



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 1302-004

EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT AND PLACEMENT SERVICES FOR AB 109 PROGRAM

Proposal Rating Sheets

RATING SHEET

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. Proposal Cover Statement - *required but not weighted*

II.1. Agency Overview

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (3 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (2 pts.) |

0-8

Comments:

II.2. Program Proposal

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (15 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (15 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (10 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

II.3. Program Implementation and Oversight

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (5 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (5 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (2 pts.) |

0-12

Comments:

II.4 Bidder's Experience

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

II.5 Responsivity

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

III.1 Fiscal Management Information

0-5

Comments:

III.2 Program Budget/Narrative

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

RATING SHEET
Anka Behavioral Health, Inc.
Employment Support and Placement Services

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement** - *required but not weighted* *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (2 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (1 pt.) |

0-8

Comments:

Locally based nonprofit with main office in Concord; program services located in Antioch and Concord. History of operating more than 80 behavioral health programs for 40 years; workforce development division, Phoenix Enterprises, providing employment related services since 1984. Collaboration history not explicit/demonstrated.

6

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (12 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (10 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (6 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

Collaborative partner: Inspire Learning Institute. (Inspire in partnership with Mongo Works, though collaboration unclear.) Program targeted to Central and East County. Proposal states an approach focused on transitional employment and vocational training, but no description of that in program model. Proposal includes irrelevant references to therapist/client relationship; unrelated to RFP. Program model focuses on Case Specialists and the assessment and referral to services functions. Job placement objective of 20-25% is too low. Collaborations/coordination with other agencies is in initial stages but intention is strong. Program evaluation and outcome component of proposal is adequate but includes erroneous information.

28

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (2 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (4 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (1 pt.) |

0-12

Comments:

Pre-release assessment is a good component, but five assessments may be too many. Employment Workshop phase includes start of traditional or transitional employment, but does not provide much detailed information about this aspect. Timeline is not clear about length of each phase. Case closed after 90 days on job; not as much follow-up as other proposals. Too many new staff to be hired. 8.0 FTEs in East County; 6.0 FTEs in Central.

7

II.4 Bidder's Experience

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Experience does not discuss direct experience with formerly incarcerated though Panel Members aware of applicant's experience. Partners have history of serving clients, roughly 5% of which were formerly incarcerated.

11

II.5 Responsivity

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

No discussion of cultural sensitivity of program or relevance of services to diverse client populations. No evidence of utilization or understanding of evidence-based practices aside from development of a "highly structured program." Proposal then cites an in-house transitional employment program, but no other description as to how this relates to proposed program.

6

III.1 Fiscal Management Information

0-5

Comments:

Annual independent audits; all financial documents provided. Solid fiscal management practices. No concerns.

5

III.2 Program Budget/Narrative

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

Insufficient information about cost of positions. Unclear allocation of costs to collaborative partner. Basis of allocations not provided in narrative.

5

Total Score**68**

RATING SHEET

City of San Pablo, Community Services Department Employment Support and Placement Services

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement - required but not weighted** *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (2 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (1 pt.) |

0-8

Comments:

City of San Pablo has provided a "host of services for offenders residing within city boundaries" since incorporation, but no evidence of service provision to other West County communities. Demonstrated collaboration focuses on organizations benefiting the San Pablo community.

6

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (8 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (10 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (10 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

Collaborative partners: 13 collaborative partners identified, primary and ancillary, which include San Pablo Economic Development Center, City of Richmond, Lao Family Community Development, Men & Women of Purpose, CCCOE, STRIDE Center, Moler Barber College, New Skin Tattoo Removal, Wardrobe for Opportunity, ReliaTech, DP Security Service, WDB, and Escalante Center. Program targeted to West County, 145 clients. City will hire 0.8 FTE Project Coordinator who will manage 2 case managers hired by Lao Family CD and housed at One Stops. Proposal of "menu of employment services" beginning pre-release through post-release job readiness, work experience and placement. Direct placement component not detailed; focus on job readiness training; 58 will be referred to other services not described, with only 9 of those moving into readiness & training. Extensive collaborations. Completion rates prorated to sections completed in 20% increments geared toward training phases; not applicable to all participants.

28

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (0 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (2 pt.) |

0-12

Comments:

No timeline provided for service delivery. No description of case manager positions in proposal.

5

II.4 **Bidder's Experience**

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Proposal does not discuss direct experience with formerly incarcerated except for experience of one staff person, and evidence of experience focused entirely on San Pablo community.

10

II.5 **Responsivity**

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

No discussion of cultural sensitivity of program or relevance of services to diverse client populations. No evidence of utilization or understanding of evidence-based practices.

3

III.1 **Fiscal Management Information**

0-5

Comments:

Annual independent audits; all financial documents provided. Solid fiscal management practices. No concerns.

5

III.2 **Program Budget/Narrative**

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

Excellent leveraging of resources. Inadequate information providing basis for computations.

