults transitioning to adulthood from the foster care system.

Motivational interviewing (MI) is a goal-focused clinical intervention that assumes that behavioral change can occur if motivation is supported and engaged within an individual.^{xli} By using a person-centered conversation style, the clinician guides the individual toward a specific goal as opposed to general self-exploration in non-directive counseling styles.^{xlii} One systematic

⁹ Evidence-supported treatments (ESTs) are psychological treatments that have demonstrated to be effective in controlled clinical trials, whereas evidence-based psychological practices (EBPPs) have repeatedly shown to be effective in multiple randomized control trials, typically across different populations.

review and meta-analysis included 15 studies ($n=1,610$) with samples of young people ages 10 to college-age (mean = 18.86 years), and compared an MI-intervention to an unspecified control condition on health behavior outcomes (e.g., sexual risk behavior, physical activity).^{xliii} The findings demonstrated that MI interventions resulted in small yet statistically significant effects across behavioral outcomes. Not all of the studies included in the analysis, however, were randomized controlled trials (RCTs) or included racially heterogeneous samples. The majority of the studies also failed to describe the training of clinicians who administered the MI intervention. Similarly, another systematic review and meta-analysis ($n=1,466$) found that MI was not successful in reducing adolescent drug use. Although the same review found that MI may have positively influenced motivation to change behaviors, the authors noted that possible publication bias reduced certainty in this finding.^{xliiv} Future research of MI should include heterogeneous samples of transition-age youth in the foster care system and employ more rigorous designs to enhance the external validity of the results.

Social Work Models

Solutions-based casework (SBC) is a child welfare practice model based on three assumptions: First, full collaboration between case workers and the family is essential for each case. Second, such collaboration should consider the daily activities of each family.^{xliiv} Third, solutions to challenges in family dynamics should emphasize the skills necessary to prevent family challenges from arising. One study of 4,559 public child welfare cases in Kentucky examined the effects of the SBC model on priority federal outcomes related to child safety, permanency, and well-being. Stronger adherence to the SBC model was found to be related to significantly better results compared to those who demonstrated little to no adherence to the SBC model. Limitations of this study, however, include lack of random assignment to conditions, differences in model fidelity across cases, and lack of detail on the sample, including age and race. Further research should examine outcomes among older youth of various racial/ethnic backgrounds.

Peer-Based Therapeutic Interventions

Positive Peer Culture (PPC) is a group therapeutic model grounded on the belief that a youth's social group has the potential to facilitate behavior change. Originally developed for delinquent youth residing in juvenile or other group facilities, PPC holds that if troubled adolescents are encouraged to develop their inherent strengths, they may effect positive change in themselves and others.^{xlivi} PPC expects youth to commit to core social values, such as being thoughtful of others, which may develop into positive self-image, increased awareness of one's abilities, and improved capacity for sensible decision-making.^{xlvii} Rigorous research examining the efficacy of PPC in producing positive change among foster youth is lacking, though a few studies have employed samples of juveniles in PPC-based groups. One German study of 163 adjudicated males in a residential setting found that youth in PPC groups experienced a significant reduction of violence and an increased sense of self-worth and willingness to help others.^{xlviii} Another article discussed a school-based PPC curriculum for those in foster care or juvenile residential settings, but we were not able to access the original article.^{xlix} Thus, there is a great need for research that evaluates PPC groups among samples of current and former foster youth.

The Citizens Intervention (CI) is another intervention for criminally-involved persons with co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse issues, but which nonetheless may be instructive for some youth transitioning out of foster care, which involves peer mentor support in group

settings.¹ Over the course of five months, participants learn how to access community resources, develop supportive relationships with members of the community, and collaborate on a shared project with other group members, among other activities. CI provides the opportunity for members to form trustworthy relationships that aid in the fulfillment of personal and shared goals. One study randomly assigned 73 participants to CI with standard services and 41 to standard services alone.¹⁰ Questionnaires were administered to clients in both conditions before treatment as well as six and twelve months after program completion. Results after the 12-month follow-up showed that although both groups reported reductions in drug use and interactions with the criminal justice system, the CI group also lowered their alcohol consumption compared to the standard services group. Notably, the CI was developed exclusively for those with substantial mental health challenges, substance use issues, and criminal justice histories; although these issues are relevant to some foster youth, they do not apply to all foster youth transitioning to adulthood. Moreover, the average age of participants in the study was 39 years.

Similarly, the Network Therapeutic Community (“Network”), developed for persons in prison or reintegrating into society, is grounded in peer-support activities with an emphasis on developing a supportive environment and modifying harmful behaviors. Its philosophy holds that criminal behavior and substance abuse are destructive ways by which individuals attempt to fulfill their needs. By participating in a shared community experience, clients develop respect for themselves and others, leading to positive behavioral change and the instilment of prosocial attitudes.^{li} No evaluation thus far has examined the effectiveness of the model, nor has it been adapted for the foster youth population elsewhere. As noted in the Program Description (*Section IV.B.4.b*), this model forms the basis of one of the components of Graham Windham’s program.

Peer-Based Workforce Programs

CareerLaunch is a job readiness program offered by the Boys and Girls Clubs of America for youth ages 13 to 18. Designed for a small group setting, CareerLaunch consists of 22 activities that prepare youth for employment by providing the opportunity to explore career paths based on personal interests, introducing hard and soft skills for finding and maintaining employment, and creating a long-term career plan.^{lii} In a multisite evaluation, pre- and post-test online survey results showed that participants significantly improved their scores on most career activities such as setting attainable short-term goals, obtaining letters of reference, and preparing for job interviews. In addition, youth significantly improved their understanding of how to search for jobs; develop cover letters and resumes; search college programs; and behave in a workplace. Youth were also reported by staff members to be more confident in their abilities, better able to identify barriers to employment and ways to surmount them, and better prepared to plan for career- and education-related goals.^{liii} These findings, however, are limited by the non-experimental evaluation design, and do not include longer-term outcomes such as job employment or graduation from academic programs. Moreover, the study did not note whether any participants were currently or formerly foster-involved.

Finally, Young Adult Work Opportunities for Rewarding Careers (YA WORC) is an evidence informed, strengths-based approach designed by the Columbia University School of Social Work’s Workplace Center. Its purpose is to aid marginalized youth in developing an

¹⁰ Standard services encompassed individual case and medication management, jail diversion services, as well as individual and group mental health and substance use treatment.

individualized career plan. It offers lessons on core skills necessary to succeed in the workplace and provides the social support needed to secure and retain employment.^{liv} *Career Club*, a curricular component of YA WORC, will form part of Graham Windham's Graham SLAM program.

Career Club allows young participants to meet in an emotionally supportive environment to discuss potential career paths, receive constructive feedback, and gain knowledge in seeking and securing work. Internal evaluations of YA WORC as a whole have been conducted by the Workplace Center across California, Rhode Island, and New York, and have revealed promising outcomes. In New York City, for instance, young adult program participants with mental health challenges were more likely to be employed (33%) by the end of the program cycle than those who did not participate at all (15%). Moreover, YA WORC students had a higher likelihood of being competitively employed (63%) compared to those youth who obtained a job without the assistance of YA WORC (32%).^{lv} Publicly accessible evaluations of YA WORC incorporating samples of foster youth in particular, however, are not yet available. Moreover, evaluations of specific modules are not readily available, and thus, it is unknown whether *Career Club* as a specific module would result in the outcomes observed for the program more broadly.

Appendix 4: Key Contract Terms

Publicity

Contractor shall submit to ISLG and DANY for review and comment any statements to the press, reports, publications or research papers based on the work performed pursuant to this Contract prior to publication by Contractor or any of its employees, servants, agents or independent contractors, either during or after expiration or termination of this Contract.

ISLG and DANY shall have thirty (30) days from receipt to (1) identify any factual errors or inaccuracies and provide information or corrections regarding them, and (2) suggest any additional contextual information that might aid in interpretation of the findings. Contractor may amend such statements, reports, publications, or research papers based on ISLG's and DANY's comments.

Unless directed otherwise by DANY, Contractor shall state in any such statements, press, reports, publications, or research papers based on the work performed pursuant to this Contract, in a prominent place: “[Program name] is funded [in part] by the New York County District Attorney’s Criminal Justice Investment Initiative (CJII). For more information on CJII please visit: www.cjii.org.”

Rights in Data and Copyrights

Except for any pre-existing intellectual property used by Contractor and all PII, all copyrightable works (including but not limited to reports, compilations of data, software or pictorial or graphics) created or prepared by 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 DANY and all copyright rights therein are expressly intended to be wholly owned and the copyright to be held by DANY. To the extent that any such copyrightable works may not, by operation of law, be works for hire, Contractor hereby assigns to DANY the ownership of copyright in such items and DANY shall have the right to obtain and hold in its own name copyrights, registrations and similar protection which may be available in such items (except for any pre-existing intellectual property used by Contractor). Contractor agrees to give DANY or its designees all assistance reasonably required to perfect such rights. All PII shall remain the property of Contractor.

Contractor shall have a perpetual, non-exclusive, irrevocable, royalty-free, noncommercial right and license to use all such works submitted by Contractor as deliverables in accordance with the Scope of Services or otherwise. Such license shall not be transferable except with permission from DANY. Contractor may request the same type of license to other materials produced by Contractor in the course of performing the Contract, which license DANY shall not unreasonably withhold.

Publication

Contractor agrees to consult with ISLG prior to publication or other disclosure of the results of the work produced under this Contract to ensure that no proprietary information is being released and for protection of DANY's patent rights. Proposed publications based on the work performed pursuant to this Contract shall be submitted to ISLG for review thirty (30) days prior to publication. ISLG shall have thirty (30) days from receipt to review the publication and to advise of any changes necessary to prevent the release of proprietary information.

