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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 programs funded under the *Youth Opportunity Hubs* initiative.

Beginning in Summer 2017 and over a period of four years (consisting of up to three months of planning, nine months of pilot, and three years of implementation), the New York County District Attorney’s Office (DANY) is committing $45.9 million under its Criminal Justice Investment Initiative (CJII) to establish five Youth Opportunity Hubs (or “Hubs”) throughout Manhattan as part of its *Youth Opportunity Hubs* initiative. Youth Opportunity Hubs will deliver holistic, wraparound supports and opportunities to youth and young adults by fostering collaboration and partnership among multiple social service providers. 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. All five of the Hubs funded as part of the *Youth Opportunity Hubs* investment will be the subject of the evaluation funded through 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 questions and goals are broad, but include an understanding of how the Hubs are implemented; whether they are effective in reducing risk factors for criminal justice involvement (e.g., school drop-out and delinquent behavior); whether they increase coordination among social service providers in the delivery of supports and opportunities, build the capacity of local organizations to better address the needs and opportunities in their neighborhoods, and increase the appeal and functionality of spaces and services that support young people’s development; and whether they are cost-effective. Thus, evaluation applicants should propose a research design that achieves a process and outcome evaluation of this initiative, including participant-level outcomes (among clients) and organization- or systems-level outcomes (among providers and social service systems), and a cost-benefit analysis (CBA).

B. Timeline and Submission Instructions

1. **Release Date of RFP:** Wednesday, October 11, 2017
2. **Questions:** Questions about this RFP and/or Hub service providers listed in this solicitation may be submitted in writing through the CJII application portal at [http://cuny-islg.fluidreview.com](http://cuny-islg.fluidreview.com). Questions and requests for clarification must be submitted by 11:59pm EST on Friday, November 3, 2017. All questions should be submitted to the link above, and not directly to the Hubs/providers listed in this solicitation. ISLG will coordinate with Hubs/providers, as necessary, to provide answers to Hub/provider-specific questions.
3. Answers to all questions will be available as an addendum to this RFP by 11:59pm EST on Wednesday, November 22, 2017. 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/category/opportunities/.

4. **Proposal Due Date:** Proposal submissions are due Thursday, December 28, 2017, at 11:59pm EST. Proposals should be submitted via [http://cuny-islg.fluidreview.com](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:** Late Spring 2018

C. **Funding and Number of Awards**

DANY anticipates awarding up to one contract for the evaluation, with total funding up to $2.2 million over up to five years.

D. **Contact Information**

Questions regarding RFP content should be submitted in writing at [http://cuny-islg.fluidreview.com](http://cuny-islg.fluidreview.com) by the date and time specified above. Questions regarding technical difficulties should be sent to [cjii@islg.cuny.edu](mailto:cjii@islg.cuny.edu).
II. Key Terms

**Youth Opportunity Hubs initiative**: A $45.9 million investment funded via the CJII which funds applicants to establish Youth Opportunity Hubs (“Hubs”). Hubs will deliver wraparound supports and opportunities to young people, increase coordination among social service providers in the delivery of supports and opportunities, build the capacity of local organizations to better address the needs and opportunities in their neighborhoods, and increase the appeal and functionality of spaces and services that support young people’s development.

**Criminal Justice Investment Initiative (CJII)**: Established by the New York County District Attorney’s Office in 2014 to invest funds 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.

**Lead Entity**: The non-profit service provider that will be responsible for managing the Hub including, but not limited to, coordinating referrals, services, and partners; forming partnerships with service providers; collecting data for the Hub; and disbursing funds to Partner Providers. The Lead Entity will also provide services to youth.

**Partner Provider**: A non-profit service provider that will work with the Lead Entity to provide services to young people. Partner Providers will provide and receive referrals to other providers (the Lead Entity and other Partner Providers) within the Hub. Partner Provider staff may or may not be co-located with Lead Entity staff, depending on the Hub.

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

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

---

*a These are asset forfeiture funds, derived from settlements with international banks that violated U.S. sanctions.
**Outcome evaluation**: Assesses whether a program or approach achieves its hypothesized or intended results with the focus population or participants.

**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.

**Wraparounds**: A wraparound approach is a comprehensive strategy that seeks to prevent poor life outcomes, including initial or further contact with the criminal justice system. The approach coordinates family, community, school and agency resources based on a young person’s individualized needs, in order to achieve more positive life outcomes.\(^b\)

---

\(^b\) For more information, see:


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 $45.9 million under CJII to fund the Youth Opportunity Hubs initiative (see Appendix 4 for the Youth Opportunity Hubs RFP), which will support five Hubs to deliver wraparound supports and opportunities to young people, reduce risk factors for justice system involvement, increase coordination among social service providers in the delivery of these supports and opportunities, build the capacity of local organizations to better address the needs and opportunities in their neighborhoods, and increase the appeal and functionality of spaces and services that support young people’s development. The investment is part of DANY’s investments in prevention, which collectively aim to prevent crime, improve public safety, and reduce involvement in the justice system.

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 five years, beginning in late Spring 2018. Funding for the full five years would support an evaluation of programs funded under the Youth Opportunity Hubs initiative over 3.5 years of the pilot and implementation of the investment itself, as well as an additional year for follow-up data collection and six months for preparation of the 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 5), 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 5. In the event that a 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 evaluation to be up to $2.2 million, to be spread across 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**

Increasing access to services and promoting more equitable opportunities in communities that have experienced high rates of criminal justice activity can help deter future juvenile and criminal justice system involvement, ultimately resulting in better individual, community, and societal outcomes. Current best practices for working with young people emphasize the importance of wraparound approaches,\(^1\) which coordinate family, community, school, and agency resources based on a young person’s individualized needs and strengths; and a positive youth development framework,\(^2\) which emphasizes the role of assets, opportunities, and resources in healthy adolescent development. These approaches facilitate the *prevention of* undesired behaviors and outcomes in a way that supports holistic *youth development* by focusing on young people’s strengths rather than solely or predominantly on risk and delinquency.

Numerous providers seek to support youth development in New York City, but these efforts are often scattered and/or fail to address comprehensively the needs of youth.\(^5\) Background research and numerous conversations with prevention providers in NYC indicate the need for better coordination and partnership among existing services, contrasted with the lack of commitment or capacity among providers and funders to realize that goal. Other ongoing initiatives in NYC, such as the Strengthening Communities Steering Committee\(^d,3\) and the Connections to Care Initiative supported by the Mayor’s Fund to Advance New York City, have also identified the need to improve access to and coordination among service providers.\(^e\)

---

\(^1\) Based on interviews conducted with NYC service providers and relevant agencies.
\(^2\) For a list of participants, see http://www.humanservicescouncil.org/Private_Documents/Participant%20List.pdf
In response, DANY has committed funding for the creation of Youth Opportunity Hubs to provide better coordination and wraparound support for youth and young adults. Youth Opportunity Hubs are a partnership approach among multiple providers to deliver holistic, wraparound supports and opportunities to youth and young adults. DANY anticipates funding five Hubs under the Youth Opportunity Hubs initiative beginning in Summer 2017. The four-year initiative will include a three-month Planning Phase, nine-month Pilot Phase, and three-year Implementation Phase. The evaluation is expected to begin part-way through the Pilot Phase.

Each Hub will focus on serving young people (ages 10-24 for the initiative as a whole, though the specific age ranges will vary by Hub) who reside in, attend school in, or have some significant connection with one or more of the CJII target neighborhoods (i.e., Washington Heights, Central and West Harlem, East Harlem, and Lower East Side). Each Hub will consist of a Lead Entity who will collaborate with multiple Partner Providers to provide wraparound supports and opportunities to a minimum of 250 young people per year. The Youth Opportunity Hub investment is situated within a broader approach to prevention (see CJII.org for more information on other initiatives such as Family and Youth Development; Community Navigators; and additional investments to be released at a later date). Wraparound supports and opportunities that will be provided in Hubs include the following, though not every Hub will provide each type of support or opportunity:

- Employment and workforce development opportunities
- Education support and training, including awareness of and response to learning challenges
- Mentorship and relationship-building
- Recreation opportunities
- Arts and culture
- Life skills
- Family strengthening support
- Trauma-specific services
- Mental health screening and counseling
- Substance abuse services (including treatment and harm reduction)
- Health education
- Community service
- Housing assistance and placement
- Legal advocacy and access to benefits
- Civic engagement and leadership
- Other appropriate supports/opportunities

Hubs are expected to engage youth on a long-term basis, as necessary, until a young person graduates from high school, attains full-time employment, enrolls in college, or otherwise achieves a stable transition out of adolescence and into young adulthood. Hub approaches can reflect centralized planning/coordination of multiple supports/opportunities, delivery of multiple supports/opportunities, and/or spaces where young people spend time and can be connected to other supports/opportunities. Thus, in some Hubs, service delivery will occur at a single, centralized location, whereas in others, service delivery will be distributed throughout the Hub in multiple locations. More detailed information on each of the Hubs is provided in Section IV.B.3.
Hubs are grounded in the developmental understanding that youth are more likely to make use of supports and opportunities when they are viewed as more easily and readily accessible;\(^4\) and that wraparound youth development supports/opportunities can support the well-being of youth and effectively prevent poor outcomes, including justice system involvement. However, more research is needed to shed light on the effectiveness of this innovative service delivery model—one that brings together multiple entities to provide comprehensive, coordinated care (e.g., through case management) for youth. Specifically, a study of the Hub service model would likely address what Rosenheck and colleagues call “the service integration hypotheses”\(^5\) which entails three premises: (1) more integration provides better access to services; (2) integrated systems result in better outcomes for their clients; and (3) the “improvement in outcomes is mediated through increased accessibility and continuity of service delivery”.\(^6\)