6

Total Score

63

RATING SHEET
Contra Costa County Office of Education
Employment Support and Placement Services

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement** - *required but not weighted* *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (2 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (2 pts.) |

0-8

Comments:

Administrative office in Pleasant Hill; program offices for CCAS (Adult School) at detention facilities. Extensive history providing education services in jails and parole education programs. Extensive history of collaboration with justice partners and service providers. Project partner has "no direct experience with formerly incarcerated."

7

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (10 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (11 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (7 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

Collaborative partner: Michael Chavez Center for Economic Opportunity. Proposal identifies other CBOs involved and funded. Proposes service delivery in Central & East County to 250. CCAS Centers targeted at adult schools in Central & East County, partner site in Concord and Bay Point, counselors at One-Stops in Far East, East and Central. Centers operable 9:00 to 3:00 M-F; Panel considered too limited. Educational and prevocational programs provided by CCAS, in & out of custody. Only one Job Developer identified; considered insufficient for 2 regions. Program centered on education, training, case management. Limited employment subsidies for 40 for 4 weeks. Indicates supported transitional employment as a component but doesn't describe. Vendor partners include SparkPoint for credit counseling and financial literacy, an attorney for legal services, and training contractors. Concern that prime subcontractor has limited experience with job placement services for the target population.

28

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (4 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (1 pt.) |

0-12

Comments:

Timeline with action steps clear. Employment Centers not open until September (4 months after project start); however, 50% participants enrolled in training, education or employment by end of Sept.? Staffing not adequate for job development/placement.

8

II.4 Bidder's Experience

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Extensive experience delivering services to incarcerated is documented in proposal for CCCOE, but no experience demonstrated with respect to employment placement services for formerly incarcerated adults. Lead partner experience with formerly incarcerated is described as "no direct experience;" only 190 individuals served in vocational training programs in 2012.

7

II.5 Responsibility

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

Spanish language capacity with Chavez Center; CCCOE teachers familiar with working with the target population, but partners and community based job developers working with youth did not demonstrate cultural competency for the target population.

7

III.1 Fiscal Management Information

0-5

Comments:

Annual independent audits; all financial documents provided. Solid financial management practices. No concerns.

5

III.2 Program Budget/Narrative

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

Aggregates both regions into one budget but clearly presented. 62% of the budget in personnel costs. \$152k for supplies/expendable equipment with no cost basis provided. Fringe benefits of 36% higher than other proposals though not unreasonable. Vendor contract cost basis don't look accurate: OJ \$21,000 for 4 female clients @ \$3,000 per client. Stride Center \$24,500 for 5 clients @ \$3,500 per client. No cost basis provided for training contractors.

6

Total Score**68**

RATING SHEET
Goodwill Industries of the Greater East Bay
Employment Support and Placement Services

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement** - *required but not weighted* *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (3 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (2 pts.) |

0-8

Comments:

Nonprofit based in Oakand, 95 years old, providing work preparation and transitional employment for participants that "mirror" AB 109. Two local program offices identified: Antioch and Rodeo (NHCDC). More than half the staff is formerly incarcerated. Proposal documents collaboration with over 20 CBOs.

8

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (10 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (11 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (8 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

Collaborative partners: New Horizons Career Development Center and GRIP (in kind). Proposes service delivery in all regions of County, male and female participants. 5 phase Career Development System. Incentivized benchmarks throughout process; strong component. Pre-release engagement, 3 individual assessments with Career Cruising software, barrier removal services, assignment to Case Manager, referrals to community partners for other services (housing, mental health, substance abuse). Career preparation workshops--job readiness and behavioral life skills. Proposal emphasis on providing transitional employment. Central/East County, 90% of transitional at one of Goodwill's employment worksites. For West/Central, 50% of transitional will be at Goodwill; the other 50% placed elsewhere. Wages paid via PayCard system, a feature the Panel liked. While in transitional employment, client to continue workshops and work with Job Developer. Outcomes clearly identified and reasonable; use of internal database. Collaboration identified with several partners.

29

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (5 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (1 pt.) |

0-12

Comments:

Timeline with action steps clear and reasonable. Staffing to cover all 3 regions is adequate. Appears to be all new staff, however.

9

II.4 Bidder's Experience

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Extensive experience delivering services to formerly incarcerated is well documented in proposal.

13

II.5 Responsivity

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

Will employ a diverse staff to meet the gender and language of participants. Current staff includes numerous formerly incarcerated and is diverse. Proposal doesn't address knowledge of or commitment to specific evidence-based practices.

7

III.1 Fiscal Management Information

0-5

Comments:

Annual independent audits; all financial documents provided. Solid financial management practices. No concerns.

5

III.2 Program Budget/Narrative

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

All aggregated into one budget, so will need to break out for region. 8.5% administrative fee is reasonable. Budget is clear and concise. Identifies leveraged resources, but doesn't fully describe how leverage is provided.