Appendix 5: Reference

- ⁱ New York City Administration for Children’s Services. (2016). *About ACS*. Retrieved September 1, 2016, from <http://www1.nyc.gov/site/acs/about/about.page>
- ⁱⁱ NYC Caregiver. (2006). *Permanency planning*. Retrieved December 3, 2015, from http://www.nyc.gov/html/caregiver/grandparenting_2f.html
- ⁱⁱⁱ New York City Administration for Children’s Services (ACS). *Foster care discharges of youth 12 and older*. Strategic Management Report. Provided by ACS to ISLG on August 5, 2016.
- ^{iv} Yaroni, A., Wetts, R., & Ross, T. (2010, May). *The Academy: A program for older youth transitioning out of foster care*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice. Retrieved from https://storage.googleapis.com/vera-web-assets/downloads/Publications/the-academy-a-program-for-older-youth-transitioning-out-of-foster-care/legacy_downloads/Heckscher-Academy-report-final.pdf.
- ^v Greeson, J. K. P., Briggs, E. C., Kisiel, C. L., Layne, C. M., Ake, G. S., Ko, S. J., Gerrity, E. T. Steinberg, A. M., Howard, M. L., Pynoos, R. S., & Fairbank, J.A. (2011). Complex trauma and mental health in children and adolescents placed in foster care: Findings from the National Child Traumatic Stress Network. *Child Welfare*, 90(6), 91–108.
- ^{vi} Kramer, T. L., Sigel, B. A., Connors–Burrow, N. A., Savary, P. E., & Tempel, A. (2013). A statewide introduction of trauma–informed care in a child welfare system. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 35(1), 19–24.
- Greeson et al. (2011).
- ^{vii} Gonzalez, M.J. (2014). Mental health care of families affected by the child welfare system. *Child Welfare*, 93(1), 7-57.
- ^{viii} Beyerlein, B.A., & Bloch, E. (2014). Need for trauma-informed care within the foster care system: A policy issue. *Child Welfare*, 93(3), 7-21.
- ^{ix} Courtney, M.E., Dworsky, A., Brown, A., Cary, C., Love, K., & Vorhies, V. (2011). *Midwest evaluation of the adult functioning of former foster youth: Outcomes at age 26*. Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago. Retrieved from [www.chapinhall.org/sites/default/files/Midwest%20Evaluation Report 4 10 12.pdf](http://www.chapinhall.org/sites/default/files/Midwest%20Evaluation%20Report%204%2010%2012.pdf).
- ^x Provided by New York City Administration for Children’s Services to ISLG on August 16, 2016.
- ^{xi} Hilliard, T. (2013, February). *Foster youth and the workforce: Next steps*. New York: Center for an Urban Future. Retrieved from [https://nycfuture.org/pdf/Foster Youth and the Workforce.pdf](https://nycfuture.org/pdf/Foster_Youth_and_the_Workforce.pdf).
- ^{xii} New York City Administration for Children’s Services (ACS). (2016). *High school graduation rates of youth in foster care annual report 2016*. Retrieved from <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/acs/pdf/data-analysis/2017/HSGRatesOfYouthInFCAnnualReport2016.pdf>.
- ^{xiii} Hilliard, T. (2011, September). *Fostering careers*. New York: Center for an Urban Future. Retrieved from [https://nycfuture.org/pdf/Fostering Careers.pdf](https://nycfuture.org/pdf/Fostering_Careers.pdf).
- ^{xiv} Hilliard, T. (2011).
- ^{xv} New York City Administration for Children’s Services (ACS). (2018, May). *Report of the Interagency Foster Care Task Force*. Retrieved from <http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/acs/pdf/testimony/2018/TaskForceReport.pdf>.
- ^{xvi} Fedcap Rehabilitation Services, Inc. (2013). *PrepNOW!*. New York, NY. Retrieved from <http://prepnw.fedcap.org/>.
- ^{xvii} New York State Office of Children and Family Services. (n.d.). *Kinship: Background and process*. Retrieved from <http://ocfs.ny.gov/kinship/kingap.asp>.
- ^{xviii} FosterClub. (2017). *Permanency pact*. Seaside, OR. Retrieved from <http://store.fosterclub.com/permanency-pact>.
- ^{xix} National Resource Center for Diligent Recruitment. (2017). *Child-specific recruitment*. Retrieved from <http://www.nrcdr.org/placement-stability-and-permanency/ideas-from-the-field/child-specific-recruitment>.
- ^{xx} National Institute for Permanent Family Connectedness. (2017). *What is family finding and permanency*. Retrieved from <http://www.familyfinding.org/index.html>.
- ^{xxi} Graham Windham. (2016). *Graham SLAM cohort analysis: Progress of first cohort (April 2014-June 2015), as of December 2016*. Provided by Graham Windham to ISLG on June 11, 2017.
- ^{xxii} Ciocanel, O., Power, K., Eriksen, A., & Gillings, K. (2017). Effectiveness of positive youth development interventions: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 46(3), 483-504.
- ^{xxiii} Benson, P.L., Scales, P.C., Hamilton, S.F., & Sesma, A. (2006). *Positive Youth Development: Theory, research, and applications*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. Catalano, R. F., Berglund, M.L., Ryan, J.A.M., Lonczak, H.S., & Hawkins, J.D. (2002). Positive Youth Development in the United States: Research findings on evaluations of Positive Youth Development programs. *Prevention and Treatment*, 5(15).

-
- Durlak, J.A. (1998). Common risk and protective factors in successful prevention programs. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 68(4), 512-520. Lerner, R.M., Almerigi, J.B., Theokas, C., & Lerner, J.V. (2005). Positive Youth Development. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 25(1), 10-16.
- ^{xxiv} Ciocanel et al. (2017).
- ^{xxv} Ciocanel et al. (2017).
- ^{xxvi} Farmer, T.W., & Farmer, E.M.Z. (2001). Developmental science, systems of care, and prevention of emotional and behavioral problems in youth. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 71 (2), 171. Hoagwood, K., Burns, B.J., Kiser, L., Ringeisen, H., & Schoenwald, S.K. (2014). Evidence-based practice in child and adolescent mental health services. *Psychiatric Services*. McEvoy, A., & Welker, R. (2000). Antisocial behavior, academic failure, and school climate: A critical review. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 8(3), 130-140. Spear, L.P. (2000). The adolescent brain and age-related behavioral manifestations. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 24(4), 417-463. Sprague, J., & Walker, H. (2000). Early identification and intervention for youth with antisocial and violent behavior. *Exceptional Children*, 66(3), 367-379.
- ^{xxvii} Bruns, E.J., Burchard, J.D., Suter, J.C., Leverentz-Brady, K., & Force, M.M. (2004). Assessing fidelity to a community-based treatment for youth: The wraparound fidelity index. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 12, 79-89.
- ^{xxviii} Clark, H.B., Lee, B., Prange, M., & McDonald, B. (1996). Children lost within the foster care system: Can wraparound service strategies improve placement outcomes? *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 5(1), 39-54.
- ^{xxix} Bruns, E.J., Rast, J., Peterson, C., Walker, J., & Bosworth, J. (2006). Spreadsheets, service providers, and the statehouse: Using data and the wraparound process to reform systems for children and families. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(3-4), 201-212.
- ^{xxx} Weiner, D.A., Schneider, A., & Lyons, J.S. (2009). Evidence-based treatments for trauma among culturally diverse foster care youth: treatment retention and outcomes. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(11), 1199-1205.
- ^{xxxi} Gonzalez, M.J. (2014). Mental health care of families affected by the child welfare system. *Child Welfare*, 93(1), 7-57.
- ^{xxxii} Weiner, D.A., Schneider, A., & Lyons, J.S. (2009).
- ^{xxxiii} National Child Traumatic Stress Network (NCTSN). (n.d.). *Skills training in affective and interpersonal regulation/narrative story-telling (STAIR/NST)*. Retrieved from http://www.nctsn.org/sites/default/files/assets/pdfs/STAIRNST_2-11-05.pdf.
- ^{xxxiv} Cloitre, Marylène, Petkova, E., Wang, J., Lu, F. (2012). An examination of the influence of a sequential treatment on the course and impact of dissociation among women with PTSD related to childhood abuse. *Depression and Anxiety*, 29(8), 709-717.
- ^{xxxv} Gudiño, O.G., Leonard, S., & Cloitre, M. (2016). STAIR-A for girls: a pilot study of a skills-based group for traumatized youth in an urban school setting. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Trauma*, 9(1), 67-79.
- ^{xxxvi} Hofmann, S. G., Asnaani, A., Vonk, I. J. J., Sawyer, A. T., & Fang, A. (2012). The efficacy of cognitive behavioural therapy: a review of meta-analyses. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 36, 427-440.
- ^{xxxvii} National Alliance on Mental Illness. (n.d.). *Psychotherapy*. Retrieved from <https://www.nami.org/Learn-More/Treatment/Psychotherapy>.
- ^{xxxviii} Cone, J.C., Golden, J.A., & Hall, C.W. (2009). The effect of short-term cognitive-behavioral group therapy on adolescents with attachment difficulties. *Behavioral Development Bulletin*, 15(1), 29-35.
- ^{xxxix} Gonzalez, M.J. (2014). Mental health care of families affected by the child welfare system. *Child Welfare*, 93(1), 7-57.
- ^{xl} Weiner, D.A., Schneider, A., & Lyons, J.S. (2009). Evidence-based treatments for trauma among culturally diverse foster care youth: treatment retention and outcomes. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(11), 1199-1205.
- ^{xli} Kohler, S., & Hofmann, A. (2015). Can motivational interviewing in emergency care reduce alcohol consumption in young people? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Alcohol and Alcoholism*, 50(2), 107-117.
- ^{xlii} Li, L., Zhu, S., Tse, N., Tse, S., Wong, P. (2016). Effectiveness of motivational interviewing to reduce drug use in adolescents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Addiction*, 111(5), 795-805.
- ^{xliii} Cushing, C.C., Jensen, C.D., Miller, M.B., & Leffingwell, T.R. (2014). Meta-analysis of motivational interviewing for adolescent health behavior: Efficacy beyond substance use. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 82(6), 1212-1218.
- ^{xliiv} Li et al. (2016).