Research on similar service delivery models has produced mixed results. These models can be generally categorized into two types: one-stop centers and service networks. One-stop centers aim to provide comprehensive services, such as mentorship, support groups, life skills training, educational and employment services, and additional resources in a single service site in order to mitigate systemic barriers to success. Prior and current examples of such approaches include the Youth Opportunity Grant Initiative,\(^7\)\(^8\) Quantum Opportunity Program,\(^9\)\(^10\) Eisenhower Quantum Opportunities,\(^1\)\(^2\) and Harlem Children’s Zone.\(^3\)

In general, research has shown that youth participating in such programs experience better outcomes during adolescence and afterwards. For instance, youth participating at Harlem Children’s Zone are more likely to graduate from secondary education with a diploma and less likely to experience negative outcomes such as teen pregnancy and juvenile justice involvement compared to youth not enrolled in these programs.\(^11\) In-school youth participating in the Eisenhower Quantum initiative had higher GPAs and greater college acceptance rates,\(^12\) and out-of-school youth in the Youth Opportunity Grant Initiative had greater rates of participation in the workforce.\(^13\) However, findings have often varied both within these approaches, and comparatively across approaches. Depending on the type of analysis conducted and the

---

\(^4\) The Youth Opportunity Grant Initiative, unrelated to Youth Opportunity Hubs, was a nationwide program targeting youth ages 14 to 21 to increase educational attainment and employment rates. It operated from 2000 to 2005 in 36 high-poverty neighborhoods, serving over 92,000 youth regardless of income. For more information: [https://clear.dol.gov/study-summary-relationships/youth-opportunity-grant-initiative](https://clear.dol.gov/study-summary-relationships/youth-opportunity-grant-initiative)

\(^5\) Located at seven sites across the U.S., the Quantum Opportunity Program was a demonstration program that targeted youth with low marks entering the 9th grade in underperforming high schools from 1995 to 2001. Youth who qualified were randomly selected into QOP and remained enrolled even if they dropped out of the program, based on the idea that less motivated participants may need the most help. The goals of the program were to increase educational attainment, raise enrollment into post-secondary education or training, and reduce risky behaviors. For more information: [https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/the-quantum-opportunity-program-demonstration](https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/the-quantum-opportunity-program-demonstration)

\(^6\) The Eisenhower Quantum Opportunities Program targeted a total of 300 9th grade students at risk of academic failure, with the goal of improving educational outcomes, including high school graduation and college acceptance and enrollment. It operated from 2009 to 2014 in five cities across the U.S. For more information: [https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=426](https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=426)

\(^1\) In operation since 1997, the Harlem Children’s Zone merges the charter school model with a network of community programs to improve educational outcomes for children in Harlem from infancy to college graduation. Children are selected into a program through a lottery system.
subpopulation involved, participants have been found to experience positive, null, or negative results. For instance, in the Quantum Opportunity Program, younger participants and those in certain geographic areas experienced greater benefits. Some reasons for these contradictory results include practical limitations, such as the lack of capacity of certain sites to provide services as fully as planned and varying levels of participation from youth. In addition, evaluations thus far have been limited by methodological challenges. In one quasi-experimental study, evaluators used different data sources for the treatment and comparison populations, which compromised the study’s internal validity. In the RCTs, despite randomization, results may nonetheless have been susceptible to social desirability bias and reference bias, as outcome measurement sometimes relied on self-report or occurred during short follow-up windows. As a result, a robust evaluation of the Youth Opportunity Hubs initiative is important not only to examine its impact on youth directly participating in the initiative but also to contribute to the inconclusive literature on these types of wraparound interventions.

Another form of wraparound service delivery includes service networks, which have been employed mainly in the health care sector to connect some patients to additional care, improve service delivery, and integrate available medical and social services. Service networks vary in their level of centralization, ranging from linkage to coordination to full integration. Results from RCTs, quasi-experimental studies, and one demonstration project of primarily coordinated and fully integrated networks reveal that patients experienced improved clinical outcomes and higher levels of satisfaction and empowerment compared to control groups. Methodological weaknesses of the studies include lack of generalizability due to self-selection into the treatment and comparison groups (for the non-RCTs) and short follow-up windows. Nevertheless, these findings show promise that integrated services can improve participant outcomes by increasing accessibility to resources, thereby meeting patient needs, increasing patient autonomy, and reducing caregiver burden.

Reflective of this wide body of research, investments in Youth Opportunity Hubs contribute to the CJII goal of improving public safety and are situated within a broader approach to prevention (see CJII.org for more information on other initiatives such as Family and Youth Development Programs; Community Navigators; and additional investments to be released at a later date).

B. Evaluation Framework

This solicitation seeks proposals to evaluate programs funded under the Youth Opportunity Hubs initiative. Given the mixed results as well as the methodological limitations of the extant

---

1 Social desirability bias is a common phenomenon in self-reported data. It occurs when participants feel the pressure to over-report positive outcomes and underreport negative ones.

2 Reference bias occurs when the frame of reference implicitly changes depending on the individual asked and the social context from which they arise. In education, for instance, students may rate themselves poorly on a skill of interest if they are comparing themselves to high-performing peers as opposed to low-performing peers, even though their test scores may indicate otherwise.

1 According to Leutz (1999), linkage is a system that refers patients to existing services, whereas coordination and full integration involve case management. Integrated health care provides all services in one system, with a unified record and full control of service delivery, whereas coordination involves referring patients out of the system to other providers.
research, there is a need for additional understanding of integrated service models for youth, such as that provided by the Youth Opportunity Hubs initiative. Further, Youth Opportunity Hubs represents a model of service delivery that, while similar to some prior initiatives, is unique, and includes capacity-building of smaller organizations, coordination among providers, and the improvement of physical spaces through capital investment\(^{m}\) as explicit goals. Thus, the evaluation should seek to understand the role of Youth Opportunity Hubs with regard to both youth and organization-level outcomes, as part of both process and outcome evaluations.

The evaluation will focus on participants and organizations in each of the Hubs listed in Section IV.B.3, below. Applicants should propose a design that permits an understanding of initial program findings within two years of program implementation. These initial results will be especially important to adjusting the implementation of the Hubs. The evaluation design should also allow for an understanding of short- (≤ 1 year following program completion) and medium-term (1-2 years following program completion) outcomes.

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 evaluations related to youth development. Finally, applicants should ideally have experience conducting multi-site evaluations.

2. **Collaboration and Partnership:** The selected applicant must work closely with ISLG and Hubs to conduct the process and outcome evaluations and CBA. In addition, the selected applicant may be required to collaborate with other CJII contractors, including Community Navigators (see cjii.org for more information).

3. **Hub Sites:** Five Hubs have been identified for the Youth Opportunity Hubs initiative. Each Hub consists of a Lead Entity and multiple Partner Providers. These Hubs include the following.
   a. Central and West Harlem Hub
      i. **Lead Entity:** Community Connections for Youth
      ii. **Approach:** Supports/opportunities will be delivered through a central Hub site and through several other Partner Provider sites, each of which will offer multiple supports/opportunities.
      iii. **Number of young people to be served:**
         - Pilot: 150
         - Implementation Year 1: 250
         - Implementation Year 2: 250
         - Implementation Year 3: 250
      iv. **Focus population:** The Hub will recruit young people, ages 10 to 24, from Central and West Harlem, with a particular focus on the Manhattanville Houses, Grant Houses, St. Nicholas Houses, and King Towers. In the Implementation Phase, the Hub will target 25 “high-risk” young people each year, ages 18 to 24, who are known gang members and have involvement in the criminal justice system. It will also plan to include 75 “medium-risk” youth, ages 13 to 17, who are

---

\(m\) As part of the Youth Opportunity Hubs Initiative, providers were given the opportunity to request funds to increase the appeal and functionality of spaces and services that support young people’s development. These projects will range in scope, from one-floor renovations to a project involving the gutting and outfitting of a multi-story building.
loosely affiliated with gangs and have had justice system contact. Finally, it will recruit 150 “at-risk” youth, ages 10 to 17, primarily through the peer and family relationships of the aforementioned “medium-” and “high-risk” young people.

b. East Harlem Hub
   i. **Lead Entity:** Union Settlement
   ii. **Approach:** The Hub will operate out of three community centers in NYCHA developments. Each location will offer many of the Hub supports/opportunities. Some supports/opportunities will be provided at Partner Provider sites.
   iii. **Number of young people to be served:**
       - Pilot: 275
       - Implementation Year 1: 500
       - Implementation Year 2: 500
       - Implementation Year 3: 500
   iv. **Focus population:** The Hub will serve youth ages 10 to 24 in East Harlem who are at risk of negative life outcomes based on factors such as antisocial behavior, involvement in the justice system, and family history of problem behavior.

