

# SAFETY AND SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION MEETING

Created by the Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act of 2014

Monday, April 25, 2016

6:30-9:00 p.m.

Council Chambers – City Hall

1 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Oakland, California 94612

**Oversight Commission Members:** Chairperson Rev. Curtis Flemming, Sr. (D-3), Vice-Chairperson Jennifer Madden (D-4), Jody Nunez (D-1), Tony Marks-Block (D-2), Rebecca Alvarado (D-5), Melanie Shelby (D-6), Kevin McPherson (D-7), Letitia Henderson Watts (At-Large), and Gary Malachi Scott (Mayor).

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** The Oversight Commission welcomes you to its meetings and your interest is appreciated.

- ✓ If you wish to speak before the Oversight Commission, please fill out a speaker card and hand it to the Oversight Commission Staff.
- ✓ If you wish to speak on a matter not on the agenda, please sign up for Open Forum and wait for your name to be called.
- ✓ If you wish to speak on a matter on the agenda, please approach the Commission when called, give your name, and your comments.

Please be brief and limit your comments to the specific subject under discussion. Only matters within the Oversight Commission's jurisdictions may be addressed. Time limitations shall be at the discretion of the Chair.

ITEM	TIME	TYPE	ATTACHMENTS
1. Call to Order	6:30pm	AD	
2. Roll Call	2 Minutes	AD	
3. Agenda Approval	3 Minutes	AD	
4. Open Forum	10 Minutes	I	
5. Approval of Minutes from March 28, 2016	5 Minutes	A	Attachment 1
6. Coordinator's Announcements a) Retreat	5 Minutes	AD	
7. Public Ethics Presentation	20 Minutes	I	Attachment 2
8. SSOC Evaluation RFP Scope Recommendation	30 Minutes	A	Attachment 3
9. HSD – RFQ Service Category 1 RFQ Service Category 2	15 Minutes	I	Attachment 4
10. Schedule Planning and Pending Agenda Items	5 Minutes	I	
11. Adjournment	20 Minutes	A	

**A = Action Item**

**I = Informational Item**

**AD = Administrative Item**

PUBLIC SAFETY AND SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
**Monday, March 28, 2016**  
Hearing Room 1

**ITEM #1: CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at by Chairperson Flemming at 6:33pm.

**ITEM #2 ROLL CALL**

Present: Chairperson Rev. Curtis Flemming Sr.  
Vice Chairman Jennifer Madden  
Commissioner Tony Marks-Block  
Commissioner Kevin McPherson  
Commissioner Gary Malachi Scott

Excused: Commissioner Rebecca Alvarado  
Commissioner Letitia Henderson Watts  
Commissioner Jody Nunez  
Commissioner Melanie Shelby

**ITEM 3: AGENDA APPROVAL**

Approved by consent.

**ITEM 4: OPEN FORUM**

One public speaker.

**ITEM #5: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Commissioner Marks Blocks moved to accept the minutes of the February 29, 2016 meeting as submitted. Motion seconded by Commissioner McPherson; Approved by consensus .

**ITEM #6: COORDINATOR'S ANNOUNCEMENT – Chantal Cotton Gaines**

Ms. Cotton Gaines has contacted each Commissioner whose term expires in April 2016. All Commissioners have agreed to continue working on the Commission. She will submit the renewal paperwork for the Council's approval shortly.

Reminder to file your Form 700 by April 1st.

**ITEM 7: SSOC EVALUATION RFP SCOPE RECOMMENDATION**

Ms. Cotton Gaines gave an overview of the evaluation scope changes since the last meeting.

Chairperson Flemming wants to hear from the Ad Hoc Committee that worked on the RFP, but unfortunately none are attendance tonight. He would entertain a motion to postpone this item to a special meeting within 2 weeks.

Commissioner Marks Block made a motion to continue this item to a Special Meeting. Seconded by Commissioner Madden. All approved.

One public speaker.

**ITEM #8: OFD QUARTERLY REPORT OCTOBER-DECEMBER 2015 – Deputy Chief Darin White**

He provided a brief summary of the report submitted in the packet. The Fire Department is responsible for maintaining adequate personnel resources, improving 911 response times and efforts to reduce homicides. Their goal is to fill the vacant positions to stabilize the department and reduce mandatory overtime. OFD started giving Fire stations a monthly graphical report on the turn out and response times and saw better turn out and response times of the engine companies. The graphical representation allowed them to see their performance. In addition to the new reports, OFD also changed some dispatch protocols while improving communication.