-
- ^{xlv} Antle, B.F., Christensen, D.N., van Zyl, M.A., & Barbee, A.P. (2012). The impact of solution based casework (SBC) practice model on federal outcomes in public child welfare. *Journal of Child Abuse & Neglect*, 36(4), 342-353.
- ^{xlvi} Laursen, E.K. (2010). The evidence base for positive peer culture. *Reclaiming Children & Youth*, 19(2), 37-42.
- ^{xlvii} Clarke, A. (2011). Three therapeutic residential care models, the sanctuary model, positive peer culture and dyadic developmental psychotherapy and their application to the theory of congruence. *Children Australia*, 36(2), 81-87.
- ^{xlviii} Steinebach, C., & Steinebach, U. (2009). Positive peer culture with German youth. *Reclaiming Children & Youth*, 18(2), 27-33.
- ^{xlix} Donlevy, J.G., & Donlevy, T.R. (1995). New paths to the middle class: Developing social skills employing positive peer culture. *International Journal of Instructional Media*, 22(4), 267-276.
- ^l Rowe, M., Benedict, P., Sells, D., Dinzeo, T., Garvin, C., Schwab, L., Baranoski, M., Girard, V., & Bellamy, C. (2009). Citizenship, community, and recovery: A group- and peer- based intervention for persons with co-occurring disorders and criminal justice histories. *Journal of Groups in Addiction & Recovery*, 4(4), 224-244.
- ^{li} Network Support Services, Inc. (n.d.). *Therapeutic Basis*. Retrieved from <http://www.networkssi.org/therapeutic-basis.html>.
- ^{lii} Boys & Girls Clubs of America. (n.d.). *CareerLaunch Facilitator Guide*. Retrieved from <http://www.bgctm.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/LIT-Career-Launch.pdf>.
- ^{liii} Gallup-Black, A. (2011, April). *Expanding career options for young people: Evaluation of Boys & Girls Clubs of America's CareerLaunch program*. FHI 360. Durham, NC. Retrieved from <https://www.fhi360.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/Expanding-Career-Options-for-Young-People.pdf>.
- ^{liv} Columbia University School of Social Work's Workplace Center. (June 23, 2017). *Young Adult Work Opportunities for Rewarding Careers (YA WORC)*. Provided by the Workplace Center to ISLG on September 12, 2017.
- ^{lv} Columbia University School of Social Work's Workplace Center. (June 23, 2017).

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood



District Attorney
of New York
County

Criminal Justice Investment Initiative

Request for Proposals for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

No. 007

Expires 01/27/2017

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

Table of Contents

I. Cover Sheet 1

II. Key Terms 2

III. Summary of the Request for Proposals 3

IV. Anticipated Scope of Services..... 5

V. Deliverables..... 12

VI. Proposal Content and Format 12

VII. Proposal Evaluation and Contract Award 18

VIII. Appendices 20

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

I. Cover Sheet for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

A. Goal of the RFP

The goal of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to seek proposals from qualified vendors to **plan and pilot OR scale up innovative programs and approaches for foster youth who are close to transitioning to adulthood or who have recently transitioned to adulthood from the child welfare system (ages 16 to 24)**. Approximately 2,900 young people aged 16 or older are currently in foster care, and roughly 600 young people age out of foster care each year in NYC. These individuals are at significantly elevated risk of criminal justice system involvement and other negative life outcomes. Proposals should address areas of support for this population, such as workforce development and training, educational attainment, housing, and/or other areas to aid transitions out of care.

B. Timeline and Submission Instructions

1. **Release Date of RFP:** September 30, 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, November 4, 2016, at 11:59pm EST.**
3. Answers to all questions will be available as an addendum to this RFP by 11:59pm on **Monday, December 5, 2016**. It will be the responsibility of applicants 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 **Friday, January 27, 2017, 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 may 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:** Spring 2017

C. Funding and Number of Awards

DANY anticipates total funding to be up to \$5.3 million for the piloting or scaling up of up to three innovative programs or approaches for foster youth who are close to transitioning to adulthood or who have recently transitioned to adulthood from the child welfare system. Implementation (Phase II) funding will be contingent upon approval of the program plan developed during the planning phase (Phase I), with a maximum individual award of \$1.875 million over up to 3.5 years.

D. Contact Information

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

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.

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

II. Key Terms

Administration for Children’s Services (ACS): The Administration for Children’s Services (ACS) protects and promotes safety and well-being of New York City’s children and families by providing child welfare, juvenile justice, and early care and education services.^{lvi}

Criminal Justice Investment Initiative (CJII): CJII was established by the New York County District Attorney’s Office in 2014 to invest funds¹¹ 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 DANY for CJII. ISLG will provide input to DANY and guidance to CJII grantees throughout the lifetime of the initiative.

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

Permanency: A legally permanent, nurturing family for every child and youth. As defined in the federal Child and Family Services Reviews,¹² permanency occurs when: (1) A child in foster care is discharged from foster care to reunification with their family, either a parent or other relative; (2) the child is discharged from foster care to a legally finalized adoption; or (3) the child is discharged from foster care to the care of a legal guardian.

Permanency Planning: Permanency planning involves efforts to achieve permanency for young people with foster system involvement. These efforts may include services that address family issues in an attempt to reunite foster youth with their family; services for families to prevent foster care placement; kinship guardianship (KinGap program) to support permanent placement of youth with relatives; or adoption.^{lvii}

The Research Foundation of the City University of New York (RFCUNY, or Research Foundation): Under CJII, all funds will be administered through the Research Foundation of CUNY. The Research Foundation is a non-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 for CJII.

Transition to Adulthood: Successful transition from the foster care system to independent living and adulthood, often through intentional efforts, resources and services for foster youth.

Trauma: Trauma results from an event, series of events, or set of circumstances experienced by an individual or group as physically or emotionally harmful or life threatening, and has lasting adverse effects on functioning and mental, physical, social, emotional, or spiritual well-being.^{lviii}

¹¹ These are asset forfeiture funds, derived from settlements with international banks that violated U.S. sanctions.

¹² See <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/monitoring/child-family-services-reviews>

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

Trauma-Informed: Organizations and practices that incorporate an understanding of the pervasiveness and impact of trauma and are designed to reduce re-traumatization, support healing and resiliency, and address the root causes of abuse and violence. ^{lix}

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

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 criminal justice system in New York City. Up to \$5.3 million of the CJII fund will be available to fund the *Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood* as described in this RFP.

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 will provide guidance to CJII grantees throughout the lifetime of the initiative. Proposals will be submitted to DANY, which makes all decisions regarding the funding of awardees, and funds will be administered through the Research Foundation of CUNY (Research Foundation).

In 2015, 616 foster youth in NYC “aged out” of the child welfare system,^{lx} i.e., they exited foster care without being adopted or parental custody being reinstated prior to turning 21. In 2014, the City of New York instituted annual reporting on housing, education and employment outcomes for foster youth who have aged out of care, acknowledging the need to better understand the myriad issues facing this population.^{lxi} This follows the federal government's Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (H.R. 6893) which improves permanency planning by mandating that states notify relatives when young people are removed from parental custody, providing federal funds to states to help more children and youth exit foster care to live permanently with relatives, and requiring transition plan development for those aging out of foster care at least 90 days before their 18th birthday (or older if the state extends care beyond age 18).^{lxii} DANY seeks to provide additional services for those **who are close to transitioning to adulthood or who have recently transitioned to adulthood from the child welfare system** in order to improve outcomes.

These efforts are especially important given the disproportionate involvement in the criminal justice system of individuals who age out of foster care.^{lxiii} Furthermore, though programs for foster youth who are aging out have become more available across the nation and in New York City specifically,¹³ gaps in services continue to exist, and outcomes for too many in this population continue to be poor. As such, DANY is seeking proposals from appropriately qualified vendors to **plan and pilot OR scale up innovative programs or approaches for foster youth who are close to transitioning to adulthood or who have recently transitioned to adulthood from the child welfare system (ages 16 to 24)**. (See *Section II. Key Terms* for definitions of permanency planning and transition to adulthood.) Proposals should address areas of support for young people aging out of foster care, such as educational attainment, workforce development, housing, and other efforts to support permanency outcomes (i.e., the achievement of stable, continuous, and reciprocal relationships with adult(s) in a family setting). (See *Appendix 3* for examples of approaches to support young people aging out of foster care.)

¹³ For instance, see the NYC Human Resources Administration “YouthPathways Concept Paper”: http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/hra/downloads/pdf/contracts/concept_papers/2015/july/HRA_YouthPathways_Concept_Paper.pdf

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

Investments in these approaches are situated within a broader investment strategy for prevention (see cjjj.org for more information on *Youth Opportunity Hubs*; *Family and Youth Development Programs*; and *Community Navigators*) aimed at reducing the likelihood of interaction with the criminal justice system for at-risk youth, improving public safety, and promoting a fair and efficient criminal justice system.

B. Anticipated Contract Specifications

The Manhattan District Attorney's Office anticipates awarding up to three contracts for the piloting or scaling up of programs/approaches. The length of program funding will not exceed 3.5 years, beginning in spring 2017; the anticipated contract term will not exceed 5.5 years, and will include up to two additional years beyond the conclusion of funding for purposes of data sharing and evaluation. Pilot programs/approaches will be eligible for up to six months of Planning (Phase I) and three years of Implementation (Phase II). Programs/approaches which scale up existing efforts will be eligible for up to three months of planning (Phase I) and three years of implementation (Phase II). Funded applicants will be required to provide ongoing performance data (see *Section III.D. Performance Measurement*) to ISLG and possibly to a third-party evaluator. Funded applicants will be required to continue providing performance data for up to two additional years beyond the period of the program funding, as part of their contracts.

The Manhattan District Attorney's Office anticipates that any agreement entered into as a result of this RFP will be with DANY as the contracting party and ISLG as DANY's agent. The contract template is attached as *Appendix 7*. In the event that the selected applicant is unable to fulfill the requirements of the contract awarded pursuant to this RFP, DANY reserves the right to enter into contract negotiations at a later date with other providers available to implement the program/approach.

Applicants may apply independently or form partnerships with other organizations to conduct the proposed work. If an applicant engages partner organizations ("Partner Providers") in the work, the applicant will hold the primary contract awarded under this RFP. The applicant will then subcontract with the Partner Provider(s). Only one organization should serve as the official applicant and submit the proposal to DANY on behalf of the partnership/coalition that will conduct the work.