7

Total Score**78**

RATING SHEET
HealthRIGHT 360
Employment Support and Placement Services

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement - required but not weighted** *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (3 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (0 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (1 pt.) |

0-8

Comments:

San Francisco based non-profit with "letter of interest" to secure 3 local facilities. Extensive services/history of service to uninsured, homeless, disenfranchised; the vast majority involved in criminal justice system. Mostly behavioral health, primary health services. Numerous collaborations with criminal justice agencies cited.

4

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (10 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (12 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (1 pt.) |

0-40

Comments:

No collaborative partners identified. Proposal states intent to establish "vocational rehabilitation centers" in each region of County, to be co-located with One-Stops. Program to serve 444 clients. Program will "combine quality in-house classes, workshops, and counseling with community connections." Assessment driven service delivery. Focus on job readiness workshops, computer classes. Job seeking activities designed to transition into job placement after 2-3 months. No transitional or subsidized employment provided in proposal. No gender specific services identified. Job development in a community with no prior experience may be difficult. Intent to collaborate and an extensive history of collaboration in SF & LA, but no collaboration evident in CCC, no MOUs provided. Solid program evaluation, data collection & reporting proposal.

23

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (2 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (2 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (1 pt.) |

0-12

Comments:

Insufficient timeline to fully describe program and service delivery components. 22 FTEs dedicated to program. 8 Employment Counselors distributed as 2.0 FTEs to East, 2.0 FTEs in Central and 4.0 FTEs in West; doesn't align with AB 109 population. 3 FTEs for Housing & Community Services coordination seems excessive if co-located in One-Stops. Description of use of local resources doesn't address CCC in any manner.

5

II.4 Bidder's Experience

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Currently operates 10 community based case management & reentry based programs for youth and adult offenders in SF and LA. Operates 14 jail and prison based programs. Substantial demonstrated experience in delivering services to targeted communities; nothing indicative of service delivery to targeted Contra Costa County communities.

12

II.5 Responsivity

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

Experience working with formerly incarcerated individuals, with appropriate capacity around language. Concerned they will need to hire all new staff to serve clients in CCC. Concerned about lack of knowledge about CCC communities. Good utilization of evidence-based practices in service delivery.

7

III.1 Fiscal Management Information

0-5

Comments:

Annual independent audits; all financial documents provided. Solid financial management practices. No concerns.

5

III.2 Program Budget/Narrative

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

54% of the budget in personnel costs, which is reasonable. Salaries low for job developers and computer lab instructors (\$32k). Over \$646k related to building and office equipment rather than service provision. Considered weakness by Panel, especially relative to other proposals. Seems more geared toward implementation of Reentry Resource Centers.

6

Total Score**62**

RATING SHEET

Henkels & McCoy Training Services Group Employment Support and Placement Services

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement** - *required but not weighted* *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (3 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (2 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (1 pt.) |

0-8

Comments:

Pennsylvania based for-profit, part of family held construction company. "Project management" locations in Pittsburg & Richmond. 30 years of employment & training to multi-barrier clients, 20% with arrest records. Collaboration history with criminal justice agencies.

6

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (10 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (12 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (6 pt.) |

0-40

Comments:

Collaborative partners identified: CCC WDB, Men & Women of Purpose, Reach Fellowship. Intensive/active case management model with proposed 6 offices, mostly co-located at exiting One-Stops, 8-5. Program to serve up to 500 clients. Pre-release by MWP to develop Individual Employment Plan. Transition plan to identify needed support services. Insufficient risk assessment or targeting of services to risk level. Proposal not clear how criminogenic factors are identified or addressed. Staff not currently trained but intention to offer T4C, though just bi-annually, considered insufficient by Panel. Proposal not clear on offering transitional or subsidized employment. Centered on developing employment plan and providing training, but falls short on how clients will obtain job placement. Job development inadequately addressed. Not sure how collaboration with WDB is integrated into program. Efforts to Outcomes tracking system a strong component.

28

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (2 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (1 pt.) |

0-12

Comments:

Timeline begins May 1, which seemed premature. Timeline doesn't fully describe the action steps of the program and is unrealistic (Are locations operational June 1 if contract begins then?). 1.86 FTEs for Job Development/Job Coaching may be insufficient. Not clear whether new or existing staff for each identified position.

6

II.4 **Bidder's Experience**

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Unclear what experience company staff have with serving formerly incarcerated. Most experience cited in resumes is at-risk youth oriented. Company may have experience with populations with barriers to employment, but does staff assigned to project and are these formerly incarcerated adults? Numerous letters of support included, however, from potential employers and community organizations.

11

II.5 **Responsivity**

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

No discussion in this section of the proposal of gender-specific services, despite the fact that they have engaged a fee-for-service partner, RFI, that is oriented toward a female clientele. No discussion of language-specific services. The commitment to have staff certified in T4C is good, but no other demonstration of evidence-based practices such as risk assessment, matching services/interventions to characteristics of individuals, or client engagement strategies.