**Discussion:**

1. What are some of the obstacles faced in hiring and bettering 911 response times?
  - a. OFD: There is a concerted effort from everyone in the hiring process to expedite it as best as possible. The primary obstacle is the pressures of other departments who also need hiring. OFD does not have a dedicated training staff, so that is an obstacle.
  - b. OFD: On the left side of the graph, it shows minutes. On the horizontal side, it shows the engines and trucks. You will see Engine 1 – 29 and Trucks 1 – 7. The line on these is the turnout time on each. Turnout time is defined as the time it takes for Firefighters/Paramedics to get out of the station and get rolling (and changes their status to “responding”). One thing we are looking at reviewing is time to get out of the station. OFD wants to be able to instantly get the information on the truck as the truck is in route. Currently, the stations are notified by a phone call, the information is sent to the printer, and then staff gets on the apparatus. OFD hopes that by making such a change, approximately one minute could be saved in response time.
2. Why do some stations have no data in the report?
  - a. OFD: Station 22 is the airport station and they do not get very many calls.
3. What is OFD’s desired response time ?
  - a. OFD: The national standards say OFD needs to meet 7.5 minutes. In Oakland, it is 8+ minutes but the department is aiming for 7.5 minutes.
4. What do you do in cases like Battalion 4, where there was a large time difference?
  - a. OFD: Sometimes, there are typos and other times, the buttons are being pushed and not really engaged and thus it skews the data. OFD does go back and have a dialogue with the company officer to make sure there is a sound expectation. Generally, there is usually a rational explanation for what occurred.
5. Is OFD top-heavy on staffing? There are 6.5 captains budgeted for every Firefighter. Couldn’t these positions be used in those lower level positions to call for service?
  - a. OFD: No, OFD is not top heavy. As attrition and promotions take place, it makes the data show that there appears to be more people at the top. OFD is working on filling those lower ranked vacancies which better balances these numbers. Each company is required to have a leader (Lt. or Captain) as the company officer who makes up one of 4 or 5 members on each apparatus. They are just one of the crew and they can pick up a hose if necessary.

Motion made by Commissioner McPherson to accept and file this report. Motion seconded by Vice-Chair Madden. All approved.

**ITEM #9: OPD QUARTERLY REPORT JULY-SEPTEMBER and OCTOBER-DECEMBER 2015 – Donneshia “Nell” Taylor and Deputy Chief Cunningham**

Ms. Taylor gave an overview of the expenses OPD has incurred during the first 2 quarters of Measure Z. The overtime was covered by vacancy savings. Those were not included in the spending plan. It is done as a balance when officers are out. The breakdown of personnel covered by Measure Z is:

- 42 Crime Reduction Team Officers (CRTs)
- 22 Community Resource Officers (CROs)
- 1 Ceasefire Program Director
- 1 Ceasefire Program Coordinator

(These numbers are not included in the staff report but will be included in future reports).

**Discussion:**

1. In one of the Measure Y evaluation reports, there was a concern by the evaluator about the OPD overtime issue. But from the department standpoint, are there other funding options?
  - a. Ms. Taylor: If it wasn't charged to Measure Z, it would be charged to the General Purpose Fund, and the cost would be backed out for any overage charges.
  - b. Deputy Chief Cunningham explained the overtime is usually for community meetings or a project that a CRO or Ceasefire candidate is working on and it holds them over, that would be considered as an extension of shift, etc.
2. How are the call-ins going, are you doing something new this year, what is going on?
  - a. Deputy Chief Cunningham commented that he has not attended a call in, but keeps in touch with Ms. Harmon, Cpt. Joiner, and Assistant Chief Figueroa who are always there. OPD has seen a lot of success. There has been roughly 75 percent attendance. OPD has also increased the opportunity for custom notifications instead of a call-in. OPD is far more focused than in years past and has done a lot better job at identifying those involved in violence. OPD has stayed focused on those individuals.
3. Please explain what the education item represents.
  - a. Ms. Taylor explained it was for attendance at the California Narcotics Expo. All of the charges are not shown here yet. Seven (7) officers attended the Conference.
4. How does OPD delineate time for officers when they are doing Measure Z work versus non-Measure Z work?
  - a. CRTs have a specific report where they detail their daily work. They include a percentage of time spent specifically working towards a Ceasefire mission or intel work.
  - b. CROs do not have as specific as a fact sheet. However, at least in the Bureau of Field Ops in East Oakland, the CROs put out a daily report to show that they are spending sufficient time on their beats and are working towards OPD and community goals. Sometimes the CROs of different beats are working together on one project.
5. Chair Flemming witnessed an interaction with one of your officers in the community and praised him for being very professional and I really appreciate that.
6. What level of detail does the SSOC want in these reports (i.e., some sort of summary report CRT and CRO work in the community, etc.).
  - a. Ms. Cotton Gaines said this would be good time to give feedback to the 3 departments who provide these reports, so that they can take your comments into consideration for future reports.
  - b. Ms. Taylor: OPD can provide an update on the programmatic elements. They do not have separate funding codes to back out charges for the individual activities unless it is for a Warrior's game or special operation.