Programs/approaches that receive funding through this RFP must be open to accepting referrals from NYC agencies, to be determined and finalized in the planning phase of program funding, for young adults who belong to the initiative's focus populations.

Programs that receive funding through this RFP must be willing to work with Community Navigators (see *Appendix 4*), which are part of a broader CJII strategy to increase access to services and coordination among service providers. Community Navigators are supervised by a Community Navigator managing entity. Funded applicants may be asked to share client information with the Community Navigator managing entity and the Community Navigator. They may also be asked to provide programmatic information to the Community Navigator managing entity on a regular basis.

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

C. Anticipated Available Funding

The Manhattan District Attorney's Office anticipates total funding for the program(s) to be up to \$5.3 million (to be spread across all awards), with a maximum individual award of \$1.875 million. **Applicants may not submit or be funded for more than one proposal.**

For applicants proposing to pilot a new program or approach, funding will be divided into Planning (Phase I, \$75,000 maximum), which will last up to six months, and may include (but not be limited to) hiring additional staff, finalizing program plans, and establishing referral streams from city agencies; and Implementation (Phase II, \$600,000 maximum per year), which will last up to three years, and is intended to support full and consistent implementation of the program/approach. Applicants proposing to implement existing programs/approaches are eligible for up to \$75,000 in Phase I funding (up to three months) and up to \$600,000 per year for Phase II funding (up to three years). Phase II (Implementation) funding will be contingent upon approval of the program plan developed during Phase I (Planning).

Funding is anticipated for up to six months for Planning and up to three years for Implementation. However, DANY acknowledges the need for flexibility to account for the variety of factors that can influence the length of the Planning and/or Implementation Phase(s), and applicants may propose a Planning Phase of shorter or longer duration. Regardless of length, funding for the Planning Phase is limited to \$75,000.

D. Performance Measurement

The Manhattan District Attorney's Office is committed to measuring outcomes for all CJII initiatives and disseminating that information so that others may learn from and build on those outcomes. Data gathered by contractors throughout the term will be used to adjust implementation of services. Process measures will be particularly important for helping grantees monitor ongoing performance.

Contractors may be required to coordinate regularly with a third-party evaluator contracted by DANY to examine the effectiveness of the programs/approaches funded through this RFP. Contractors will be required to provide the independent evaluator with program and process information as requested by the evaluator and/or ISLG on a regular basis. These metrics will be finalized during the contracting phase or during the term of any contract awarded from this RFP. (See *Section VI.C. Performance Measurement* and *Appendix 1* for more information about performance measurement.)

IV. Anticipated Scope of Services

A. Background

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

CJII is committed to supporting impactful projects that improve public safety and promote a fair and efficient justice system in New York City. Targeted efforts to prevent contact with the justice system, including investments to support underserved population groups, particularly those with elevated risk of criminal justice involvement, are essential to this goal. Individuals with current or past involvement in the child welfare system are one such group.

The point-in-time foster care population in New York City has dropped substantially from 45,000 in 1993^{lxiv} to 22,000 in 2003.^{lxv} Today, fewer than 10,000 young people are in foster care on any given day and approximately 17,000 in care at some point over the course of a year.^{lxvi} Much of the recent reduction has resulted from increased access to preventive services, allowing more young people to remain safely at home and fewer short-term foster care stays (i.e., fewer than thirty days),^{lxvii} perhaps indicating that the population remaining in foster care may represent more difficult cases with longer lengths of stay.

Typically, young people involved in the foster system have been abused and/or neglected,^{lxviii} and oftentimes, a court has ordered their removal from home and placement in a foster home or facility.^{lxix} These types of experiences are traumatic and can lead to an increased risk of involvement with the criminal justice system. A recent study found that, of a group of young people in New York City who were discharged from foster care between the ages 13 and 18 from 2004 to 2006, 15 percent had a jail stay within six years.^{lxx} Another study in upstate New York found that adults who were abused or neglected during adolescence had higher rates of general offending (e.g., theft, robbery), arrest/incarceration, and violent offending than those who did not experience maltreatment in adolescence.^{lxxi} As such, foster youth face higher rates of incarceration than the general population. Research across several states found that 7 percent of former foster youth in their early twenties had been in jail or prison in the past year compared to only 0.1 percent of a nationally representative sample of young adults.^{lxxii} Once in contact with the justice system, foster youth face exceptional circumstances, including bias in detention decisions^{lxxiii} and a higher likelihood of detention or jail involvement than their peers with no foster care involvement.^{lxxiv} Additionally, foster youth oftentimes experience poor outcomes in other areas, such as education and employment.^{lxxv} For instance, of the foster youth who aged out of the New York City child welfare system in the mid-2000s, one in ten entered a homeless shelter within a year and one in five entered a shelter within three years.^{lxxvi} Elsewhere, a study of Midwest foster youth in their early twenties revealed that nearly half were unemployed, almost one in ten had been evicted, and roughly one in fourteen were in prison or jail within a year prior to the study.^{lxxvii}

Foster youth are typically eligible to remain in the foster system until age 21. Those who age out of the child welfare system without a permanent family are at particular risk for poor outcomes, and face challenges in transitioning to independent living. Although the majority of young people who enter foster care in New York City achieve “permanency” through kinship guardianship (i.e., via a caretaker who is a relative), adoption, or reunification with their parents, more than 600 young people in New York City age out of foster care each year without permanent families.^{lxxviii}

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

Throughout the duration of a young person's case, Service Plan Reviews, which assess the appropriateness of the person returning to their parents, are completed every six months. According to New York City Administration for Children's Services *Preparing Youth for Adulthood* plan, preparing for the transition into adulthood should begin at age 14 for foster youth. At this time the foster care agency should connect the young person to education and employment opportunities; identify a stable living arrangement; ensure that the young person has an adequate support network before discharge, including a caring adult; and help them meet their individual health needs (e.g., substance abuse, mental health, pregnancy needs).^{lxxix}

At age 18, foster youth are legally allowed to exit the child welfare system. However, given what is known about adolescent development, brain science, and the challenges of transitioning to adulthood, ACS and foster care stakeholders work with young people to encourage them not to "sign themselves out of care" at age 18. Yet, some foster youth do choose to exit care. Given the risks that exist for these young people, a specialized ACS unit called the "Supervision to 21 Unit" works with these young people before and after they have exited care in order to support and connect them to resources. These young people also have the option of reentering foster care if that becomes necessary.

In addition, ACS allows young people to remain in foster care beyond age 21 (through an Exception to Policy, or ETP) if, for example, a young person is still finishing college, permanent housing has not yet been identified, or the young person is awaiting placement with the New York State (NYS) Office of Mental Health (OMH) or the NYS Office for People with Developmental Disabilities (OPWDD). The City of New York supports the full costs of maintaining these young people in foster care after age 21 because all state and federal foster care funding ends when they turn 21.

When young people are preparing to discharge from foster care, they are typically placed on "Trial Discharge" status, during which time the individual lives independently while still in the custody of ACS and maintains access to ACS and agency services on an as-needed basis. At least 90 days before final discharge, a social worker must inform the young people in writing of the final discharge date, identify individuals and services that can aid the person, and request furniture and other supplies if necessary.^{lxxx}

Although the process of aging out features several possible points of intervention, planning, and support for foster youth, foster youth frequently encounter struggles to achieving independence. Fifty percent of foster youth who aged out in 2015 had experienced four or more placement moves during their time in foster care.^{lxxxii} The transience experienced by foster youth disrupts schooling, severs support networks, and contributes to poor educational outcomes. Only 15 percent of 8th grade foster youth perform at or above grade level in English or math,^{lxxxii} and of the foster youth 17 and older enrolled in high school in NYC during the 2014-2015 school year, only 23% were on track to graduate.^{lxxxiii} As a result, many foster youth find it difficult to obtain stable employment. Although the poor educational attainment among foster youth in general illustrates the critical need for earlier intervention and concerted effort to improve access to higher education, effective support for this population often requires remedial education and pathways to employment not dependent on higher education. Similarly, approaches that address young people's financial needs (e.g., via stipends; paid internships) in combination with other

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

supports (e.g., to complete one’s high school diploma; to address mental health needs) may best equip them to transition out of care successfully.

In addition to education and workforce challenges, foster youth transitioning to adulthood often struggle to find and maintain stable housing. In a study of young people in the Midwestern U.S. who had a history of being in foster care and who were 21 years old at the time they were interviewed, 18 percent had been homeless at least once since aging out of foster care between the ages of 18 and 21.^{lxxxiv} Another study found that former foster youth experienced more negative housing outcomes in adulthood than their non-foster youth counterparts, including elevated rates of homelessness, less stable housing, increased use of public housing assistance, and poorer neighborhood quality.^{lxxxv}

Compounding these systemic barriers to independent living is the varying capacity of foster care agencies with respect to education, employment, and housing services. Additionally, agencies serve an important, primarily protective function: the priorities of caseworkers and agencies are to ensure the immediate well-being of foster youth and finding the young person a permanent home. As a result, many agencies, even if they desire to assist in preparing a young person for adulthood, lack the connections and expertise to adequately do so. As such, greater capacity and expertise in education, workforce, and housing are in particular need.^{lxxxvi}

In recent years, ACS and other partners have committed to several programs and policies to support young people who are close to aging out or who have recently aged out of care (see *Appendix 3*). Nonetheless, given the overrepresentation of former foster youth in the criminal justice system and in other poor outcomes, there is continued need for investment and innovation in young people aging out of foster care, particularly with respect to education, workforce development, and housing support. Extant programs lack the capacity to address the scale of the need, or incompletely address the broad range of needs of this population. **In particular, there is greater need for programs that support financial independence while addressing other critical needs:** young people may be prevented from finishing a high school diploma because of the very real need to earn an income; they may ultimately be unsuccessful in maintaining stable housing because they lack the resources or ability to maintain stable employment. In addition, **there is additional need to support and engage “over-age, under-credit” young people in foster care**—i.e., young people who are far behind their peers academically and need more intensive, tailored opportunities to continue their education.