c. Washington Heights Hub (also serving parts of Marble Hill and a northern part of Central and West Harlem)
   i. **Lead Entity:** NewYork-Presbyterian Hospital
   ii. **Approach:** Supports/opportunities will be delivered primarily at a central site in Washington Heights with some supports/opportunities provided off-site.
   iii. **Number of young people to be served:**
       - Pilot: 100
       - Implementation Year 1: 200
       - Implementation Year 2: 250
       - Implementation Year 3: 250
   iv. **Focus population:** The Hub will serve youth ages 14-24 who are, have been, or are at risk of involvement with the juvenile or adult justice system.

d. Lower East Side Hub
   i. **Lead Entity:** Henry Street Settlement
   ii. **Approach:** The Hub will operate like a "web" by connecting six LES settlement houses as the primary Hub providers and a number of community-based providers as Partner Providers. Thus, supports/opportunities will be provided in multiple sites, with numerous supports co-located at each of the settlement houses.
   iii. **Number of young people to be served:**
       - Pilot: 180
       - Implementation Year 1: 360
       - Implementation Year 2: 360
       - Implementation Year 3: 360
iv. **Focus population:** The Hub will serve youth ages 13-24 who live, attend school, or spend a majority of their time in the Lower East Side. It will focus on enrolling youth who in general are at heightened risk for engagement with the criminal justice system. The proposed catchment area is Manhattan Community District 3.

e. **Citywide Hub (specifically, Washington Heights, Central and West Harlem, East Harlem, and Lower East Side)**
   i. **Lead Entity:** The Door
   ii. **Approach:** Supports/opportunities will be delivered primarily at a central location in SoHo. A few supports/opportunities will be delivered at Partner Provider sites.
   iii. **Number of young people to be served:**
       - Pilot: 1,125
       - Implementation Year 1: 1,500
       - Implementation Year 2: 1,500
       - Implementation Year 3: 1,500

iv. **Focus population:** Youth ages 12-24 from Manhattan

4. **Evaluation Types/Components:** Applicant should propose an evaluation design for each of the following evaluation types:

   a. **Process Evaluation:** Applicants should propose a design which aids understanding of program implementation and factors key to the model’s success, including the establishment and maintenance of collaborative relationships between organizations; implementation of the Hub model; capacity-building of the organizations involved; the improvement of physical spaces for youth; and any coordination with other CJII investments, such as Community Navigators. Both participants and organizations should be a focus of the process evaluation.

   b. **Outcome Evaluation:** Applicants should propose an outcome evaluation design which facilitates understanding of the initiative as a whole, including outcomes related to youths’ functioning and well-being; education; employment; justice system involvement; and any other relevant domains. In addition, the outcome evaluation should include a stratified analysis of program effects for participants with different characteristics, including with respect to age, race, dosage, risk level; and who receive supports/opportunities in different Hub sites or approaches. Applicants should anticipate a quasi-experimental design rather than an experimental design; although randomization is theoretically possible, it is unlikely given the practical challenges to randomizing participants who are eligible for the programs. The evaluation should also include organization-level outcomes such as those related to organizational ties, collaboration, and capacity-building.

   c. **Cost-Benefit Analysis:** Applicants should propose a plan to collect and gather program data necessary to analyze the economic benefits and costs of the funded Youth Opportunity Hubs programs.
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 solicitation, 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 (15 page maximum)

The evaluation proposal should address the research design, sources and methods of data collection, and measures of the process evaluation, outcome evaluation, and CBA, as indicated below. The outcome evaluation proposal should also include an approach to address selection bias and a power analysis.

1. Process evaluation
   a. Design. Applicants should propose a process evaluation of the Youth Opportunity Hub initiative and outline the approach and specific research questions. The process evaluation should aid understanding of program implementation and factors key to program success.
   b. Sources of data. Applicants should anticipate that they will have access to program-related data (e.g., enrollment, attendance, services received) from the Hubs while clients are enrolled in and participating in the Hubs. In addition, applicants should identify additional sources of data (e.g., survey, existing risk assessment tool, administrative data) they propose to collect as part of the process evaluation. For each of these 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. Applicants should also include a research timeline with specific activities (e.g., survey of clients) for each quarter. 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.
c. Measures. Applicants should propose questions and measures as part of their proposals. These preliminary measures will be finalized with feedback from Hubs, ISLG, and other relevant stakeholders. Sample measures are included below:

- Clients served
- Attendance rates
- Client satisfaction
- Client demographics
- Program responsiveness
- Dosage
- Barriers to access
- Partner participation in Hub activities
- Types and frequency of contact between Partners
- Strategies used to build capacity of Partners

d. Publication and dissemination strategy. Applicants should propose a plan for reporting on the findings of the process evaluation, which may or may not be part of the dissemination plan for the outcome evaluation and cost-benefit analysis (listed below). Anticipated deliverables, including publications, are listed in Appendix 2. Deliverables will be finalized in the course of contract negotiations.

2. Outcome evaluation

a. Design. Applicants should outline their specific research questions, approach/design for the outcome evaluation, and anticipated analytical techniques. In doing so, applicants should consider program effects at multiple levels, including participant-level outcomes (among clients) and organization- or systems-level outcomes (among providers and social service systems). The study design should include appropriate comparison group(s) for participating youth and organizations.

b. Approach to address selection bias. Applicants are expected to develop a design to control for selection bias, as randomization will likely not be possible. The evaluation should also examine program effects among both program completers and those who do not complete the program, i.e., young people who disengage from Hubs prior to graduating from high school, attaining full-time employment, enrolling in college, or otherwise achieving a stable transition out of adolescence and into young adulthood.

c. 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.

d. Sources of data. Again, applicants should anticipate that they will have access to program-related data (e.g., enrollment, attendance, services received, total dosage, program completion) from the Hubs while clients are enrolled in and participating in the Hubs. 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. For each
of these 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. Applicants should also include a research timeline with specific activities (e.g., survey of clients) for each quarter. 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.

e. **Measures.** Applicants should propose questions and measures as part of their proposals. These preliminary measures will be finalized with feedback from Hubs, ISLG, and other relevant stakeholders. The evaluation should include some outcomes that are risk or protective factors for later justice system involvement. Sample outcome measures are included below:
   
   i. **Health and functioning**
      - Emotional well-being
      - Physical well-being
   
   ii. **Social functioning**
      - Self-control
      - Sense of belonging
   
   iii. **Education**
      - Four-year graduation rates
      - School attendance
      - Academic performance
   
   iv. **Employment**
      - Full-time employment rate
      - Part-time employment rate
   
   v. **Justice system involvement**
      - Arrest rates
      - Engagement in illegal activity
   
   vi. **Partnerships**
      - Relationship quality among providers
      - Collaboration among providers
      - Strength of the Hub’s network
   
   vii. **Capacity building**

f. **Publication and dissemination strategy.** Applicants should propose a plan for reporting on the findings of the outcome evaluation, which may or may not be part of the dissemination plan for the process evaluation (listed above) or the cost-benefit analysis (listed below). Anticipated deliverables, including publications, are listed in **Appendix 2.** Deliverables will be finalized in the course of contract negotiations.

3. **Cost-benefit analysis**
   
a. **Design.** Applicants should outline their specific research questions and approach for the CBA. Applicants should propose a CBA that calculates the cost of the program and weighs that against the financial value of
programming young people receive through the Hub (e.g., education programming) as well as any other benefits arising from the program.

b. *Sources of data.* Again, applicants should anticipate that they will have access to program-related data (e.g., services received, dosage/number of hours engaged in programming) from the Hubs while clients are enrolled in and participating in the Hubs. In addition, applicants should identify anticipated sources of data (e.g., original survey, interviews, administrative data) and include a research timeline with specific activities (e.g., acquisition of program budgets) for each quarter. For each of these 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. Applicants should anticipate challenges associated with data collection and reporting (e.g., lack of expertise or software) and how they plan to address them. For instance, 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? The cost of data collection and analysis should also be incorporated into the budget and explained in the project narrative.

c. *Measures.* Applicants should propose questions and measures as part of their proposals. These preliminary measures will be finalized with feedback from Hubs, ISLG, and other relevant stakeholders. Sample measures are included below:

- Tangible and intangible costs and benefits, including the financial value of programming young people receive through a Hub.

d. *Publication and dissemination strategy.* Applicants should propose a plan for reporting on the findings of the cost-benefit analysis, which may or may not be part of the dissemination plan for the process or outcome evaluation (listed above). Anticipated deliverables, including publications, are listed in *Appendix 2.* Deliverables will be finalized in the course of contract negotiations.

C. **Performance Measurement (3 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. All selected applicants 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 and 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 relevant evaluation components (i.e., process, outcome, and 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 I only as an example);
3. Methods of data collection for performance measurement (any costs related to data collection/analysis should be incorporated into the budget and explained in the budget narrative); and
4. Challenges associated with performance measurement (e.g., lack of expertise or software) and the way the applicant plans to address them.

