



District Attorney of  
New York County

November 14, 2018

The CUNY Institute for State and Local Governance (ISLG) appreciates your interest in the Request for Proposals (RFP) for Evaluation of the *Early Diversion Programs for Young Adults and Adults* initiative.

This addendum includes answers to questions submitted via CJII Application Portal to ISLG by October 28, 2018.

**ANSWERS TO APPLICANT QUESTIONS**  
**Evaluation of the**  
***Early Diversion Programs for Young Adults and Adults Initiative***

**PROGRAM DESIGN**

**QUESTION: We are confused about the terms Adult Project Reset and the Early Diversion initiative as used in the RFP. Are they synonymous, with both describing the initiative covered by this RFP?**

**ANSWER:** Adult Project Reset is the name of the program being funded through the Early Diversion initiative. Three different providers are being funded to implement the program, as described in the RFP. For the purposes of this initiative, “Adult Project Reset” is synonymous with the “Early Diversion initiative”.

**QUESTION: How many participants does DANY project for the Early Diversion initiative in the period to be evaluated?**

**ANSWER:** DANY expects the initiative to serve up to 7,842 participants total during the three-year implementation period, including 5,400 by CCI; 1,932 by Osborne Association, and 510 by Young New Yorkers. See *Section IV.B.4.* of the RFP for more information on the anticipated focus populations and volume of clients.

**QUESTION: Are individuals who present with severe mental health disorders or substance abuse issues eligible? Will these or other similar risk factor indicators be available?**

**ANSWER:** Mental health disorders and substance misuse are not exclusionary criteria for the program. The three different providers may or may not record such information on intake. Some providers also refer participants to optional post-program services based on their individualized needs, which may include services for substance abuse and/or mental health disorders. Information on these referrals is not included in performance reporting but may nonetheless be available for evaluation purposes.

**QUESTION: Are there risk assessment tools currently in use for placement in one of the three programs? If so, what are the names of the tools?**

**ANSWER:** CCI uses the CCAT. Osborne and YNY use other assessment tools developed specifically for their programs.

**QUESTION: What, if any, follow-up is built into the diversion programs? Are the staff in contact with the participants or are the participants required to provide updates?**

**ANSWER:** A mixture of voluntary program and referral services are available among the three providers following program completion. These include social resilience model workshops, restorative justice workshops, case management services, and college tours. The providers document the participants who solicit these services and/or how many

post-program sessions each participant attends. However, participants are not required to provide updates following program completion, and providers generally do not follow up after six months, given the light-touch nature of the program.

**QUESTION: Are there other similar diversion programs currently in effect in the U.S. that DANY sees as models or good comparisons? Do any of these programs have evaluations that DANY sees as particularly effective?**

**ANSWER:** DANY is not familiar with other, similar programs and their evaluations.

**QUESTION: Do participants in the Early Diversion Initiative commit to participate in evaluation activities as part of their involvement in the program?**

**ANSWER:** Participants are not required to participate in evaluation activities as part of their participation in the program. Nonetheless, DANY expects that administrative data from providers and other agencies will serve as a primary source of data in the evaluation. The evaluator will be responsible for obtaining any necessary IRB approval or waiver for use of such data.

In addition, applicants should identify additional sources of data (e.g., baseline survey, follow-up survey, interviews, administrative data, program expenditures, opportunity costs, and expected benefits of diversion programs based on a set of assumptions about programs' goals, population flows, and outcomes) they propose to collect as part of the implementation assessment. The evaluator will also be responsible for obtaining any necessary IRB approval for these additional research activities.

## **AVAILABILITY AND PROVISION OF DATA**

**We received several questions regarding the types of data that DANY will provide. This explanation serves to address those questions.**

**ANSWER:** DANY will provide information related to criminal history, program eligible arrest charges, subsequent arrests, dispositions, demographic information, unique identifiers (e.g., NYSID, name, DOB) of participants and comparison group members.