Research demonstrates a positive return on investment for programs that comprehensively advance academic, social and career skills. Successful and promising approaches provide multiple and flexible pathways for young people, incorporate additional supportive services, and connect young people to supportive adults.^{lxxxvii} As noted by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, a continuum of work experiences—“including volunteer and community service, summer and part-time jobs, work-study experiences, internships and apprenticeships — build job-readiness skills, knowledge and confidence. These encompass not just workplace and financial skills, but

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

also the broader ‘soft skills’ of taking responsibility and initiative, working in teams, focusing on problem-solving and learning how to contribute.”

Stable housing is another critical factor in the success of young people exiting foster care. Yet, it remains confounding for many foster youth who have aged out of care, as evidenced by high rates of homelessness among the population.^{lxxxviii} Some innovative housing programs are challenging this systemic barrier by providing subsidized housing, group housing, scattered site housing, and other types of housing in combination with education, employment, and supportive services.^{lxxxix} However, administering such programs is challenging, as funding is limited and organizations often must draw from and navigate the constraints on multiple sources of funding in order to operate their programs. Child welfare agencies may also fail to make use of available housing programs, or be excluded or discouraged from referring clients to them due to program restrictions on maximum length of stay and preferences to serve families rather than individuals.^{xc} In New York City, foster youth are impeded by long waiting lists for public (NYCHA) housing or, in some cases, prior felony records; moreover, many young people are ultimately removed from public housing because they lack the supportive services to help them address their other needs, including substance use and mental health needs.

This investment seeks to facilitate the piloting or scaling up of innovative programs and approaches to support transitions to adulthood for foster youth. It represents one portion of a continuum of supports for prevention (see cjj.org for more information on *Youth Opportunity Hubs*; *Family and Youth Development Programs*; and *Community Navigators*) funded through CJII.

B. Program Description

This request seeks proposals from vendors to plan and pilot OR scale up innovative transition programs and approaches for foster youth who are close to transitioning to adulthood or who have recently transitioned to adulthood from the child welfare system (ages 16 to 24).

1. **Eligible Programs and Approaches:** Applicants may plan and pilot OR scale up an innovative project that addresses the needs of the focus populations. Programs could be administered by foster youth-serving organizations (e.g., an organization serving primarily foster youth could implement a new employment program) or non-foster youth-serving organizations (e.g., an organization focused employment programs for a broad population could implement a program tailored toward foster youth specifically). For-profits, non-profit organizations¹⁴, and governmental entities are eligible to apply, provided that they meet the other eligibility criteria defined herein. Note that asset forfeiture funds (i.e., the source of CJII funding) cannot be used to fund government staff, however. The types of programs that would help achieve the aforementioned goals include, but are not limited to, those focusing on:
 - a. **Housing**, including but not limited to models that provide:
 - Housing assistance (rent and rent subsidies)

¹⁴ Non-profits without 501(c)(3) status are required to have a fiscal sponsor in place upon proposal submission.

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

- Combined housing assistance with case management and mentoring
 - Scattered site apartments (with or without subsidies or stipended rent) and supportive services
 - Onsite programming connected to housing (education, workforce and supportive services), and
 - Group housing.
- b. **Employment, Education, and Supportive Services**, including:
- i. Workforce development/support specifically for foster youth, which may:
 - Provide stipends or subsidize wages for internships or jobs, which are critical to supporting financial independence
 - Provide opportunities for young people with different levels of education, including those without higher education
 - Focus particularly on young people who are under-credit and overage
 - Provide TA to non-foster organizations to work with foster youth
 - Fund education specialists for foster youth organizations, and
 - Provide pathways to employment, including through sectoral job training and placement initiatives (i.e., guaranteed employment following training in a particular sector or industry, or with a specific employer), internships, job placement, and post-placement support and coaching services.
 - ii. Educational support for foster youth, including but not limited to approaches that focus on:
 - Remedial education to prepare foster youth to complete high school or enroll in higher education
 - Structures to support transitions to higher education, including targeted coordination with higher education programs, counseling, and financial resources to help young people complete their education
 - Supporting foster youth with children to continue their education
 - Reducing truancy and increasing student engagement, and Adult Basic Education and High School Equivalency (HSE) test preparation
 - Support during enrollment in post-secondary education
 - Vocational and training preparation and instruction

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

- *Educational Navigators*¹⁵ or *Networks* to connect young people to resources and which could be based in school or district offices or local agencies (e.g., to navigate school transitions, mentor, and provide in-home tutoring; use of retired social workers and teachers to connect to young persons' parents).
- iii. Supportive Services, which may include counseling, mental health support, mentoring, case management, life and social skills development, childcare, and other services.
- c. **A Combination of these Approaches**, such as combining housing and supportive services, or combining employment opportunities with pathways to finishing a high school diploma
- d. **Other Programs/Approaches to Advance Permanency Outcomes for Older Youth in Care**, including:
 - Child-specific recruitment/ family-finding strategies,
 - Family permanency pacts (i.e., pledges by non-familial adults to maintain life-long relationships and provide continual support and guidance to foster youth),¹⁶ and
 - Approaches to support older youth to achieve permanency through guardianship (KinGap¹⁷) and adoption.

These approaches are not considered exhaustive but rather, are possible ways applicants could address factors known to contribute to poor outcomes among young people aging out of foster care. Other approaches not listed above could also be effective at easing the transition to adulthood and are eligible for funding (see *Appendix 3*). Given that little is known about the effectiveness of interventions with this population, proposals for innovative approaches that are novel to New York City or in general are strongly encouraged.

2. **Mandatory minimum requirements:** Only proposals that serve primarily foster youth transitioning to adulthood or who have recently transitioned to adulthood will be scored, per the Evaluation Procedures specified in *Section VII.A* of this RFP.
3. **Eligible expenses:** A total of \$5.3 million dollars over 3.5 years are available for up to three programs/approaches, with maximum funding per program/approach of \$1.875 million. Funding may be used for costs of operating programs for young people aging out of foster care, and may include staff, materials, operations, stipends, rent payments or rent subsidies and other program expenses necessary to meet young people's needs and accomplish the goals of CJII.

C. Focus Populations

This initiative focuses on *foster youth who are close to transitioning to adulthood or who have recently transitioned to adulthood from the child welfare system*. In New York City, foster youth

¹⁵ Various models of “educational navigators” serve to connect foster youth to resources to support educational success. For example, the College Success Foundation’s Passport Navigator Program in Washington State uses peer mentors to support foster youth in their postsecondary educational career. See <https://www.collegesuccessfoundation.org/wa/supports/college/navigator>

¹⁶ For example, see <http://rhfdn.org/permanency.php>

¹⁷ See <http://ocfs.ny.gov/kinship/kingap.asp>

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

may exit the child welfare system at age 18, though many decide to stay until age 21, the maximum age at which an individual can remain in the child welfare system unless an Exception to Policy (ETP) is granted by ACS.¹⁸ As such, this initiative focuses on individuals aged 16 to 24 years old with current or past foster system involvement. Roughly 2,900 young people aged 16 and older are currently in the foster care system,^{xci} and approximately 600 young people age out each year.^{xcii} Proposed programs/approaches should meaningfully serve this population.

Due to the increased risk of involvement with the criminal justice system among foster youth who have aged out of care,^{xciii} investments in prevention could have a substantial impact on improving public safety and promoting a fair and efficient criminal justice system. In addition, transition programs/approaches could benefit youth and families across the city by providing more structured education, employment, housing, and other opportunities. Other CJII investments are intended to complement these programs/approaches (see cjii.org for more information on *Youth Opportunity Hubs*; *Family and Youth Development Programs*; and *Community Navigators*).

D. Goals and Objectives

The goal of this investment is to support programs or approaches that seek to improve outcomes for young people aging out of foster care. The investment will aim to achieve this goal through the piloting or the scaling up of programs or approaches that support foster youth transitioning to adulthood, including those related to educational attainment, workforce development, housing, and other forms of support for foster families/youth. Programs/approaches should be or aim to be trauma-informed when appropriate for the populations to be served (programs/approaches that are not currently trauma-informed may be provided technical assistance). Outcomes may include, but are not limited to:

- Reduced use of residential facilities (e.g., shelters) and justice/mental health facilities
- Reduced rates of entry and reentry into the criminal justice system
- Improved rates of educational attainment
- Improved rates of placement into stable employment
- Reduced rates of homelessness and improved housing stability
- Increased rates of permanency for older youth.

V. Deliverables

The Contractor will be required to submit regular 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 possible deliverables.

¹⁸ In such instances, a young person can remain in care – e.g., if they are enrolled in college, permanent housing has not yet been identified, or the young person is awaiting placement with the New York State (NYS) Office of Mental Health (OMH) or the NYS Office for People with Developmental Disabilities (OPWDD).

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

VI. Proposal Content and Format

Applicants are asked to structure their submission in multiple parts, listed below. Each lettered item (except item *H. Proposal Formatting and Length Requirements*) should be included as a separate document, which applicants will upload to the CJII Application Portal.

A. Cover Letter

The cover letter should provide a brief description of the proposed program/approach, the focus populations and neighborhood(s); and indicate whether the proposed program or approach is a new program or an expansion of an existing program/approach; the amount of and number of years of funding the applicant is seeking; and give basic information (e.g., location, contact information) about the applicant. The cover letter should be signed and dated by an authorized representative of the applicant.

B. Program Narrative (15 page maximum)

Applicants should describe in detail how the applicant will provide the services set forth below. Applicants should specifically address the following:

1. **Program Design:** Applicants must plan and pilot OR scale up a program or approach that supports young people transitioning to adulthood, including with regard to educational attainment, workforce development, housing, or other forms of support. All applicants should discuss the elements below as they relate to the program or approach for which they are seeking funding.
 - a. Program activities: What activities will the program/approach entail (e.g., counseling for foster families, employment training/placement, mentoring, financial education, housing support)? How will these activities lead to improved outcomes? How do these activities expand beyond the provider's existing services and which gaps do they address? Which gaps will remain unaddressed even if CJII funding is awarded? (For example, an applicant's workforce development program may remain limited in its ability to provide adequate housing support for higher-needs young people.) How do these activities expand beyond existing services in the city, and which needs do they address? Although applicants may propose to deliver discrete education, employment, or supportive services, those that provide a comprehensive approach to education, employment, and supportive services for foster youth are preferred.
 - b. Program models, best practices, and evidence base: Has the program/approach been evaluated and demonstrated to be effective? If not, describe the literature, theories, and/or evidence that suggest the program or approach would be effective. Applicants should also indicate whether or not the program/approach employs trauma-informed approaches, if appropriate. If so, describe how they are integrated into the program model. If not, is the applicant willing to work with a TTA provider to adopt trauma-informed practices?