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 IV. The applicant should upload a single Organizational and Staff Capacity file for items 1 and 2 below in the CJII Application Portal. Specifically, applicants should address the following:

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 evaluations, 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, such as interviews, surveys, observations/site visits, and other methods.
   b. Outcome evaluation, such as interviews, surveys, administrative data analysis, and other methods.
   c. CBA component, such as program expenditures, opportunity costs, and expected benefits of Youth Opportunity Hubs based on a set of assumptions about the programs’ goals, population flows, and outcomes.
3. Letters of support/commitment from city agencies, 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.
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:

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 youth.
3. Describe the applicant’s experience partnering with relevant community-based organizations and government agencies to collect and interpret data.
4. Describe the applicant’s experience conducting evaluations related to integrated service delivery.

5. Describe the applicant’s experience conducting multisite evaluations.

6. Describe the applicant’s experience collecting and analyzing data for all applicable evaluation components, including with regard to:
   a. Process evaluations
   b. Outcome evaluations
   c. CBA, including with regard to collecting and analyzing data on program expenditures, opportunity costs, and expected benefits Hubs 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 populations and/or types 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, outcome, and cost-benefit analyses, 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. Applicants should describe funding needs on an annual basis over the length of the funding period (funding may vary by year). 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.

The Evaluation Budget Narrative should not exceed three pages (double-spaced) total, 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 15 pages (double-spaced), including any tables and charts. Only the first 15 pages of the Evaluation Proposal will be read and scored by the proposal evaluation team.
  - The Performance Measurement Section (VI.C) should not exceed three pages (double-spaced), including any tables. Only the first three pages will be read and scored by the proposal evaluation team.
  - Section 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 will be read and scored by the proposal evaluation team.
  - The Fiscal Sponsorship documentation (Section VI.G), 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. 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 Design and Plan – 55%
- Level of organizational capacity – 20%
- Relevant experience – 20%
- Budget summary and narrative – 5%

**C. Basis for Contract Award**

The contract award will be made to the applicant whose proposal is determined 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 the Research Foundation and the selected applicant.
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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 three components of the evaluation (i.e., process, outcome, 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 performance measurement 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Type</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Process Measure &amp; Target</th>
<th>Output Measure &amp; Target</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Evaluation</td>
<td>1a) Collect baseline survey with sample size of sufficient power</td>
<td>1a) Q1: Percentage of participants for whom baseline survey data are collected prior to Hub enrollment: 75%</td>
<td>1a) Q1: Number of program participants for whom survey data are collected prior to program enrollment: 188</td>
<td>Administrative Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1a) Q2:</td>
<td>1a) Q2:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1a) Q3:</td>
<td>1a) Q3:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1a) Q4:</td>
<td>1a) Q4:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b)</td>
<td>1b) Q1:</td>
<td>1b) Q1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1b) Q2:</td>
<td>1b) Q2:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1b) Q3:</td>
<td>1b) Q3:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1b) Q4:</td>
<td>1b) Q4:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Evaluation</td>
<td>2a) Collect interviews with representative sample</td>
<td>2a) Q1: Percentage of interview sample who are high-risk young adults: 45%</td>
<td>2a) Q1: Number of interview sample members who are high-risk young adults: 113</td>
<td>Administrative Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2a) Q2:</td>
<td>2a) Q2:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2a) Q3:</td>
<td>2a) Q3:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2a) Q4:</td>
<td>2a) Q4:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-Benefit Analysis</td>
<td>3a) Collect program expenditure data with sample size of sufficient power</td>
<td>3a) Q1: Percentage of participants for whom data on tangible and intangible costs per participant are collected: 80%</td>
<td>3a) Q1: Number of participants for whom data on tangible and intangible costs per participant are collected: 200</td>
<td>Administrative Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency/Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evaluation Plan</td>
<td>Detailed plan for evaluation design</td>
<td>Once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Status Report</td>
<td>• Evaluation updates&lt;br&gt;  o Process&lt;br&gt;    ▪ E.g., Changes to approach, progress in data collection and analysis at variable level&lt;br&gt;  o Outcome&lt;br&gt;    ▪ E.g., Changes to approach, progress in data collection and analysis at variable level&lt;br&gt;  o Cost-Benefit&lt;br&gt;    ▪ E.g., Changes to approach, progress in obtaining cost data&lt;br&gt;  o Successes&lt;br&gt;    o Setbacks and challenges (e.g., instructor turnover)&lt;br&gt;    • Corrective action plans (as needed) to address specific challenges, ensure short-term goals and full implementation are achieved&lt;br&gt;  • Goals for next quarter</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Operational costs status report</td>
<td>Financial reports</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mid-evaluation report</td>
<td>• Synthesis of status reports from first two years of the evaluation, including summary of status reports at variable level&lt;br&gt;  • Initial and ongoing findings of process, outcome, and cost-benefit evaluations&lt;br&gt;  • Outstanding challenges and plans to address them</td>
<td>End of 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Process/ Coordination Report</td>
<td>• Mid-initiative report on the successes, failures, and challenges of coordination of supports/opportunities among Hub Lead Entities and Partner Providers</td>
<td>End of 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>• Full findings from process, outcome, and cost-benefit evaluations&lt;br&gt;  • Recommendations for Youth Opportunity Hubs policy and practices, as informed by the evaluations</td>
<td>End of 5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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II. Cover Sheet for Youth Opportunity Hubs

A. Goal of the RFP

The goal of this Request for Proposals (RFP) is to seek proposals from qualified applicants to plan, pilot, and implement Youth Opportunity Hubs (or, “Hubs”), which will:

- **Increase coordination** among local service providers in the delivery of wraparound supports and opportunities to young people
- **Increase the appeal and functionality of spaces and services** that support young people’s development
- **Build the capacity of local organizations** to better address the needs and opportunities in their neighborhoods

Youth Opportunity Hubs will be located and/or serve young people from one or more of the following four focus neighborhoods in Manhattan (East Harlem, Central and West Harlem, Washington Heights, Lower East Side). A portion of the funds available through this RFP are intended to support capital costs associated with the creation or operation of Youth Opportunity Hubs, specifically for the purpose of improving the appeal and functionality of services for young people in their own neighborhoods.

B. Timeline and Submission Instructions

1. **Release Date of RFP:** June 23, 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, July 22, 2016, at 11:59pm EST.**
3. Answers to all questions will be available as an addendum to this RFP by 11:59pm on **Monday, August 8, 2016.** It will be the responsibility of proposers 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://cji.org/category/opportunities/.
4. **Proposal Due Date:** Proposal submissions are due on **Thursday, September 1, 2016, 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:** Late Fall 2016

C. Amount and Number of Awards

DANY anticipates funding up to six Hubs, with a total cost of up to $51.5 million. Maximum funding per applicant is anticipated to be $10.3 million, including up to $4 million in capital improvements. Pilot (Phase II), Implementation (Phase III), and, if applicable, Capital Improvement (Phase IV) funding will be contingent on approval of the program plans and pilot report developed during the Planning and Pilot Phases (I and II).
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D. Contact Information

Questions regarding RFP content should be submitted in writing at http://cuny-islg.fluidreview.com. Questions regarding technical difficulties should be sent to cji@islg.cuny.edu.
III. Key Terms

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

City University of New York (CUNY) Institute for State and Local Governance (ISLG): ISLG is the technical assistance consultant to DANY for CJII. ISLG oversees CJII on behalf of DANY, manages and provides guidance to CJII contractors, and conducts oversight and performance measurement 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.

Applicant: With regard to this RFP, the entity responsible for oversight, coordination, and disbursement of funds to partner providers in a proposed Hub. The applicant serves as the representative of the multiple service providers who comprise the Hub. In any proposal involving requests for capital improvements, the applicant should also be the proposed recipient of capital funds. Although it is not a requirement, in many cases, the applicant will be the largest provider in a Hub, as defined by budget and/or number of clients served annually.

Lead Applicant: See “Applicant”.

Partner Provider: A service provider in a Hub which is not the “applicant” or “lead applicant”, and which therefore is not responsible for oversight and coordination of the Hub. Partner providers are ineligible for capital funding.

Place-based: Place-based strategies acknowledge that conditions in a given neighborhood are shaped by unique resources, issues, and challenges; and as such, involve coordination among local actors and other stakeholders to improve the conditions within a neighborhood or community.\(^{20}\)

Positive Youth Development (PYD): A theoretical and practical framework which emphasizes the role of assets, opportunities, and resources in positive and healthy adolescent development. Rather than defining adolescence as a period of risk and delinquency, PYD asserts that intentional engagement with young people strengthens their ability to transition successfully into adulthood.\(^{21}\)

The Research Foundation of the City University of New York (RFCUNY, or Research Foundation): Under CJII, all funds will be awarded through the Research Foundation of CUNY. The Research Foundation is a not-for-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 and administers funds and signs certain contracts on behalf of ISLG, including those related to CJII.