7

III.1 **Fiscal Management Information**

0-5

Comments:

Annual independent audits; all financial documents provided. Solid financial management practices. No concerns.

5

III.2 **Program Budget/Narrative**

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

Buried in the budget is \$240,000 for "Client Internships and WEP(?), described as "5 weeks x 20 hour/wk x \$8/hr." Also, "Staffing Company Fees" for \$52,800. And "Forklift (45 clients) for \$21,000." These components are not described in proposal. If this is related to transitional employment, would have been helpful to describe. Cost basis for partner agencies support not provided.

7

Total Score

70

RATING SHEET
HR Management, Inc.
Employment Support and Placement Services

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement** - *required but not weighted* *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (2 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (1 pt.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (1 pt.) |

0-8

Comments:

For-profit firm based in Oakland, started in 2002 primarily offering payroll service programs, and temporary and permanent staffing. Intent to open CCC offices (on "as needed basis") or share facilities, but no evidence of local presence. Limited history of collaboration documented in proposal; one organization cited.

4

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (7 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (1 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (10 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

Collaborative partners: Mothers Advocating Juvenile Justice, Reach Fellowship, Oakland PIC, Stride Center, Michael Chavez Center, Urban University, Shelter Inc., Men & Women of Purpose, Men of Valor, The Workforce Collaborative, The Veterans Resource Project. Objective to serve formerly incarcerated African-American males, employing 100 candidates within 16 months. Neglects to serve the majority of AB 109 population (White and Hispanic). Target population may include women, but no description of gender-based services. Target population "will have high school diploma or GED." No placement based on risk/needs; instead chosen by "greatest chances of success." No assessment tools identified. No outcomes identified other than "place 100 candidates on full-time positions within time limits." No indication of collaborative case management or consideration of additional support services except for housing (Shelter Inc.) and mental health (County Behavioral Health). Numerous partners identified, though not funded in budget.

18

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (3 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (0 pt.) |

0-12

Comments:

Condensed timeline doesn't indicate primary roles and responsibilities. Program staffing doesn't indicate FT equivalencies or commitment of resources for all program staff. Use of local resources consists of an invitation to "major public agencies" to "support our goals."

6

II.4 Bidder's Experience

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Proposal does not provide demonstrated ability of firm to deliver services to the formerly incarcerated or significant current or past experience delivering services to formerly incarcerated. Cites experience with public and private sector entities in the provision of temporary and permanent employment services. Partner agencies have experience with service provision to formerly incarcerated, but not clear how they are utilized.

7

II.5 Responsibility

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

No evidence in the proposal of firm's utilization or understanding of evidence-based practices. No evidence of cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services.

5

III.1 Fiscal Management Information

0-5

Comments:

No audit provided; no statement of reason for why no audit conducted or certification from CEO that the information provided accurately reflects company's current financial status. Financial management practices adequate for size of firm.

1

III.2 Program Budget/Narrative

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

Budget indicates funding of 19 FTEs, but narrative doesn't include titles, rate of pay, time allotted to program. No cost basis provided for budget line items. Additional budgets provided for housing and mentoring services but no corresponding proposals submitted for those RFPs. No cost basis information provided for those additional budgets either.

4

Total Score**45**

RATING SHEET
Rubicon Programs, Inc.
Employment Support and Placement Services

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement** - *required but not weighted* *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (3 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (2 pts.) |

0-8

Comments:

Non-profit based in Richmond in operation since 1973 serving formerly incarcerated and employment services/supports for 30 years. Antioch location for East County services. Extensive demonstration of collaboration to deliver services.

8

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (14 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (14 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (10 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

Collaborative partners: STAND! For Families Free of Violence, Bay Area Legal Aid, and Literacy for Every Adult Program. Extensive referral network also identified. Program offers full continuum of employment support and placement services to AB 109 population in East and West County. "Jail to Community" model that includes access to other Rubicon services, including housing, substance abuse counseling and financial stability services. Other key services include domestic violence screening & counseling and anger management training; legal services; computer literacy and GED classes. Incorporates "Thinking for a Change" classes for clients, and staff will use trauma-informed approach. Program design is clear and concise and includes vocational training, transitional employment and subsidized employment. Collaboration roles clearly identified. Program evaluation and outcomes overseen by Quality Assurance Manager. Clear outcome measures and performance targets, managed by custom web-based database.

38

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (5 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (4 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (2 pt.) |

0-12

Comments:

Timeline & responsible staff clearly identified and sufficient for program. Review Panel questions necessity of 1.0 FTE for financial coach. Extensive use of local resources including survey of service needs of adult reentry conducted by Safe Return.

11

II.4 **Bidder's Experience**

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Extensive demonstrated experience providing services to formerly incarcerated including PAPAS and Second Chance programs. Staff experience with service delivery to target population also identified. Not identified in proposal is staff with incarceration experience though known to hire formerly incarcerated.