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

- c. Focus population, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and catchment area: What are the program-specific focus population, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and catchment area? What specific age range will the program serve? In addition, what specific neighborhood(s) will the proposed program serve, if any? What are the boundaries of the catchment area? Why was the focus neighborhood(s) chosen? How is the proposed intervention appropriate or necessary for the focus population? How will foster youth and community members be involved in the design and refinement of the program?
 - d. Outreach and engagement: How will the applicant conduct outreach to focus populations (including biological and/or foster parents/families and/or their children, if applicable and when appropriate)? How will the applicant identify, recruit, and engage participants that meet inclusion criteria? Do applicants have existing partnerships with city agencies and providers, including for referral purposes? How will the applicant identify and recruit participants who meet inclusion criteria? Applicants should speak to the extent to which their proposed services are culturally and linguistically appropriate for the focus population, especially given the disproportionate representation of young people of color in the foster population. This could include identifying elements of program design that allow for flexibility and tailoring of the program/approach based on clients' backgrounds, and key staff members who have specific expertise to serve the focus population(s).
 - e. Numbers served: How many clients does the program plan to serve in each year of the initiative? Is there a minimum or maximum number of individuals within this population that the program/approach could serve? Would the program be able to expand services if the demand existed? If yes, how would the program go about doing this?
 - f. Program dosage: What is the proposed length of the program/approach (e.g., number of sessions and over what length of time)? What is the duration and intensity of each session/visit (if applicable)? What constitutes program completion/exit?
 - g. Planning and Implementation: Detail the process through which the applicant intends to plan (if applicable) and implement a program for young people transitioning to adulthood from foster care. Provide a timeline that outlines the major milestones of the Planning (for applicants proposing new/innovative or promising programs/approaches) and Implementation Phases and how they align with program goals. The timeline should also stipulate key staff responsible for each milestone and denote milestone completion by month or quarter. As indicated in *Appendix 2. Deliverables*, the applicant will produce a program plan at the conclusion of the Planning Phase (I) (if applicable), which is to be approved before release of funds for Implementation (Phase II).
2. **Sustainability**: Applicants should consider sustainability in the design and implementation of the program/approach and address steps they will take to increase the likelihood of sustainability following the end of grant funding. Applicants should discuss with as much specificity as possible the government agencies and other

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

organizations they believe might fund the program/approach in the future to extend their overall impact.

C. Performance Measurement (3 page maximum)

Applicants should present their current capacity and proposed methods for collecting performance data (see *Appendix 1* for more information on performance measurement). All selected applicants will be required to provide data on performance measurement to ISLG and/or the initiative's third-party evaluator. In addition, grantees implementing or expanding a promising or innovative program or approach may be required to coordinate regularly with a third-party evaluator contracted by DANY to examine the effectiveness of their program or approach. Initial metrics will be finalized during the contracting phase and may be subject to change during the grant term, after discussion among all parties, based on programmatic implementation concerns, availability of data, and/or research needs.

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

4. Clearly articulated goal(s) that are broken down into objective(s) (see Exhibit 1 in *Appendix 1*);
5. Anticipated process, output, and outcome measures for each objective for each quarter of the first year of the Implementation Phase (sample information is included in Exhibit 1 in *Appendix 1* only as an example);
6. Methods of data collection (any costs related to data collection/analysis should be incorporated in the budget and explained in the budget narrative); and
7. Challenges associated with data collection and reporting (e.g., lack of expertise or software) and the way the applicant plans to address them.

Applicants who lack capacity for performance measurement and data collection may be offered assistance by CUNY ISLG to comply with this funding requirement.

D. Organizational Capacity (8 page maximum)

Applicants should describe their organizational (i.e., technical, managerial, and financial) capacity to perform the work set forth in *Section IV*. Applicants should also identify any area (e.g., technical, managerial, financial; connecting with referral sources, developing partnerships) where capacity building assistance could be helpful (e.g., developing operational plans; performance measurement and/or evaluation design). Applicants are encouraged to request this assistance so as to improve the implementation of CJII.

Applicants should specifically address the following:

1. Resources that the applicant would use to provide the services, including number of all permanent full-time staff members, facilities, volunteers, and technology (if applicable).
2. Basic information about any Partner Providers/subcontractors (if applicable), including a description of their role in the proposed program/approach. For what portion of the program/approach would the subcontractor(s) be responsible? Refer back to the Program Narrative, as appropriate.

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

3. Description of any resource or referral directory (if applicable, e.g., of other providers in the neighborhood or city and to which clients are referred) maintained by the applicant, current use, and staff resources needed to maintain the directory.
4. Description and evidence of community/neighborhood ties. Identify any partnerships with other service providers (e.g., community-based organizations, religious institutions, schools) and describe the nature of the partnerships.
5. Letters of support/commitment from city agencies, consultants, subcontractors, and/or other funders, as appropriate. Letters should be addressed to DANY and submitted as a single file in the CJII Application Portal. Note that applicants do not need and should not request letters of support from ACS.
6. A copy of the applicant's latest audit report or certified financial statement, or a statement as to why no report or statement is available.
7. Areas in which training and technical assistance may be needed (e.g., connecting with referral sources, record-keeping/data collection, trauma-informed approaches). Applicants are encouraged to request this assistance so as to improve the implementation of CJII. CJII funds may be made available to provide training and technical assistance if necessary.

E. Experience (8 page maximum)

Describe the successful relevant experience of the applicant, each proposed subcontractor or consultant (if any), and the proposed key staff in providing the work described in *Section IV*. Applicants should specifically address or include the items listed below:

1. Explain how the applicant's current and/or previous work is relevant, and how its knowledge and experience will be leveraged in the Planning (if applicable) and Implementation of the proposed program/approach. How does the proposed program relate to the applicant's overall mission and services (e.g., a homeless services organization serves all types of individuals but also includes specific programming for young people with experience in the foster system)?
2. Indicate the length of time the applicant has a) been in operation and b) provided services relevant to this RFP.
3. Indicate the number of clients that the applicant has served for similar services in the previous calendar year.
4. List the key program staff and the role(s) each will fill. What are the qualifications for staff in each role? How are key staff supported? To what extent do staff have training and experience in working with individuals from the focus population? Do staff have experience recognizing and responding to individuals with past traumatic experiences? What additional training will key staff need to deliver the proposed program/approach?
5. Attach resumes of the key staff who will be providing the work.

F. Program Budget

Applicants should provide a budget outlining their proposed use of funding to achieve the goals of the proposed program/approach and overarching goals of the *Programs and Approaches for*

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood investment. The budget should include a proposed breakdown of funds for Planning (Phase I), if applicable, and Implementation (Phase II), broken out by year. Funding is anticipated for up to six months for Planning and up to three years for Implementation. However, DANY acknowledges the need for flexibility to account for the variety of factors that can influence the length of the Planning and/or Implementation Phase(s).

The budget should include only the funding requested through this RFP, and not the entire costs needed to operate a program (i.e., if this funding would support only a portion of the costs needed to implement the proposed program/approach). The budget form is included only as an example; applicants may submit budgets in a different format, but their budgets should include at least the sections and information identified in the sample budget form (*Appendix 5*).

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 evaluation team, taking into consideration the price and such other factors and criteria as are set forth in the RFP (see *Sections VII.B* and *VII.C*).

G. Program Budget Narrative (3 page maximum)

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 Program Narrative should link the proposed costs to the proposed program components and activities and outline any assumptions on which the budget is based.

H. Fiscal Sponsorship Documentation (if applicable)

As noted, for-profits, non-profits, and government agencies are eligible to apply. Non-profits without 501(c)(3) status are required to have a fiscal sponsor in place upon proposal submission. In such instances, applicants should state the name of the fiscal sponsor; outline the responsibilities of the fiscal sponsor; and outline their obligations to the fiscal sponsor. Applicants should also submit any fiscal sponsorship agreement. If the applicant has a fiscal sponsor, any fees charged by the sponsor should be included and clearly labeled in the budget.

I. Proposal Formatting and Length Requirements

Applicants should adhere to the following formatting requirements:

- All submissions should be double-spaced, using standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with 1-inch margins.
- Charts, figures, tables, footnotes, endnotes, and references do not need to be double-spaced, but are included in any restrictions on length described below, unless otherwise noted.
- Pages should be paginated.

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

- Length restrictions:
 - The Program Narrative (*Section VI.B*) should not exceed 15 pages (double-spaced), including any tables and charts. Only the first 15 pages of the Program Narrative will be read and scored by the evaluation team.
 - The Performance Measurement Section (*VI.C*) should not exceed 3 pages (double-spaced), including any tables. Only the first 3 pages will be read and scored by the evaluation team.
 - The Organization Capacity Section (*VI.D*) should not exceed 8 pages (double-spaced), excluding letters of support/commitment and the applicant latest audit report or certified financial statement. Only the first 8 pages will be read and scored by the evaluation team.
 - The Experience Section (*VI.E*) should not exceed 8 pages (double-spaced), excluding resumes of key staff. Only the first 8 pages will be read and scored by the evaluation team.
 - The Program Budget Narrative Section (*VI.G*) should not exceed 3 pages (double-spaced). Only the first 3 pages will be read and scored by the evaluation team.
 - Other sections of the submission 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 proposals.

VII. Proposal Evaluation and Contract Award

A. Evaluation Procedures

All proposals accepted by DANY will be reviewed to determine whether they are responsive to the requisites of this RFP. Proposals that are determined by DANY to be non-responsive may be rejected. An evaluation team selected by DANY will evaluate and rate proposals based on the evaluation criteria described below. DANY reserves the right to 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, DANY 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. DANY will be responsible for making all funding decisions.

DANY reserves the right to fund zero, one, or multiple applicants, based on the proposals received in response to this RFP.