\(^a\) These are asset forfeiture funds, derived from settlements with international banks that violated U.S. sanctions.
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**Trauma:** Individual trauma results from an event, series of events, or set of circumstances experienced by an individual as physically or emotionally harmful or life threatening, and has lasting adverse effects on an individual’s functioning and mental, physical, social, emotional, or spiritual well-being.\(^{22}\)

**Trauma-Informed:** Organizations and practices that incorporate an understanding of the pervasiveness and impact of trauma and that are designed to reduce re-traumatization, support healing and resiliency, and address the root causes of abuse and violence.\(^{23}\)

**Wraparound:** A wraparound approach is a comprehensive strategy which seeks to prevent poor life outcomes, including initial or further contact with the criminal justice system. The approach coordinates family, community, school and agency resources based on a young person’s individualized needs, in order to achieve more positive life outcomes.\(^{b}\)

\(^{b}\) For more information, see:
IV. Summary of the Request for Proposals

A. Purpose of the RFP

The Manhattan District Attorney’s Office 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. Up to $51.5 million of the CJII fund will be available to fund Youth Opportunity Hubs (or “Hubs”) to:

- **Increase coordination** among local service providers in the delivery of wraparound supports and opportunities to young people
- **Increase the appeal and functionality of spaces and services** that support young people’s development
- **Build the capacity of local organizations** to better address the needs and opportunities in their neighborhoods

Up to six Hubs will be funded, some of which will be awarded funding specifically for capital improvements (see Sections IV.C.3. Eligible Expenses and VI.B.2. Capital Funding for more information on eligible capital expenses).

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 oversees CJII on behalf of the Manhattan District Attorney’s Office, including managing the solicitation and contracting process, managing and providing guidance to award recipients, and providing oversight and performance measurement throughout the lifetime of the initiative. Proposals will be submitted and funds awarded through the Research Foundation of CUNY (Research Foundation).

**Youth Opportunity Hubs** are a partnership approach among multiple providers to deliver holistic, wraparound supports and opportunities to youth and young adults. Hub approaches supported by this RFP could include more centralized **planning** or **coordination** of services; **delivery** of services; and/or **spaces** where youth can be engaged in prosocial opportunities and supports. Applications should be submitted by the provider responsible for coordinating, managing, and disbursing funds to providers in the Hub (i.e., the “applicant” or “lead applicant”), on behalf of all providers (i.e., “partner providers”) in that proposed Hub. (Although it is not a requirement, in many cases the applicant will be the largest provider in the Hub, defined by budget and/or number of clients served annually.) Applicants should propose to provide wraparound support and opportunities to youth and young adults from one or more of the four focus neighborhoods in Manhattan (i.e., be located in or serve youth from East Harlem, Central and West Harlem, Washington Heights, or Lower East Side). Providers may be included as an **applicant** or **lead applicant** in a single proposal only. However, providers can be included as a **partner provider** (i.e., non-“applicants” or non-“lead applicants”) in multiple proposals.

**Proposals may be submitted with or without a request for capital improvement funding.** Capital funds are available to address a continuum of capital needs, from basic refurbishment of a space to new construction. For example, funding could be used to support co-location of services to create a resource hub; improving the aesthetics and accessibility of the applicant’s space to increase client traffic and participation; or construction of new neighborhood spaces to
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engage young people in recreation and arts with intentional connections to other supports and opportunities. Applicants are encouraged to leverage capital funding available through this RFP with other sources of funding, if warranted by their capital needs and strategic plans.

DANY is particularly interested in projects that prevent system involvement in part by expanding workforce and educational opportunities while also meeting other needs of young people in ways that support their overall development. Investments in wraparound, youth opportunity approaches contribute to the CJII goal of improving public safety by providing youth greater access to services, supports, and opportunities that, ultimately, facilitate healthy development. They are situated within a broader investment strategy for prevention (see CJII.org for solicitations and information on Family and Youth Development Programs; Community Navigators; and additional investments to be released at a later date).

B. Anticipated Contract Specifications

DANY anticipates awarding up to six contracts to support Hubs in each focus neighborhood. The anticipated contract term will not exceed five years. The length of Planning, Pilot, and Implementation funding (Phases I-III) will not exceed four years, beginning in Late Fall 2016. Funded applicants and partner providers will be required to provide ongoing performance data (see Section III.D. Performance Measurement) to ISLG and a third-party evaluator. Funded applicants and partner providers will be required to continue providing performance data for up to one additional year beyond the period of Hub funding, as part of their contracts.

The Manhattan District Attorney’s Office and ISLG anticipate that any agreement entered into as a result of this RFP will be with the Research Foundation as the contracting party on behalf of ISLG. An example contract template is attached as Appendix 5. In the event that a selected applicant is unable to fulfill the requirements of the contract awarded pursuant to this RFP, ISLG reserves the right to have the Research Foundation enter into contract negotiations at a later date with other providers who are available to fulfill the services specified in this RFP.

Providers that receive funding through this RFP must be open to accepting referrals from NYC agencies of youth and young adults from the population(s) to be served, to be determined and finalized in the Planning Phase (I) of funding.

Providers that receive funding through this RFP must be willing to work with Community Navigators, which are part of a broader CJII strategy to increase access to services and to increase coordination and partnership among service providers (see cjii.org for more information on Community Navigators). 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.

C. Anticipated Available Funding

CJII funds will be spread across multiple recipients and their subcontractors in several
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communities across several years. DANY anticipates total funding of Youth Opportunity Hubs to be up to $51.5 million to be spread across all awards over four years, including:

1. Up to $6.3 million per Hub for Planning (Phase I, three months, $75,000 maximum), Pilot (Phase II, nine months, $1.25 million maximum), and Implementation (Phase III, three years, $5.0 million maximum) Phases.

2. Up to $4 million in Capital Improvement (Phase IV) costs per Hubs. Only one provider per Hub is eligible to receive capital funding, and this provider should serve as the proposal’s applicant; therefore, providers requesting capital funding should also function as the coordinator or manager of the Hub. Maximum four-year funding per applicant inclusive of capital costs is $10.3 million.

The Planning Phase (I) will last up to three months, and may include (but not be limited to) hiring additional staff, finalizing agreements and subcontracting with partner providers, and establishing referral streams from city agencies. Piloting (Phase II) will take place over nine months, and be used to demonstrate functioning of the applicant’s Hub model and adjust delivery as needed. Part III (Implementation; up to three years) funding will be contingent on approval of the program plan and pilot report developed during Phases I and II (Planning and Pilot), and is intended to support full and consistent implementation of the Hub. Phase IV, if applicable, will support capital costs for the purposes of increasing the appeal and functionality of spaces and support youth development, and could include additions/modifications of existing physical space and/or new construction. Capital Improvement (Phase IV) funding is contingent on approval of capital improvement project plans (developed during Phase II) and would be awarded concurrent with Implementation Phase (III) funding. As such, applicants’ proposals for Hubs should demonstrate an ability to operationalize a Hub with or without capital funding, and in ways that could support service delivery while any capital investments are ongoing.

D. Performance Measurement

The Manhattan District Attorney’s Office and ISLG are committed to measuring outcomes for all CJII initiatives and disseminating that information so that others may learn from and build on those outcomes. Funded applicants and partner providers will be required to provide performance measurement data to ISLG and the third-party evaluator throughout the duration of the contract. Performance measurement data will include both process/implement data and outcome/impact measures and may be subject to change during the term of the contract. Applicants will work with ISLG and the third-party evaluator during the contracting process and throughout the term of the contract to determine appropriate metrics. (See Appendix I for more information about performance measurement.)

V. Anticipated Scope of Services

A. Background

Preventing antisocial behavior and addressing risk factors for delinquency can help young people avoid juvenile and criminal justice system involvement, ultimately resulting in better individual and societal outcomes. Current best practices for working with young people emphasize the importance of wraparound approaches,²⁴ which coordinate family, community, school and
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agency resources based on a young person’s individualized needs; and a positive youth development framework,\(^{25}\) which emphasizes the role of assets, opportunities, and resources in healthy adolescent development. These approaches facilitate the prevention of undesired behaviors and outcomes in a way that supports holistic youth development by focusing on young people’s strengths rather than solely or predominantly on risk and delinquency.

Numerous providers seek to support youth development in New York City, but these efforts are often scattered and/or fail to address comprehensively the needs of youth.\(^{26}\) During ISLG’s background research and in numerous conversations with prevention providers in NYC, providers overwhelmingly noted the need for better coordination and partnership among existing services, contrasted with the lack of commitment or capacity among providers and funders to realize that goal. Other ongoing initiatives in NYC, such as the Strengthening Communities Steering Committee\(^{26}\) and the Connections to Care Initiative supported by the Mayor’s Fund to Advance New York City have also identified the need to improve access to and coordination among service providers.\(^{8}\) In response, this investment funds the creation of Youth Opportunity Hubs to provide better coordination and wraparound support for youth and young adults. Hubs reflect the developmental understanding that youth are more likely to make use of supports and opportunities when they are viewed as more easily and readily accessible;\(^{27}\) and that wraparound youth development services can support the well-being of youth and effectively prevent poor outcomes, including justice system involvement.

B. Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives of the work solicited via this RFP will help achieve CJII’s broader goals of improving public safety and promoting a fair and efficient justice system by:

- Increasing coordination among local service providers in the delivery of wraparound supports and opportunities to young people
- Increasing the appeal and functionality of spaces and services that support young people’s development
- Building the capacity of local organizations to better address the needs and opportunities in their neighborhoods

By intervening early with supports and opportunities that support targeted, holistic development, these investments will make it less likely that young people become system-involved and more likely that they engage in pro-social activities. The specific goals and objectives for the Youth Opportunity Hubs solicited in this RFP (which serve CJII’s broader goals above) include:

- Reduced likelihood of initial justice system involvement;
- Reduced idle time and risk behaviors;
- Increased prosocial behaviors;
- Improved physical and mental health, including awareness of and response to trauma;
- Improved educational and workforce opportunities and participation; and
- Improved connection to positive adults, mentors, and other supports and opportunities.

Applicants should highlight how their proposals will achieve these and other goals and objectives.

\(^{e}\) Based on interviews conducted with NYC service providers and relevant agencies.
\(^{d}\) For a list of participants, see http://www1.nyc.gov/office_of_the_mayor/news/527-15/mayor-s-fund-advance-new-york-city-corporation-national-community-service-announce

C. **Program Description**

ISLG is seeking proposals from qualified applicants to plan, pilot, and implement Youth Opportunity Hubs in order to serve young people in one or more of the four focus neighborhoods in Manhattan (East Harlem, Central and West Harlem, Washington Heights, Lower East Side).

1. **Description:** Youth Opportunity Hubs are a partnership approach among multiple providers to deliver holistic, wraparound supports and opportunities to youth and young adults. Hub approaches can reflect centralized **planning/coordination** of multiple services, **delivery** of multiple services, and/or **spaces** where young people spend time and can be connected to other supports/opportunities. Applicants should manage and coordinate the proposed Hub; however, applicants are also expected to explicitly identify other providers (i.e., “partner providers”) to deliver additional wraparound support and opportunities within the Hub, beyond what is provided currently, as necessary to participants’ needs (see **Section IV.C.2. Program elements**). Funding could be used to support the costs of greater collaboration, including staff (e.g., a Hub liaison for each participating organization) and expenses related to coordination (e.g., common communication systems), as well as capital projects designed to increase the appeal and functionality of spaces and services that support young people’s development.

2. **Program elements:** Applicants for Youth Opportunity Hubs are expected to **currently** provide one or more of the following wraparound supports/opportunities, as appropriate to the population(s) they serve and needs/gaps in their communities. Applicants will be required to identify and coordinate with other providers in the community, and will not be considered for funding if their proposals do not reflect the intention and ability to coordinate. Applicants should include youth and young adults in the design and refinement of their program models to the extent possible.

Applicants should complete the Wraparound Supports/Opportunities Worksheet (see **Appendix 3**; applicants should complete this form online in the CJI Application Portal) to indicate whether they **currently** provide each of the following wraparound supports, and how and to what extent they propose to deliver them **if funded through this RFP:**

- Employment and workforce development opportunities
- Education support and training, including awareness of and response to learning challenges
- Mentorship and relationship-building
- Recreation opportunities
- Arts and culture
- Life skills
- Family strengthening support
- Trauma-specific services
- Mental health screening and counseling
- Substance abuse services (including treatment and harm reduction)
- Health education
- Community service
- Housing assistance and placement
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- Legal advocacy and access to benefits
- Civic engagement and leadership
- Other appropriate supports/opportunities

3. **Eligible expenses:** A total of $51.5 million dollars over four years are available for up to six Youth Opportunity Hubs, with maximum funding per Hub of $10.3 million. Funding may be used to cover expenses related to coordination: e.g., a Hub manager or other coordinating staff within the applicant’s site; a coordinator for each or several of the partner providers; better data-sharing and case management systems; and other mechanisms to increase coordination and accomplish the goals of CJII. Funding may also be used for the costs of operating Hubs and may include program staff, materials, operations, and other program expenses necessary to meet young people’s needs and accomplish the goals of CJII, provided that funds are not used to supplant existing funding. Any young person currently served by the applicant or partner provider(s), and supported by CJII funding in the future, should have full access to the Youth Opportunity Hub funded through this RFP as appropriate to their needs.

Up to $4 million in capital costs, included in the maximum allocation detailed above, will be awarded to select applicants. Capital funds are available to address a continuum of capital needs, from basic refurbishment of a space to new construction. For example, funding could be used to support co-location of services to create a resource hub; improving the aesthetics and accessibility of the applicant’s space to increase client traffic and participation; or construction of new neighborhood spaces to engage young people in recreation and arts alongside other supports and opportunities). Applicants are encouraged to leverage capital funding available through this RFP with other sources of funding, if warranted by their capital needs and strategic plans. It is preferable that capital improvements be made in a location viewed as neutral and accessible for residents in the community and nearby communities. Only one provider per Hub is eligible for the receipt of capital funding, and this provider should serve as the proposal applicant; therefore, providers requesting capital funding should also serve as the coordinator or manager of the Hub. Although DANY expects to fund up to six Hubs total, some applicants who request capital funding may be awarded funds solely for the creation and management of a Hub (i.e., not for capital improvements).

4. **Eligibility criteria:** Applicants should represent a group of service providers proposing to deliver services as a more coordinated and intentional Hub, whether defined by centralized planning/coordination, delivery, or space. The applicant will be responsible for managing and coordinating the Hub and should have the capacity to enter into subcontracts with partner providers and disburse funding to them. Providers may be included as an applicant or lead applicant in a single proposal only. However, providers can be included as a partner provider (i.e., non-“applicants” or non-“lead applicants”) in multiple proposals. Applicants should have experience providing one or more supports/opportunities (among those listed in Section IV.C.2) for one or more of the four focus neighborhoods in Manhattan (see Section IV.D).

Each Hub will be required to work with Community Navigators (see cjii.org for more information on Community Navigators) to connect youth and families to additional supports/opportunities in the community as necessary (e.g., housing, acute
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In comparison to other areas of Manhattan, residents within these neighborhoods experience worse economic prospects (e.g., lower mean household incomes, higher likelihood of living in poverty, higher unemployment rates); poorer health (e.g., higher likelihood of living with HIV/AIDS, lower likelihood of having health insurance); lower educational attainment (e.g., lower likelihood of finishing high school); and higher rates of prison admission. These factors, individually and collectively, lead to heightened violence and less safety in homes, schools, and communities and lead to residents’ increased involvement in the justice system. For example, see:


In particular, Hubs are intended to support young people at elevated risk of negative life outcomes, as defined by individual (e.g., academic problems), family (e.g., poor interpersonal relationships), and/or community-level (e.g., poverty) factors. Each Hub should aim to serve at least 250 youth annually in the most-commonly utilized services supports (e.g., mentoring; recreation; educational support), with other supports/opportunities provided proportionally according to participants’ needs. Hubs should aim to provide long-term support and opportunities (i.e., through the completion of high school/equivalency and/or stable job placement) to the populations they serve. Applicants should also address how they will create relationships and channels of communication with city agencies, local CBOs, and other relevant entities.

D. Focus Neighborhoods and Populations To Be Served

This funding can be used to support Youth Opportunity Hubs to serve one or more of the four focus neighborhoods in Manhattan: East Harlem, Central and West Harlem, Washington Heights, and the Lower East Side. Applicants and partner providers should provide supports/opportunities to young people from these neighborhoods. These efforts reflect DANY’s interest in place-based initiatives, which seek to strengthen the capacity of neighborhoods and communities to respond to the issues facing their residents. Available data demonstrate particular need for investment in these four neighborhoods. For instance, indicators such as unemployment, youth educational outcomes, and use of preventive family services suggest greater relative need in these neighborhoods.¹

In particular, Hubs are intended to support young people at elevated risk of negative life outcomes, as defined by individual (e.g., academic problems), family (e.g., poor interpersonal relationships), and/or community-level (e.g., poverty) factors. Each Hub should aim to serve at least 250 youth annually in the most-commonly utilized services supports (e.g., mentoring; recreation; educational support), with other supports/opportunities provided proportionally according to participants’ needs. Hubs should aim to provide long-term support and opportunities (i.e., through the completion of high school/equivalency and/or stable job placement) to the populations they serve. Applicants should also address how they will create relationships and channels of communication with city agencies, local CBOs, and other relevant entities.

VI. Deliverables

¹ In comparison to other areas of Manhattan, residents within these neighborhoods experience worse economic prospects (e.g., lower mean household incomes, higher likelihood of living in poverty, higher unemployment rates); poorer health (e.g., higher likelihood of living with HIV/AIDS, lower likelihood of having health insurance); lower educational attainment (e.g., lower likelihood of finishing high school); and higher rates of prison admission. These factors, individually and collectively, lead to heightened violence and less safety in homes, schools, and communities and lead to residents’ increased involvement in the justice system. For example, see:
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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 example deliverables.

VII. Proposal Content and Format

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

A. Cover Letter

A cover letter should provide basic information about the applicant, including the focus neighborhood, length of time the applicant has been in operation, and current supports/opportunities offered. The cover letter should also indicate the amount of and number of years of funding the applicant is seeking; whether the applicant is seeking funding for capital improvements; and the number of proposed partner providers. The cover letter should be signed and dated by an authorized representative of the applicant.