14

II.5 **Responsivity**

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

Proposal incorporates evidence-based, integrated services approach including "Thinking for A Change," cognitive behavioral therapy. Commitment to train all staff in trauma-informed care strategies. Will tailor services to women and provide domestic violence support and family reunification services through Bay Area Legal Aid. Diverse staffing matches ethnicity of population, but doesn't identify formerly incarcerated on staff.

8

III.1 **Fiscal Management Information**

0-5

Comments:

Annual independent audits; all financial documents provided. Solid financial management practices. No concerns.

5

III.2 **Program Budget/Narrative**

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

Thorough and extensive documentation of all costs related to program and cost basis provided for all elements.

9

Total Score 93



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 1302-003

SHORT AND LONG-TERM HOUSING ACCESS FOR AB 109 PROGRAM

Proposal Rating Sheets

RATING SHEET

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. Proposal Cover Statement - *required but not weighted*

II.1. Agency Overview

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (3 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (2 pts.) |

0-8

Comments:

II.2. Program Proposal

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (15 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (15 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (10 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

II.3. Program Implementation and Oversight

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (5 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (5 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (2 pts.) |

0-12

Comments:

II.4 Bidder's Experience

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

II.5 Responsivity

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

III.1 Fiscal Management Information

0-5

Comments:

III.2 Program Budget/Narrative

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

RATING SHEET
Anka Behavioral Health, Inc.
Short and Long-Term Housing Access

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement** - *required but not weighted* *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (3 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (1 pt.) |

0-8

Comments:

Locally based nonprofit with main office in Concord; program services located in Richmond, Antioch and Concord. History of operating more than 80 behavioral health programs for 40 years; 20 years providing services to target population. Collaboration history not provided in proposal but discussed in interview.

7

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (9 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (10 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (5 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

Collaborative partner: none identified except informally—REACH, County Office of Homeless Programs, Men & Women of Purpose, GRIP, Bay Legal, and Community Housing Development Corporation. Services to be offered countywide. 2.0 FTE Housing Specialists to staff program; \$274k to provide financial assistance in the form of security deposits, first/last rent. Offers housing placement/vouchers, financial assistance, intensive services to 100 (pre-release assessment & planning, family reunification, emergency housing plan, landlord services). Not clear on how clients obtain placement. Remainder to receive access and referrals to services, Housing Resource Guide, Shared Housing Directory, matching assistance, and individual/group sessions on housing issues. Unsure what efforts will be made to ensure clients are put on eligibility lists for public housing. Outcome data shows 20 individuals housed; 5 families housed. Outcomes not clearly quantified. Data to be collected focused on employment. Collaboration not strong.

24

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (4 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (5 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (1 pt.) |

0-12

Comments:

Start-up of program completed in 30 days, services beginning start of month 2. Only describes roll-out for intensive services to 100. Program staff sufficient.

10

II.4 Bidder's Experience

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Housing & Homeless Services Department providing services for 20 years. Proposal section on Bidder's Experience doesn't fully describe their experience serving formerly incarcerated population.

12

II.5 Responsivity

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

Field-based services are good. Commitment to use of and understanding of evidence-based practices is good. However, response doesn't clearly highlight criminal justice experience or language skills of staff.

8

III.1 Fiscal Management Information

0-5

Comments:

Audit committee hires outside auditors for annual audit requirement. Excellent fiscal system administration. No concerns expressed by Panel.

5

III.2 Program Budget/Narrative

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

Budget not easy to read; no aggregate budget provided, and FTE count for each region not accurate. Salary per FTE not provided. More resources dedicated for housing assistance than staff, which is positive, but Review Panel had no clear understanding of how these resources will be used for long-term access. Proposal was inadequate to answer questions about role of specific funding requests; interview did not clarify.

7

Total Score**73**

RATING SHEET
Greater Richmond Interfaith Program
Short and Long-Term Housing Access

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement** - *required but not weighted* *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (3 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (2 pt.) |

0-8

Comments:

Richmond based nonprofit with 47 years of services to community. Homeless focus and basic needs support. Proposal doesn't mention their permanent supportive housing, funded by HUD. Panel concerns about capacity issues. Demonstrated history of collaborations.

8

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (10 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (10 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (9 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

Collaborative partners: Reach Fellowship for 7-bed shelter/transitional housing for female ex-offenders and support services for males and females; Neighborhood House of North Richmond for transitional and permanent housing through 25 project-based vouchers. Panel concerned that 25 project based vouchers not actually available because no evidence provided from Richmond Housing Authority. Proposes intensive housing services to 145, with 1 FTE Housing Coordinator, 0.2 FTE Case Manager, 0.2 FTE Program Manager. NHRN indicates 20 service-enriched transitional housing beds, 31 permanent housing units available to AB 109 clients. Services to include centralized intake screening, intensive housing assistance services, access to emergency financial assistance, transportation, identification, other leveraged reentry services and referrals. Monthly follow-up for 12 months. Placement services not a strong component if housing with partners not readily available. Goal of permanent housing placement within 90-120 days, 72% retain housing for 1 year. 50% placed in transitional housing for 90-120 days. 40% immediately into permanent housing. Data and evaluation plans didn't include any quality assurance staff.