**QUESTION: Would we be able to collect data on comparable young adults from any of the other boroughs? Could DANY help us connect with the other district attorney offices to facilitate that effort?**

**ANSWER:** Applicants are encouraged to propose a design that incorporates a comparison group of individuals that is as similar to the treatment/program as possible. Applicants may propose any design that achieves this goal, including comparison to similar individuals from other boroughs. However, applicants are encouraged to consider use of data available through DCJS, given that district attorney offices in other boroughs

may not have access to or be willing to provide the same type of information that DANY will provide.

**QUESTION: Does DANY have desk appearance ticket data pre-program implementation (including NYSID or other ID and contact information)?**

**ANSWER:** DANY has and can provide information on individuals prior to the launch of this initiative, including information regarding prior DATs, e.g., for the purposes of historical comparison. Note, however, that individuals who are arrested for the first time, but whose cases are declined for prosecution, would receive a new NYSID at any subsequent arrest.

**QUESTION: Are risk assessment data available? If so, what instrument is used and when are risk assessments administered?**

**ANSWER:** CCI uses the CCAT. Osborne and YNY use other assessment tools developed specifically for their programs.

**QUESTION: What service engagement data are collected and who collects it? Is there data available for the non-mandatory services recommended to participants by the programs?**

**ANSWER:** Providers will collect information on dosage, attendance, and completion for program participants. These data are required for performance measurement and reported to ISLG in aggregate form. They will also be provided to the evaluator at an individual level, subject to negotiation of a DUA governing use of such data.

Enrollment in post-program optional services may be collected by providers who offer these services. This information is not required for performance measurement, however. Providers may make these data available to the evaluator as provided for in a DUA to be negotiated between each provider and the evaluator.

**QUESTION: Is information available about referrals that program participants followed through with, especially if they were referrals to outside agencies?**

**ANSWER:** Providers will collect information on dosage, attendance, and completion for program participants. These data are required for performance measurement and reported to ISLG in aggregate form. They will also be provided to the evaluator at an individual level, subject to negotiation of a DUA governing use of such data.

Information on referrals to outside agencies and follow-through on those referrals may be collected by providers who offer these services. This information is not required for performance measurement, however. Providers may make these data available to the evaluator as provided for in a DUA to be negotiated between each provider and the evaluator.

**QUESTION: How will the evaluator access administrative data, such as recidivism data, program data, and data on courtroom efficiency?**

**ANSWER:** The evaluator will have access to administrative data from several sources, including program-related data (e.g., enrollment, attendance, interventions received, program completion) from the programs while clients are enrolled in and participating in the program, and other data from DANY (e.g., subsequent arrests in New York City, case processing times). The evaluator should identify other data sources (e.g., DCJS; Office of Court Administration), whether administrative or original, for use in the evaluation. The evaluator will be responsible for negotiating any DUAs or agreements to allow for use of such data.

**QUESTION: Will performance measurement data collected by ISLG be made available to the evaluator? If so, what performance measurement data does ISLG collect?**

**ANSWER:** ISLG collects quarterly, aggregate performance data from each of the providers implementing the program. It will make these data available to the evaluator. The evaluator will also receive individual-level, identifiable data from both the providers and from DANY. DANY anticipates that most of the aggregate data provided to ISLG for performance measurement would also be provided at an individual level. Providers will make these data available to the evaluator as provided for in a DUA to be negotiated between each provider and the evaluator.

**QUESTION: What data are available to estimate the costs of program implementation and case processing?**

**ANSWER:** ISLG, DANY, and providers will provide information regarding total program expenses during the initiative. DANY will also make available program budgets to the evaluator.

**QUESTION: How is evaluation being done for the pilot of Project Reset and the expanded Project Reset? Are there any learnings (positive or negative) from evaluation of Project Reset that can inform evaluation of the Early Diversion initiative?**

**ANSWER:** An outcome evaluation of the Project Rest pilot (focused on youth ages 16 and 17 years old) is currently underway and is expected to be completed by the time the evaluator is selected for this initiative. Results will be shared with the evaluator to help guide the evaluation of the *Early Diversion* initiative

**QUESTION: How is evaluation being done for the Community Navigator program? Are there any learnings (positive or negative) from evaluation of Community Navigator that can inform evaluation of the Early Diversion initiative?**