B. Program Narrative

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

1. **Program Design:** All applicants should discuss the elements below:
   a. **Program activities:** Which supports and opportunities will the applicant and partner providers offer (e.g., mentorship and relationship building, health education classes)? Which supports/opportunities will be provided after school vs. during, and during the school year vs. during breaks in the year? Where will supports/opportunities be provided (e.g., in Hub or applicant site, separate partner provider location, in home)? For how long and how frequently will supports/opportunities be provided? How will these supports and opportunities contribute to improved outcomes? How do these supports and opportunities expand beyond the provider’s existing work and which gaps do they address? Which gaps will remain unaddressed even if CJII funding is awarded? (For example, the applicant’s workforce development program may remain limited in its ability to provide more intensive programming for higher-needs young people.)
   b. **Program model, best practices, and evidence base:** Have the program approach(es) and activities been evaluated and demonstrated to be effective? If not, describe the literature, theories, and/or evidence that suggest the program approach(es) would be effective.
   c. **Principles:** Key principles that should be incorporated into the design of Youth Opportunity Hubs include:
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- Positive Youth Development (PYD) framework, a strengths-based approach which focuses on developing healthy young people by connecting them to pro-social activities, opportunities, roles, and relationships.
- Community-based and -informed (i.e., place-based) approach, providing supports/opportunities in young people’s neighborhoods
- Trauma-informed approach, recognizing the role of unaddressed trauma in inhibiting healthy development.

Applicants should present their experience incorporating and plans to incorporate these principles into the delivery of services.

d. Planning and Implementation: Detail the process through which the applicant intends to plan and implement a Youth Opportunity Hub. Provide a timeline that outlines the major milestones of the Planning, Pilot, and Implementation Phases and how they align with program goals. As indicated in Appendix 2: Deliverables, the applicant will produce a program plan at the conclusion of the Planning Phase (I), which is to be approved before release of funds for Piloting (Phase II). All subcontracts with partner providers must be approved before Phase II work can begin.

e. Structure and Distribution of Funds: The applicant should include a proposed distribution of funds between the applicant and each partner provider (i.e., what proportion of funding will each provider in the Hub receive? On what basis?). How many clients is each provider expected to serve, and at what cost? The distribution of funds among providers in a Hub will be finalized during contract and subcontract negotiations.

f. Focus population, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and catchment area: What are the program-specific focus population, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and catchment area? Are there specific populations for which program(s) are designed (e.g., age, gender)? How will providers assess (and reassess when needed) a participant’s needs for the different services/opportunities offered through the Hub? How will providers ensure ongoing client engagement in those services/opportunities? In addition, what specific neighborhood(s) in Manhattan will the proposed Hub serve? What are the boundaries of the catchment area? Why was the area chosen? How is the proposed intervention culturally appropriate or necessary for the proposed populations and catchment area? How will youth and community members be involved in the design and refinement of the Hub?

g. Outreach: How will the applicant identify and recruit the populations to be served, specifically young people who are less connected to supports and opportunities currently and/or who are at higher risk of negative outcomes? How is the proposed approach expected to appeal to the populations to be served? Applicants should address how they will create relationships and channels of communication with city agencies, local CBOs, and other relevant entities.

h. Numbers served: How many clients does the Hub plan to serve in each year of funding, for each of the wraparound supports/opportunities? Would the providers be able to expand access to supports/opportunities
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beyond the scale proposed in the application, if the demand existed? If 
yes, how would the Hub propose to achieve this?

2. **Capital Funding:** Applicants may choose to submit an application with or without a 
request for capital funding. Although DANY expects to fund up to six Hubs total, 
some applicants who request capital funding may be awarded funds solely for the 
creation and management of a Hub (i.e., not for capital improvements). Applicants 
requesting capital funding should address the following:

   a. The amount requested
   b. The proposed use of funding, including the location and scope of capital 
      improvements (e.g., service co-location and creation of shared space for 
      partner providers; modifying the second floor of the provider’s current 
      building to create five additional rooms for program delivery; construction 
      of a new recreational space for young people served by a Hub)
   c. How capital improvements will increase the appeal and functionality of 
      spaces and services for young people, including new opportunities for 
      youth engagement
   d. The estimated length of time that will be required to complete capital 
      improvements
   e. The status of planning for capital improvements. Has the applicant begun 
      planning prior to this point?
   f. Whether the funding requested through this RFP finances planned capital 
      improvements in part or in full. If funding is necessary beyond the scale 
      provided for in this RFP, does the applicant have existing commitments 
      from other funders? What is the status of other funding (e.g., ongoing 
      contracting/negotiations, disbursed, unsecured)?
   g. Whether, how, and to what extent capital improvements would interrupt 
      service delivery and/or operations. If so, how does the applicant propose 
      to continue operating while capital improvements are ongoing?

3. **Program Monitoring:** Applicants should describe their current ability to collect and 
manage data. They should also describe whether and how youth and community 
members will be involved in performance monitoring in their site. In addition, funded 
applicants will be required to coordinate regularly with ISLG to examine the 
effectiveness of the Youth Opportunity Hubs funded through this RFP. Funded 
applicants and partner providers will be required to provide ISLG with program and 
implementation information as requested by the evaluator and/or ISLG.

4. **Sustainability:** The funding available through this RFP could be used to support 
Hubs in full or in part; however, any young person currently served by the applicant 
or partner provider(s), and supported in the future by CJII funding, should have full 
access to the Youth Opportunity Hub funded through this RFP as appropriate to their 
needs. Applicants should address with as much specificity as possible the steps they 
will take to facilitate sustainability following the end of grant funding, as well as 
discuss the government agencies and other organizations they believe might fund the 
Hubs in the future to extend their overall impact.
Appendix 4. Youth Opportunity Hubs Programs RFP

The Program Narrative should be double-spaced, using standard 12-point font (Times New Roman is preferred) with 1-inch margins, and should not exceed 15 pages (excluding appendices and resumes). Pages should be paginated.

C. Organizational Capacity

CJII is committed to funding neighborhood-based initiatives and helping CBOs develop capacity where needed. Applicants should describe their organizational (i.e., technical, managerial, and financial) capacity to perform the work set forth in Section IV. Applications should also include information about partner providers, as requested below. Applicants should also identify any area (e.g., technical, managerial, financial; connecting with referral sources, developing partnerships) where capacity building assistance from ISLG or another entity could be helpful to the applicant and/or partner providers (e.g., pro-bono contracting assistance; developing operational plans; capacity to monitor performance among applicants or partner providers; ability to include youth and community members in the design of the Hub model and/or performance monitoring).

Applicants are encouraged to request this assistance as part of their applications so as to improve the implementation of CJII; CJII funds may be made available to provide training and technical assistance, if necessary.

Applicants should specifically address the following:

1. Number of clients the applicant and partner providers have served for similar supports/opportunities in the previous calendar year. (Applicants should provide this information by completing the Partner Provider Information Worksheet online in the CJII Application Portal. A copy of the worksheet is shown in Appendix 4 to ensure that applicants are aware of the information they will need to gather to complete the form online.)
2. Resources the applicant and partner providers would use to provide the supports/opportunities, including number of full-time staff members, facilities, and technology (if applicable).
3. Resources the applicant would use to conduct and manage capital improvements (if applicable).
4. The applicant’s capacity to enter into subcontracts and disburse funding to other providers.
5. 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 and/or partner providers, current use, and staff resources needed to maintain the directory.
6. Description and evidence of community/neighborhood ties of the applicant and partner providers. Identify any partnerships with other service providers (e.g., community-based organizations, religious institutions, schools) and describe the nature of the partnerships.
7. Whether or not the applicant proposes to use volunteers as part of program delivery and, if so, the anticipated number of volunteers per month and their purpose. Also, indicate the applicant’s number of current volunteers per month.
8. An explanation of how the supports/opportunities proposed will fit into the applicant’s current or future operations, if the approach funded here represents only a portion of the
Appendix 4. Youth Opportunity Hubs Programs RFP

applicant’s overall mission and services (e.g., a homeless services organization serves people of all ages but also includes specific programming for young adults).

9. Areas in which training and technical assistance may be needed (e.g., connecting with referral sources, record-keeping/data collection, trauma-informed approaches).

10. Attach letters of support/commitment from each partner provider intending to serve clients through the Hub; as well as from city agencies, consultants, and/or other funders, as appropriate.

11. Attach 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.

12. Basic information about each of the partner providers using the Partner Provider Information Worksheet (see Appendix 4; applicants should complete this form online in the CJII Application Portal).

D. Experience

Describe the relevant experience of the applicant and the proposed key staff in providing the work described in Section IV. Specifically, address the following:

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, Pilot, Implementation, and (if applicable) Capital Phases of the Youth Opportunity Hub.

2. Indicate the length of time the applicant has a) been in operation and b) provided supports/opportunities relevant to this RFP.

3. Detail the applicant’s specific experiences with wraparound youth development approaches in the proposed focus neighborhood.