29

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (2 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (2 pt.) |

0-12

Comments:

Timeline does not provide flow of services. Everything happens on one business day except for follow-up. Programming staffing sufficient. Good use of local resources.

7

II.4 Bidder's Experience

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Proposal provides demonstrated ability of and past experience of applicant to deliver services to formerly incarcerated. However, Review Panel concerned about capacity of organization and quality and availability of transitional housing opportunities.

12

II.5 Responsivity

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

Thorough discussion of client responsivity, engagement and feedback. Use of evidence-based and field-based practices in the West County community, including motivational interviewing and Stages of Change training. Staff includes formerly incarcerated. Strong reputation for delivering services in the community.

10

III.1 Fiscal Management Information

0-5

Comments:

Solid financial management practices. Audit provided. All required documents submitted. Concern that Comptroller/HR Director is apparently leaving the organization.

4

III.2 Program Budget/Narrative

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

65% of grant funding dedicated to Personnel. Budget provides \$43k for transitional/intermediate housing with partners at \$500/month with estimated average stay of 30 days. Not enough resources dedicated to assistance with permanent housing.

5

Total Score

75

RATING SHEET
SHELTER, Inc.
Short and Long-Term Housing Access

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement** - *required but not weighted* *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (3 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (2 pts.) |

0-8

Comments:

Locally based nonprofit with main office in Martinez; staff at sites in Antioch, Pittsburg, One-stops in Concord and Richmond, and SparkPoint Bay Point. 26 years in operation providing continuum of housing services to low-income. 60 agencies with referral relationship; partnership with CCCOE, Leah's Pantry, Rubicon and Bi-Bett Corporation.

8

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (13 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (13 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (10 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

Collaborative partner: Bay Area Legal Aid (SparkPoint also cited in proposal as "vendor relationship"). Services to be provided countywide. "Housing First" model to address immediate housing needs then services. Targets 144 clients for housing search and placement; 12 homeless clients for room in master leased facilities; 100 clients for rental subsidies/assistance with deposits; 30 clients for legal assistance from Bay Legal; 40 clients referred to SparkPoint for financial education. Staff additions: 1 FTE housing specialist; 2.5 FTE Case Managers; 1 Program Coordinator; 0.33 FTE attorney. Review Panel suggested staffing may be too much unless providing search & placement services to more clients. In interview, proposer suggested staffing would be reevaluated during implementation. Clients may have access to SHELTER's homeless programs or dedicated AB 109 beds at adult shelters. Good continuum of housing services. Solid program evaluation program and identification of outcomes. Demonstrated collaboration.

36

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (4 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (2 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (2 pts.) |

0-12

Comments:

Realistic start-up. 15 to 20 clients for each case manager at a time. Doesn't describe service roll-out. Staffing fully described; may be too much. Good use of local resources in program implementation and evaluation.

8

II.4 Bidder's Experience

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Lead agency and partners all with extensive experience providing services to formerly incarcerated in all regions of County.

15

II.5 Responsivity

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

Thorough description of responsivity to client needs; good use of consumer feedback and grievance process. Case Managers trained in evidence-based practices of motivational interviewing, stages of change, harm reduction, and de-escalation techniques. Review Panel members expressed concerns that SHELTER perceived as not as "welcoming" as other agencies because staff not representative of client population.

8

III.1 Fiscal Management Information

0-5

Comments:

Solid financial management information. All required financial documentation provided, including Combined Financial Statements with independent Auditor's report. No concerns.

5

III.2 Program Budget/Narrative

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

Thorough and easy to read. Doesn't indicate any leveraged support. May be too heavy in staffing for number of clients served. Reasonable benefits load of 24%.

8

Total Score**88**



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 1302-005
PEER AND MENTORING SERVICES FOR AB 109 PROGRAM

Proposal Rating Sheets

RATING SHEET

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. Proposal Cover Statement - *required but not weighted*

II.1. Agency Overview

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (3 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (2 pts.) |

0-8

Comments:

II.2. Program Proposal

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (15 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (15 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (10 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

II.3. Program Implementation and Oversight

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (5 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (5 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (2 pts.) |

0-12

Comments:

II.4 Bidder's Experience

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

II.5 Responsivity

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

III.1 Fiscal Management Information

0-5

Comments:

III.2 Program Budget/Narrative

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

RATING SHEET
Contra Costa County Office of Education
Peer & Mentoring Services

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement** - *required but not weighted* *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (3 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (2 pts.) |

0-8

Comments:

Locally based administrative office in Pleasant Hill; program offices at detention facilities. Extensive history providing education services in jails and parole education programs. Extensive history of collaboration with justice partners and service providers. Multiple partner agencies identified for project with reentry population experience.