**ANSWER:** The evaluation approach for the Community Navigator program is still in development.

## **PROPOSAL DESIGN AND REQUIREMENTS**

**QUESTION: The recidivism analysis that is proposed in the RFP- 1 month, 3 month, 6 month, 1 year- can this be analyzed for the final report (i.e., with one data request from our data partners and not doing analysis for part of this for the mid-year report and part at for final report)?**

**ANSWER:** Given the timeline for the mid-evaluation report (1.5 years following commencement of the evaluation), the evaluator will not be able to include a longer-term follow-up period for all participants. The evaluator may propose to analyze recidivism for a subset of participants, and/or to analyze a different subset of participants for different follow-up periods. However, the evaluator should plan to analyze recidivism in some way in the mid-evaluation report. Therefore, the evaluator should plan to obtain data during at least two different time points for the purposes of the evaluation.

**QUESTION: Can we propose a different way of analyzing recidivism overtime than the one listed in the RFP (1, 3, 6 months, and 1 year)?**

**ANSWER:** Applicants may propose other approaches to analyzing recidivism beyond those listed in the proposal. Measures listed in the proposal are provided for example purposes only. However, measures should include both short-/medium- term outcomes, however they are defined.

**QUESTION: Would DANY be interested in proposals that track recidivism beyond 1-year?**

**ANSWER:** Measures listed in the proposal are provided for example purposes only. Applicants may propose other measures and follow-up periods beyond those listed in the proposal. Nonetheless, the program is light-touch in nature and therefore, it may be unreasonable to expect longer-term (e.g., more than one year) program effects that have not already appeared in short- and medium-term follow-up periods.

**QUESTION: Does the RFP seek analysis of the eligible people who opted not to participate in the Early Diversion initiative and those that didn't complete programming? Will DANY and the providers provide support in contacting these individuals and getting information?**

**ANSWER:** Applicants should anticipate having access to administrative data on both participants and non-participants. Nonetheless, DANY expects that very few individuals participants in the program will fail to complete it. In other words, given the light-touch and one-day nature of the program, DANY expects that very few participants will drop out of the program prior to completion. Thus, DANY does not expect the sample to be robust enough to compare program completers to non-completers. Applicants should describe how they plan to address non-completers in the analysis.

Providers are required to work with ISLG and the evaluator for purposes of the evaluation. The evaluator will be responsible for identifying and negotiating any

additional sources of data beyond the administrative data described above. Providers already collect some data on non-completers, and they may agree to make such data available to the evaluator. However, these data may be more limited than for completers. DANY does not expect that providers will collect or provide non-administrative data as part of their responsibility to submit regular performance data to ISLG.

DANY can provide unique identifiers (e.g., NYSID) for all eligible individuals, including participants and non-participants. DANY will not contact these individuals for the purpose of the evaluation.

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

## **PROPOSAL FORMAT**

**We received several questions regarding page limits for the Organizational and Staff Capacity and Experience sections. This explanation serves to address those questions.**

**ANSWER:** The Organizational and Staff Capacity and Experience sections of the proposal should not exceed five double-spaced pages each, excluding resumes of key staff and excluding letters of support/commitment and a copy of the applicant's latest audit report or certified financial statement.

**QUESTION: Is the 15-page evaluation proposal double or single spaced?**

**ANSWER:** The evaluation proposal 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 in the RFP, unless otherwise noted.

## **CONTRACT AND DELIVERABLES**

**QUESTION: What type of contract/award is this going to be (e.g., cost reimbursement, fixed price)?**

**ANSWER:** The contract payment structure will be deliverables-based.

**QUESTION: What is expected in the mid-year report, specifically for the initial outcome measures? Is this flexible based on the proposed timing of the research plan?**

**ANSWER:** The mid-evaluation report typically provides information on progress in data collection, analysis, and challenges, along with a description of findings to date, including differences in the treatment and comparison groups and any observation of program effects to date.

## **MISCELLANEOUS**

**QUESTION: Are CUNY institutions eligible to bid on this RFP?**

**ANSWER:** CUNY institutions are eligible to submit a proposal for this RFP.

**QUESTION: Are there other DANY programs that have independent evaluators that provide learnings (positive or negative)? Can you share links to any publicly available reports that could be informative?**

**ANSWER:** DANY is not able to provide such information at this time.