4. List the applicant’s 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 members have training and experience in working with individuals from the populations to be served? Do staff have experience recognizing and responding to youth with past traumatic experiences? What additional training will key staff need to deliver the proposed program(s)? To the extent possible, provide similar information for anticipated partner providers.

5. Describe the applicant’s experience including youth and community members in the design (and evaluation, if applicable) of supports and opportunities.

6. Describe the applicant’s experience entering into subcontracts with other providers and supervising their work.

7. Describe the applicant’s experience in conducting and managing capital improvement projects.

8. Attach resumes of the key staff who will be providing the work.

E. Program Budget

Applicants should provide a budget outlining their proposed use of funding to achieve the goals of the proposed Hub and overarching goals of the Youth Opportunity Hubs investment, including anticipated allocations to the applicant and to partner providers. The budget should include a proposed breakdown of funds for Planning (Part I), Pilot (Phase II), Implementation (Part III), and, if applicable, Capital Improvements (Phase IV). Applicants should provide as many
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specifics as possible (e.g., plans, subcontractors, site, space modifications) for each of the funding phases.

F. Program Budget Narrative

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 Hub components and activities and outline any assumptions on which the budget is based.

G. 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.
- Pages should be paginated.
- The Program Narrative should not exceed 15 pages, excluding appendices and resumes. There are no length restrictions on other sections of the submission.
- 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 submitted proposals.

VII. Proposal Evaluation and Contract Award

A. Evaluation Procedures

All proposals accepted by ISLG will be reviewed to determine whether they are responsive to the requisites of this RFP. Proposals that are determined by ISLG to be non-responsive will be rejected. An evaluation team will evaluate and rate proposals based on the evaluation criteria prescribed below. The evaluation team may 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, ISLG and DANY reserve 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 final funding decisions.

DANY reserves the right to fund none, 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):
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- Quality of proposed approach (determined via proposal and site visits, interviews, presentations and/or demonstrations) - 55%
- Organizational capacity - 20%
- Prior relevant experience - 20%
- 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 the Research Foundation and the selected applicants. Pilot (Phase II), Implementation (Phase III), and, if applicable, Capital Improvement (Phase IV) funding will be contingent upon approval of the program plans and pilot report developed during the Planning and Pilot Phases (I and II).
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VIII. Appendices

Appendix 1: Performance Measurement

The Manhattan District Attorney’s Office and ISLG are committed to measuring outcomes for all CJII initiatives and disseminating that information so that others can learn from and build on those outcomes.

All funded applicants and partner providers will be required to provide performance measurement data to ISLG and/or a third-party evaluator on a quarterly basis. These 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:
1. Clearly articulated goal(s) that are broken down into objective(s) (see Exhibit 1 for an example table);
2. Anticipated process (e.g., program satisfaction), output (e.g., program participants), and outcome measures (e.g., degree completion) for each objective for each quarter;
3. Methods of data collection (any costs related to data collection/analysis should be incorporated into the budget and explained in the program 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Process Measure &amp; Target</th>
<th>Output Measure &amp; Target</th>
<th>Outcome Measure &amp; Target</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal #1: Improve educational attainment among higher-risk youth</td>
<td>1) To improve graduation rates of higher-risk youth currently enrolled in high school</td>
<td>1) Q1: Percent of participants “very satisfied” with the program: 85%</td>
<td>1) Q1: Percentage of students on track for graduation: 60% 1a) Q1: Percentage of underperforming students enrolled in academic tutoring: 75%</td>
<td>1a) Q1: Percentage of 21 year-olds with a HS diploma: 60%</td>
<td>Surveys; program attendance records; School and district assessments and records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1a) Q2: Percent of participants “very satisfied” with the program: 90%</td>
<td>1a) Q2: Etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1a) Q3: Etc.</td>
<td>1a) Q3: Etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1a) Q4: Etc.</td>
<td>1a) Q4: Etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b) To increase rates of high school equivalency certification among higher-risk youth who have dropped out of school</td>
<td>1b) Q1: Percent of participants “very satisfied” with the program: 85%</td>
<td>1b) Q1: Percentage of HS drop-outs participating in counseling/mentoring program: 60% 1b) Q1: Percentage of HS drop-outs making progress toward equivalency: 55%</td>
<td>1b) Q1: Percentage of 21 year-olds with a HS equivalency: 20%</td>
<td>Surveys; program attendance records; Schools and district assessments and databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1b) Q2: Percent of participants “very satisfied” with the program: 90%</td>
<td>1b) Q2: Etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1b) Q3: Etc.</td>
<td>1b) Q3: Etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List goal #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that applicants or partner providers who lack capacity for performance monitoring and data collection may be offered assistance by CUNY ISLG to comply with this funding requirement.
Appendix 2: Deliverables

Funded applicants will be required to submit regular deliverables to ISLG throughout the term (see Exhibit 2 for examples). Please note that deliverables, frequency, and dates are subject to negotiation.

Exhibit 2. Deliverables for Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency/Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Program Plan and Finalized Subcontracts</td>
<td>• Detailed plan for program roll-out based on research and planning undertaken during Phase I. • Finalized subcontracts with all partner providers</td>
<td>End of Month 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pilot Report</td>
<td>Report on the Pilot Phase (II) of Hub implementation, including: • challenges to implementing and growing the program • changes in Hub membership and operation proposed for the Implementation Phase (III) • status of solutions</td>
<td>End of Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Capital Plan (if applicable)</td>
<td>Proposed plan and timeline for capital investments, including: • Land/property procurement (if necessary) • Proposed subcontractors • Capital timeline • Purpose of capital improvements • Plan for Hub operation during capital improvements</td>
<td>End of Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>De-identified, client-level data</td>
<td>Client-level information such as: • Date enrolled in program • Client demographics, such as race, gender and age • Services provided • Length of participation in program</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Operational costs status report</td>
<td>Financial reports</td>
<td>Twice per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Implementation report</td>
<td>Report on challenges to implementing and growing the program; status of solutions; outputs</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Outcome data</td>
<td>Data on various outcomes as requested by external evaluator</td>
<td>Quarterly or twice per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, selected applicants will be required to coordinate regularly with a third-party evaluator contracted with ISLG. Selected applicants will be required to provide the evaluator with requested program and process information as requested by the evaluator and/or ISLG.
Appendix 3: Provision of Wraparound Supports/Opportunities by Lead Applicants and Partner Providers

Applicants will be prompted to complete this form online in the CJII Application Portal as one step of the application process. Applicants should not recreate this form in their written submission, although they may speak to information in the form in the Program Narrative section of the application, as appropriate. Applicants should indicate (A) whether each support/opportunity is currently provided by the applicant and/or a partner provider; (B) whether it will be provided by the applicant, partner provider, or not at all if the applicant is funded; (C) the partner provider who will provide a particular support/opportunity, if “partner provider” is selected in column “B”; and (D) the number and percentage of clients anticipated to receive each support/opportunity through the Hub. The form is included here to ensure that applicants are aware of the information they will need to gather to complete the form online in the CJII Application Portal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wraparound Supports/Opportunities</th>
<th>A. Currently Provided by Lead Applicant and/or Partner Provider?</th>
<th>B. Support/Opportunity will be Provided by: Lead Applicant, Partner Provider, or Will Not be Provided</th>
<th>C. Partner Provider to provide support/opp if app.</th>
<th>D. Number/Percent Expected to Receive Support/Opp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment and workforce development opportunities</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education support/training, inc. awareness of and response to learning challenges</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship and relationship-building</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and culture</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life skills</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family strengthening support</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma-specific services</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health screening and counseling</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse services (including treatment and/or harm reduction)</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health education</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing assistance and placement</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal advocacy and access to benefits</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement and leadership</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other appropriate supports/opportunities</td>
<td>Y       N</td>
<td>Lead Applicant</td>
<td>Partner Provider</td>
<td>Will not be Provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Partner Provider Information Worksheet

Applicants will be prompted to complete this form online in the CJII Application Portal, as one step of the application process. Applicants should not recreate this form in their written submission, although they may speak to information in the form in the Program Narrative section of the application, as appropriate. Applicants should provide the following information on each of the partner providers expected to deliver services/opportunities as part of a Hub. Any providers identified in Column C of Appendix 3 should be included in this table. The form is included here to ensure that applicants are aware of the information they will need to gather to complete the form online in the CJII Application Portal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name of partner provider</th>
<th>2. Contact person and information (i.e., phone, email, address) for partner provider</th>
<th>3. Location and service area of partner provider</th>
<th>4. Length of time the partner provider has been in operation</th>
<th>5. Types of supports/opportunities currently offered by the partner provider</th>
<th>6. Types of supports/opportunities that will be provided through the partner provider, if funded</th>
<th>7. Number of clients served in previous calendar year for supports/opportunities identified in column 6</th>
<th>8. Length of time the partner provider has provided supports/opportunities identified in column 6</th>
<th>9. Annual operating budget for FY 2014, 2015, and 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4. Youth Opportunity Hubs Programs RFP
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Appendix 5. 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 as such term is defined in Appendix C of this Contract, 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 as defined in Appendix C to this Contract shall remain the property of Contractor, subject to the Data Use Agreement contemplated in paragraph (G) of such appendix.

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.