8

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (12 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (13 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (10 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

Collaborative partners: Men & Women of Purpose, Brighter Beginnings, Insight Prison Project, Center for Human Development. (Proposal cites Child Abuse Prevention Council as service provider but no discussion of role.) Proposal cites intent of serving 250, countywide, which is ambitious. Services begin pre-release. Weekly face-to-face meetings not sufficient during first 4-8 weeks post-release. Program services matrix thorough. Proposed model for services follows best-practices guided by "Building Offenders' Community Assets through Mentoring." Modified training curriculum provided by Insight Prison Project. Extensive training component. Intention to establish mentor relationships that last at least six months may not be sufficient; Review Panel members suggest serving fewer with more intensive services. Excellent description of program evaluation and commitment to specific outcomes.

35

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (5 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (4 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (2 pts.) |

0-12

Comments:

Thorough description of action steps and timeline. Programming staffing is experienced and sufficient. Excellent use of local resources.

11

II.4 **Bidder's Experience**

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Lead agency and partners with extensive experience providing services to incarcerated and formerly incarcerated in all regions of County. Direct experience with development/implementation of mentoring programs less evident.

13

II.5 **Responsivity**

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

Demonstrates good understanding and commitment to evidence-based practices. Excellent commitment to providing services that are responsive to individuals and common issues. Commitment to recruit mentors that mirror the community, but no explicit inclusion of mentors sensitive to issues of sexual orientation.

6

III.1 **Fiscal Management Information**

0-5

Comments:

Solid financial management information. Yearly audits. Extensive manual of fiscal procedures and policies. Utilization of MUNIS.

5

III.2 **Program Budget/Narrative**

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

Thorough and easy to read. Includes leveraged support. Reasonable benefits load of 20-24%.

10

Total Score

88

<p style="text-align: center;">RATING SHEET Contra Costa County Service Integration Team <i>Peer & Mentoring Services</i></p>

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 100:

- I. **Proposal Cover Statement** - *required but not weighted* *Submitted but incomplete*

The proposal was deemed to be not compliant with technical and Minimum Organizational Requirements by the CAO's office. The proposal was not scored.



REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 1302-007
PLANNING OF (3) ONE-STOP CENTERS
FOR AB 109 PROGRAM

Proposal Rating Sheets



RATING SHEET

Program elements will be weighted as follows:

Program Elements and Possible Score

- I. Proposal Cover Statement - *required but not weighted*
- II.1. Agency Overview/Components
1. Organization's overall services/history (3 pts.)
 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based (3 pts.)
 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services (2 pts.)
- 0-8
- II.2. Program Proposal
1. Program design/methodology (20 pts.)
 2. Program evaluation/outcomes (10 pts.)
 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination (10 pts.)
- 0-40
- II.3. Program Implementation and Oversight
1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the process will be complete (5pts.)
 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management (5pts.)
 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation (2 pts.)
- 0-12
- II.4. Bidder's Experience
Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities
- 0-15
- II.5. Responsivity
Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.
- 0-10
- III.1 Program Budget/Narrative
Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.
- 0 – 10

Total 95 pts.

RATING SHEET
Emerald HPC International, LLC
Planning for (3) Reentry Resource Centers

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 95:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement** - *required but not weighted* *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|------------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (2 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (2.5 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (1.5 pts.) |

0-8

Comments:

Headquarters in SF but Antioch business address. Consulting firm with a focus on sustainable communities. Proposal does not indicate a lot of adult reentry experience but award-winning experience in public safety/violence mitigation, prisoner reentry in Northern Ireland.

6

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (14 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (8 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (7 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

Proposal for both Central and East County planning but doesn't distinguish planning processes for both. Consultants confident planning for both regions can be done simultaneously given experience. Retreat concept good; may be necessary for buy-in, especially in politically sensitive context. Better explanation of *High Performing Communities* framework in interview, which increased score. Development of asset map is a unique component of proposal. Successful completion of projects. Numerous letters of support demonstrating coordination/collaboration. Insufficient description of data evaluation component. However, proposal suggests consultants understand and are committed to data sharing.

29

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|------------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (2 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (3.5 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (1.5 pts.) |

0-12

Comments:

Insufficient information in timeline. No administrative support identified. Timeline seems ambitious for the completion of both projects. Interview clarified implementation and increased scored.

9

II.4 Bidder's Experience

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Excellent references but limited experience indicated in proposal with respect to Central County reentry issues. In interview, expressed interest in partnering, collaborating with the safety net collaborative process underway in Central County.

12

II.5 Responsivity

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

Proposal suggests extensive involvement in East and Central communities. Cultural sensitivity/ responsivity seems to be a hallmark of the firm. No demonstrated knowledge of evidence-based services.

8

III.1 Program Budget/Narrative

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

More task-oriented budget needed, but operations costs are reasonable. Commitment made during interview to complete projects successfully on budget.