B. Evaluation Criteria

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

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

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

C. Basis for Contract Award

Contract award(s) will be made to the applicant(s) whose proposal(s) are determined to be the most advantageous, taking into consideration the price and such other factors and criteria as are set forth in the RFP (see *Section VII:B. Evaluation Criteria*) and outlined above. Contract awards shall be subject to the timely completion of contract negotiations between DANY and the selected applicants. Implementation (Phase II) funding will be contingent upon approval of the program plans developed during the Planning Phase (I) (see *Section III.C*).

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

VIII. Appendices

Appendix 1: Performance Measurement

The Manhattan District Attorney’s Office is committed to measuring outcomes for all CJII initiatives and disseminating that information so that others can learn from and build on those outcomes. Also see *Section VI.C* of this RFP.

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

4. Clearly articulated goal(s) that are broken down into objective(s) (see Exhibit 1; sample information is included in Exhibit 1 only as an example);
5. Anticipated process, output, and outcome measures for each objective for each quarter in the first year of the Implementation Phase (sample information is included in Exhibit 1 only as an example);
6. Methods of data collection (any costs related to data collection/analysis should be incorporated in the budget and explained in the budget narrative); and
7. Challenges associated with data collection and reporting (e.g., lack of expertise or software) and the way the applicant plans to address them.

Applicants who lack capacity for performance measurement and data collection may be offered assistance by CUNY ISLG to comply with this funding requirement.

Exhibit 1. Performance Measurement Plan

| Goal | Objective | Process Measure & Target | Output Measure & Target | Outcome Measure & Target | Data |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| Goal 1: Improve educational attainment among foster youth | 1A. To improve graduation rates of foster youth currently enrolled in high school | <i>Measure:</i> Percent of participants "very satisfied" with the educational support program | <i>Measure:</i> Number of program participants on track for graduation | <i>Measure:</i> Percentage of 22 year-old foster youth with a HS diploma | Surveys; program attendance records; School and district assessments and records |
| | | <i>Year 1, Q1:</i> 85% | <i>Year 1, Q1:</i> 50 | <i>Year 1, Q1:</i> 60% | |
| | | <i>Year 1, Q2:</i> 90% | <i>Year 1, Q2:</i> 60 | <i>Year 1, Q2:</i> 65% | |
| | | <i>Year 1, Q3:</i> | <i>Year 1, Q3:</i> | <i>Year 1, Q3:</i> | |
| | 1B. To increase rates of high school equivalency certification among foster youth who have dropped out of school | <i>Measure:</i> Percent of participants "very satisfied" with the educational support program | <i>Measure:</i> Number of HS drop-outs making quarterly progress toward equivalency | <i>Measure:</i> Percentage of 22 year-old former foster youth with a HS equivalency | Surveys; program attendance records; School and district assessments and databases |
| | | <i>Year 1, Q1:</i> 85% | <i>Year 1, Q1:</i> 12 | <i>Year 1, Q1:</i> 20% | |
| | | <i>Year 1, Q2:</i> 90% | <i>Year 1, Q2:</i> 15 | <i>Year 1, Q2:</i> 22% | |
| | | <i>Year 1, Q3:</i> | <i>Year 1, Q3:</i> | <i>Year 1, Q3:</i> | |
| Goal 2: (Add | 2A. (Add | <i>Measure:</i> | <i>Measure:</i> | <i>Measure:</i> | |
| | | <i>Year 1, Q1:</i> | <i>Year 1, Q1:</i> | <i>Year 1, Q1:</i> | |
| | | <i>Year 1, Q2:</i> | <i>Year 1, Q2:</i> | <i>Year 1, Q2:</i> | |

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|
| goals/rows as needed) | objectives/rows as needed) | <i>Year 1, Q3:</i> | <i>Year 1, Q3:</i> | <i>Year 1, Q3:</i> | |
| | | <i>Year 1, Q4:</i> | <i>Year 1, Q4:</i> | <i>Year 1, Q4:</i> | |

Appendix 2: Deliverables

All grantees will be required to submit regular deliverables throughout the term (see table below for examples). Please note that deliverables, frequency, and dates are subject to negotiation.

Exhibit 2. Deliverables for Applicants

| # | Name | Description | Frequency/Due Date |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 1 | Program Plan | Detailed plan for program roll-out based on research and planning undertaken during Phase I | Within 1 year of a signed contract |
| 2 | De-identified, client--level data | Client-level information such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date enrolled in program • Client demographics, such as race, gender and age • Risk assessment outcome • Services provided • Length of participation in program | Quarterly |
| 3 | Operational costs status report | Financial reports | Twice per year |
| 4 | Implementation report | Report on challenges to implementing and growing the program; status of solutions; outputs | Quarterly |
| 5 | Outcome data | Data on various outcomes as requested by ISLG and/or external evaluator | Quarterly or twice per year |

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

Appendix 3: Approaches to Support Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

Current ACS and other NYC initiatives to address the needs of foster youth transitioning to adulthood include:

Employment, Education, and Supportive Services

- *Young Adult Internship Program Plus*: A partnership between ACS and the NYC Department of Youth and Community Development (DYCD) to provide internship opportunities for young people involved in the foster care and juvenile justice system.¹⁹
- *HRA YouthPathways*: Aims to increase educational attainment, provide wraparound supports, and provide workforce training and employment opportunities.²⁰
- *Civil Service Pathways*: A partnership between ACS and the NYC Department of Citywide Administrative Services (DCAS) that assists foster youth in entering the civil service sector by preparing them for civil service exams and obtaining the necessary documentation for the exam.²¹
- *DYCD Summer Youth Employment Program*: Provides employment and education services in conjunction with mentoring/counseling, and allots some program spots specifically to foster youth.²²
- *Data Match with NYC Department of Education*: A collaboration between ACS the NYC Department of Education to share data so that each agency can best support the needs of individual youth.²³
- *The City University of New York (CUNY) Foster Care Collaborative*: A collaboration among CUNY, ACS, and community-based foster care provider agencies to create/provide/connect youth in foster care that attend CUNY schools to supportive services and programs.
- *TAY (Transition-Aged Youth) Program*: A three-year expansion, funded by a Conrad N. Hilton Foundation grant, of the existing CUNY Start (which provides low-cost remedial instruction and college preparation) and ASAP (Accelerated Study in Associate Programs)²⁴ programs to include additional designated supports specifically for youth in foster care.
- *Guardian Scholars Program*: A program administered by New Yorkers for Children in collaboration with CUNY to provide financial and social-emotional support services to students in foster care that attend John Jay College of Criminal Justice, Hostos Community College, Kingsborough Community College, or Hunter College.²⁵

¹⁹ See N.Y.C. Administration for Children's Services. (2016). ACS foster care strategic blueprint implementation status report.

²⁰ See http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/hra/downloads/pdf/contracts/concept_papers/2015/july/HRA_YouthPathways_Concept_Paper.pdf

²¹ See http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/acs/images/content/youth/CSPYP_flyer.jpg

²² See http://www.nyc.gov/html/dycd/downloads/pdf/SYEP2013_Annual_Summary.pdf

²³ See N.Y.C. Administration for Children's Services. (2016). Making Extended Care Work for Foster Youth [Powerpoint slides].

²⁴ See <http://www2.cuny.edu/academics/academic-programs/model-programs/cuny-college-transition-programs/cuny-start/>

See <http://www1.cuny.edu/sites/asap/about/asap-at-a-glance/>

²⁵ See <http://newyorkersforchildren.org/article/nyfc-guardian-scholars-program/>

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

- *New Yorkers for Children Charles Evans Emergency Education Fund*: Provides former foster youth with money necessary to pursue their educational goals.²⁶
- *Back-to-School Package*: A program administered by New Yorkers for Children to provide an Amazon gift card, a Metrocard, and a laptop for students in foster care attending college.²⁷
- *Educational Training Vouchers*: A mixture of federal, state, and city funding that provides foster youth with up to \$5,000 a year for higher education-related expenses;²⁸
- *Fostering College Success Initiative*: Administered by ACS and funded by the city, this program will offer 12-month on-campus housing in CUNY dorms for youth in foster care and enrolled in Queens College and the College of Staten Island, starting in Fall 2016. Students will also receive a weekly stipend to support college-related expenses and funding to cover fees not fully covered by financial aid.²⁹
- *Youth Matters Program*: State-funded extension of CUNY Education Opportunity Programs—College Discovery and Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge (SEEK)—which provide instructional, financial, and counseling assistance.³⁰ Delivers additional designated support services such as tutoring and counseling to foster youth attending CUNY schools. Similar programs exist through The State University of New York’s (SUNY) Educational Opportunity Program.³¹

Housing

- *Housing Academy Collaborative*: Assists youth in submitting housing applications for public and supportive housing; provides career counseling, training on how to negotiate with creditors and how to maintain housing and employment, and other strategies.³²
- *NY/NYIII supportive housing for youth*: Provides on-site and scattered site housing to older foster youth and young people who have recently aged out of care;³³
- *NYCHA Priority Status for youth leaving care*: Grants priority status to youth aging out of foster care on NYCHA applications.³⁴
- *ACS collaboration with NYC Human Resources Administration (HRA)* to establish a source of income if a young person is not employed prior to being offered supportive or public housing: HRA will provide foster youth with a presumptive budget letter

²⁶ See <http://newyorkersforchildren.org/article/charles-evans-emergency-educational-fund/>

²⁷ See <http://newyorkersforchildren.org/article/back-to-school-package-program-supplies-for-success/>

²⁸ See <http://www.fc2sprograms.org/new-york/>

²⁹ See N.Y.C. Administration for Children’s Services. (2016). ACS foster care strategic blueprint implementation status report.

³⁰ See <http://www2.cuny.edu/academics/academic-programs/seek-college-discovery/college-discovery-overview/#1456941895762-97719d77-4419>

See <http://www2.cuny.edu/academics/academic-programs/seek-college-discovery/seek-overview/#1456940566409-92fc620b-7459>

³¹ See <https://www.suny.edu/attend/academics/eop/>

³² See <http://www1.nyc.gov/site/acs/youth/housing.page>

³³ See <http://www1.nyc.gov/site/acs/youth/housing.page>

³⁴ See <http://archive.advocate.nyc.gov/housing-guide/B/1>

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

that details the amount of Public Assistance the youth would receive if they were to apply. The letter serves as an “income placeholder” for youth who are offered an apartment and need to establish a source of income.³⁵

³⁵ Carrión, G. (2016). *Making extended care work for foster youth* [PowerPoint slides]. Provided by N.Y.C. Administration for Children’s Services to ISLG on August 5, 2016.