8

Total score**72**

RATING SHEET
Further The Work, LLC
Planning for (3) Reentry Resource Centers

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 95:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement** - *required but not weighted* *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (2 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (3 pts.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (1 pt.) |

0-8

Comments:

Richmond based with multi-stakeholder, place-based approach, focused on formerly incarcerated issues. Incorporated in 2009; not an extensive history of collaboration with partners, but experience directly related to reentry.

6

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (18 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (7 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (9 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

Clear and comprehensive project planning outline for West County, framed with philosophy. Commitment to 3 additional project outcomes: to increase community participation, increase trust, encourage collective learning and capacity building. Excellent understanding of systems of care models. Extensive commitment to collaboration; numerous letters of support. History of successful completion of community-driven projects. Data evaluation/design discussion not as strong.

34

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|------------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (5 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (4.5 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (2 pts.) |

0-12

Comments:

Extensive, thorough timeline with attention to detail. Ambitious schedule but reasonable. Appropriate staffing with credentials and experience. Staff experience with data evaluation/design not as extensively documented.

11.5

II.4 Bidder's Experience

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Demonstrated involvement in justice-related and reentry issues, with a focus on West County. Successful completion of project to facilitate development of AB 109 Operations Plan. Collaborators also have directly related experience in reentry issue projects and extensive experience in project facilitation.

13.5

II.5 Responsivity

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

Excellent understanding of cultural competence, particularly with regard to West County and formerly incarcerated populations. Good discussion of inclusive processes and philosophy of "nothing about us without us." Could have addressed the AB 109 population more specifically.

9

III.1 Program Budget/Narrative

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

Excellent use of leveraged funding and intent to bring additional resources to the project. Thorough, easy to understand budget and narrative.

10

Total score**84**

RATING SHEET
HealthRIGHT 360
Planning for (3) Reentry Resource Centers

Program elements will be weighted as follows with a maximum score of 95:

I. **Proposal Cover Statement** - *required but not weighted* *Submitted*

II.1. **Agency Overview**

- | | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Organization's overall services/history | (3 pts.) |
| 2. Administrative and program offices are locally based | (1 pt.) |
| 3. Demonstrated collaboration with partners to deliver services | (2 pts.) |

0-8

Comments:

San Francisco non-profit with "letter of interest" to secure 3 local facilities if awarded contract. Extensive services/history of service to uninsured, homeless, socio-economically disenfranchised, the vast majority involved in criminal justice system. Numerous collaborations with partners.

6

II.2. **Program Proposal**

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Program design/methodology | (10 pts.) |
| 2. Program evaluation/outcomes | (9 pts.) |
| 3. Collaboration with other organizations/Coordination | (5 pts.) |

0-40

Comments:

Proposed locations for "implementation" of service centers in "letter of interest" pre-determines the outcome. Good explanation of planning process but must hire contract planner. With no demonstrated CCC experience, not clear how outreach and community engagement will be conducted or managed effectively. Local partners not identified in proposal except by function. 3 subcommittees representing functional service areas all focused on employment, an admitted mistake in interview. Proposal doesn't indicate distinct approaches to separate regions. Excellent response to issue of data systems and evaluation; dedicated Department of Research and Evaluation.

24

II.3. **Program Implementation and Oversight**

- | | |
|--|------------|
| 1. Action-steps and timeline for implementation, including primary roles and responsibilities, as well as a target date by which the program will be operational | (2 pts.) |
| 2. Program staffing (FT equivalencies, responsibilities, experience) and management | (2 pts.) |
| 3. Use of local resources, inclusion of local residents in program planning, implementation and evaluation | (0.5 pts.) |

0-12

Comments:

Proposal anticipates planning process not starting until contract planner hired in month 2. First stakeholder meetings in month 4 to explain goal and deliverables; too long of a process. Timeline doesn't include explicit development of Implementation Plan.

4.5

II.4 Bidder's Experience

Bidder's current or past experience and demonstrated ability of applicant to deliver services to the targeted communities as specified.

0-15

Comments:

Project planning/facilitation experience not demonstrated. However, extensive experience in delivery of reentry services and operation of a One-Stop/Day Reporting Center.

8

II.5 Responsivity

Cultural sensitivity of program and relevance of services to diverse client populations, including gender specific services and delivery of services in the clients' primary language.

0-10

Comments:

Excellent understanding of cultural competence and community responsiveness. Excellent understanding of evidence based practices to support successful outcomes. Does not demonstrate or indicate particular knowledge about CCC or community characteristics.

9

III.1 Program Budget/Narrative

Program budget detailing the cost for program administration, salaries, benefits and operation.

0-10

Comments:

Budget indicates Planning Consultant would work 20 hours week/43 weeks. For a project this size (3 regions), not sufficient. Mileage of 65 miles per week may not be realistic, if covering 3 areas. Budget clearly presented, however, with minimal operations costs.

7

Total score**58.5**