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

Appendix 4: Description of Community Navigator Pilot

As part of CJII, DANY is making investments to ensure that people receive services to support positive outcomes and prevent any future contact with law enforcement. Therefore, DANY is investing in a pilot program to create Community Navigators, which will connect individuals to resources and services they need to prevent future crime and re-victimization in order to make a strong impact on public safety over a long period of time.

The Community Navigator pilot will begin to develop a network of trained peers and social workers—Community Navigators—to work with individuals to locate, connect, and engage with services they need. Navigators will be mobile and meet people where they are and serve as the bridge to guide individuals across different systems, city agencies, and organizations to ensure they are connected with the services and resources that meet their needs and achieve their goals. Additionally, Community Navigators will have the opportunity to participate in an educational fellowship program that will allow them to advance their education and support their career development through meaningful work in social service fields.

A managing entity will be responsible for managing the Community Navigator pilot (including recruiting, hiring, training, and managing individuals to work as Community Navigators) and the fellowship program. The managing entity will also collaborate with city agencies and community-based service providers to explore needs and to facilitate cooperation and coordination among stakeholders.

During the pilot, Community Navigators will focus on working in East Harlem with survivors of domestic violence and with young people (ages 14 to 21) who are at risk of becoming involved in the justice system. After the pilot, the network of Navigators will expand to other Manhattan neighborhoods that experience many factors that have an impact on crime. Navigators will also work with survivors of other types of crime as well as youth and adults who are involved in the justice system and people returning to neighborhoods from incarceration.

Community Navigators are independent of programs funded through this RFP. They are, however, likely to have interaction with programs funded through this RFP as part of their work connecting individuals to the services they need. Community Navigators will identify and connect with individuals from various city and social service agencies. They will connect those individuals with the services they need. Those services may be found within one or several agencies or organizations. The Community Navigator will work with individuals to determine what is needed, help them figure out how to access the services, work with them to make appointments (if necessary or desired), and accompany them to those appointments (if necessary or desired).

Programs funded under this RFP *may* be asked to receive and process referrals from Community Navigators. Funded programs will also be encouraged to refer clients, as appropriate, to work with Community Navigators to support their ancillary needs.

Programs funded under this RFP *may* be asked to share client information with Community Navigators and the managing entity to facilitate program implementation. The managing entity will also ensure that the process and procedures for sharing client information among the various

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

stakeholders will be informed by best practices in working with survivors of crime and with individuals at risk of violence. The Community Navigator pilot and initiative will comply with all federal, state and city legal requirements including those of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

Appendix 5: Sample Budget Form

The budget form in Exhibit 2 is included only as an example. Applicants may submit budgets in a different format, but their budgets should include at least the sections and information identified in Exhibit 2.

Exhibit 2. Sample Budget Form

| Budget Category | Per unit cost | FTE* | Planning | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | TOTALS |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Program Director | | | | | | | |
| Other Program Staff (1) | | | | | | | |
| Other Program Staff (2) | | | | | | | |
| Other Program Staff (etc) | | | | | | | |
| Total Personnel | | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| Other Non-Personnel Expenditures (1) | | | | | | | |
| Other Non-Personnel Expenditures (2) | | | | | | | |
| Total Non-Personnel | | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| <i>Subtotals</i> | | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| <i>Indirect Costs**</i> | | | | | | | |
| Total | | | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |

*FTE - Include percentages for personnel who are not 100% funded under this initiative. For example, the Program Director for all courses may only dedicate 15% of time to the program or approach.

**Denote the percentage IDC used

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

Appendix 6: Reference

- ^{lvi} New York City Administration for Children's Services. (2016). *About ACS*. Retrieved September 1, 2016, from <http://www1.nyc.gov/site/acs/about/about.page>.
- ^{lvii} NYC Caregiver. (2006). *Permanency planning*. Retrieved December 3, 2015, from http://www.nyc.gov/html/caregiver/grandparenting_2f.html.
- ^{lviii} Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. *SAMHSA's Concept of Trauma and Guidance for a Trauma-Informed Approach*. HHS Publication No. (SMA) 14-4884. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2014.
- ^{lix} National Center on Domestic Violence, Trauma, and Mental Health. (2013). *Thinking about trauma in the context of DV advocacy: An integrated approach*. Adapted from Harris and Fallot, 2001.
- ^{lx} New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS). Foster care discharges of youth 12 and older. Strategic Management Report. Provided by ACS to ISLG on August 5, 2016.
- ^{lxi} New York City, New York, Law number 2014/046 (effective September 30, 2014).
- ^{lxii} Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008, 42 U.S.C. §1305 (2015).
- ^{lxiii} Courtney, M.E., Dworsky, A., Lee, J.S., & Rapp, M. (2010). *Midwest evaluation of adult functioning of former foster youth: Outcomes at age 23 and 24*. Chicago: Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago.
- ^{lxiv} Peak, C. (2015, November 25). Removing children from abusive situations at home isn't always the answer. This is. *NationSwell*. Retrieved from <http://nationswell.com/nyc-successfully-reduces-foster-care-population/>.
- ^{lxv} Citizens' Committee for Children of New York. (2016). *Foster Care Population* [Table]. Retrieved from <http://data.cccnewyork.org/data/table/28/foster-care-population#28/49/1/a/a>.
- ^{lxvi} New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS). *New York City children in foster care and children receiving preventive services, 1996-2015*. Provided by ACS to ISLG on August 5, 2016.
- New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS). (2015, August). *Flash* [PDF document]. Retrieved from http://www.nyc.gov/html/acs/downloads/pdf/statistics/Flash_August_2015.pdf.
- ^{lxvii} New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS). (2012). *Administration for Children's Services* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from <http://www.nyc.gov/html/ops/downloads/pdf/mmr/acs.pdf>.
- ^{lxviii} ABC News. (2013). *Facts on foster care in America* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from <http://abcnews.go.com/Primetime/FosterCare/story?id=2017991&page=1>.
- ^{lxix} New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS). (2015, November). *Flash* [PDF document]. Retrieved from http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/acs/pdf/data-analysis/Flash_Nov_2015.pdf.
- ^{lxx} Center for Innovation through Data and Intelligence (CIDI). (2015). *Young adult outcomes of foster care, justice, and dually involved youth in New York City*. New York: CIDI. Retrieved from <http://www.nyc.gov/html/cidi/downloads/pdf/foster-care-justice-dually-involved-report.pdf>.
- ^{lxxi} Thornberry, T. P., Henry, K. L., Ireland, T. O., & Smith, C. A. (2010). The causal impact of childhood-limited maltreatment and adolescent maltreatment on early adult adjustment. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 46*(4), 359-365.
- ^{lxxii} Courtney et al., 2010.
- ^{lxxiii} Conger, D., & Ross, T. (2001). *Reducing the foster care bias in juvenile detention decisions: The impact of Project Confirm*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.
- ^{lxxiv} Center for Innovation through Data and Intelligence, 2015.
- ^{lxxv} Courtney et al., 2010.
- ^{lxxvi} Hilliard, 2011.
- ^{lxxvii} Courtney et al., 2010.
- ^{lxxviii} New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS). Foster care discharges of youth 12 and older. Strategic Management Report. Provided by ACS to ISLG on August 5, 2016.
- ^{lxxix} New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS). (2006). *Preparing youth for adulthood*. Retrieved from http://www.youthsuccessnyc.org/PDF/PYA_goals-rev.pdf.
- ^{lxxx} New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS). (2016) *Planning for your future*. Retrieved from <http://www1.nyc.gov/site/acs/youth/planning-future.page>.
- ^{lxxxi} Provided by New York City Administration for Children's Services to ISLG on August 16, 2016.

Appendix 6: RFP for Programs and Approaches for Foster Youth Transitioning to Adulthood

^{lxxxii} Hilliard, 2011.

^{lxxxiii} New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS). (2015). *ACS report on high school graduation rates of youth in foster care, 2015*. Retrieved from http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/acs/pdf/data-analysis/2016/High_School_Graduation_Rates_of_Youth_in_Foster_Care_Annual_Report_2015.pdf

^{lxxxiv} Courtney, M.E., Dworsky, A., Cusick, G.R., Havilcek, J., Perez, A., & Keller, T. (2007). *Midwest evaluation of adult functioning of former foster youth: Outcomes at age 21*. Chicago: Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago

^{lxxxv} Berzin, S. C., Rhodes, A. M., & Curtis, M. A. (2011). Housing experiences of former foster youth: How do they fare in comparison to other youth? *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33(11), 2119-2126.

^{lxxxvi} Hilliard, 2011.

^{lxxxvii} The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2012). *Youth and work: Restoring teen and young adult connections to opportunity*. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/AECF-YouthAndWork-2012-Full.pdf>

Hilliard, 2011.

^{lxxxviii} Dion, R. (2015). *Housing for youth aging out of foster care*. Retrieved from Mathematica Policy Research website: <https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/housing-for-youth-aging-out-of-foster-care-in-focus-brief>.

^{lxxxix} Dworsky, A., Keri-Nicole, D., Dion, M.R., Coffee-Borden, B., Resenau, M. (2012). *Housing for youth aging out of foster care: A review of the literature and program typology*. Retrieved from The U.S., Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research website: https://www.huduser.gov/publications/pdf/HousingFosterCare_LiteratureReview_0412_v2.pdf.

^{xc} Dion, 2015.

^{xci} New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS). Youth (16-21) in Foster Care + Youth on ETP by Case CD and Facility CD (as of 8/28/16). Provided by ACS to ISLG on August 31, 2016.

^{xcii} New York City Administration for Children's Services (ACS). Foster care discharges of youth 12 and older. Strategic Management Report. Provided by ACS to ISLG on August 5, 2016.

^{xciii} Courtney et al., 2010.