- c. There is an interest in receiving personnel breakdown each quarter.
- d. At an upcoming retreat, the SSOC should focus on Ceasefire and OPD's role and what type of info the SSOC wants to see from OPD.

Motion made by Commissioner McPherson to accept and file this report. Motion seconded by Commissioner Scott. All approved.

**ITEM # 10: HSD QUARTERLY REPORT JULY-SEPTEMBER and OCTOBER-DECEMBER 2015 – Josie Halpern Finnerty**

Josie Halpern Finnerty presented the first two quarterly reports. Each month is reflected on a monthly basis. These reports are during the time in which the Commission approved the 6-month extension for the Measure Y programs. Funding came from the Measure Y reserves and Measure Z funds while the RFP was in process. The vast majority of grantees and contracts are paid on a quarterly basis which is why you see major jumps in October. The next quarterly reports will reflect the final payments of the 6-month extension, as well as the advances for the new programs that began in January 2016.

There is one correction to narrative with the personnel expenditure throughout each of the 6-month period. It personnel expenditure also includes four (4) FTE service positions, not just administrative positions. HSD will break them out in future reports. Overhead charges will be waived for these funds and HSD is working with fiscal to get those reversed.

Ms. Halpern Finnerty thanked staff and Chair Flemming for attending inaugural event of the grantees.

**Discussion:**

1. How are things are going thus far with the agencies?
  - a. Ms. Halpern Finnerty commented that things are going very well thus far. Grantees are pretty energized and excited to have new faces in the room and to see some of the revised structures in place. It has been a busy time, but it is good. Folks have hit the ground running and are eager to serve the community.
2. How did the transition that took place in different strategy areas go from existing agencies to new agencies? How did you facilitate that?
  - a. Ms. Halpern Finnerty explained that where there were changes and the providers were no longer going to be funded, HSD organized a hand-off from the existing providers to the new providers. The West Oakland Street Outreach contract is a good example of that. It is being coordinated by Kevin Grant to make sure staff is talking to one another and that there is not a gap in service and that if clients wanted to go from one agency to another, that they could.
3. Please speak to the collaboration between agencies. The Commission was interested in if people had the desire to provide services and didn't have the ability to meet the requirements of the RFP, what are opportunities for them?
  - a. Ms. Cotton Gaines: What staff has seen is multiple organizations partnering in order to provide a service. Capacity building has been expressed as an interest of this Commission, on encouraging more agencies to partner together in providing services and that can be further explored.
  - b. Ms. Halpern Finnerty commented on the upcoming RFQ technical assistance will be for existing network grantees, not for the broader community as a whole. HSD is using the input received previously about what technical needs the agencies need to build their capacity to get stronger.
  - c. As for other partnerships between agencies, Youth Alive! Partnered with BOSS for the West Oakland Street Outreach proposal. Ms. Halpern-Finnerty will send out the list of

the number of collaborations within each strategy. There are varying sizes and types of partnerships for each.

- d. Chair Flemming wanted to thank HSD for inviting us to the inaugural event. It was nice to see this web of human kindness in Oakland.
- e. Let's take the time and benchmark these agencies soon to show we are serious and sincere about the work they do.

Motion made by Commissioner McPherson to accept and file this report. Motion seconded by Commissioner Marks Block. All approved.

**ITEM #11: SCHEDULE PLANNING AND PENDING AGENDA ITEMS**

- Schedule a retreat to talk about Ceasefire. Commissioner Scott would like to invite some participants and/or the street outreach workers to come and share their experience with the Commission during that retreat.

**ITEM #12: ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Marks Block made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded by Commissioner McPherson. All approved.

Meeting adjourned 7:49pm

---

**TO: SAFETY & SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (SSOC)**

**FROM: Jelani Killings**

**SUBJECT: GEA Presentation**

**DATE: April 11, 2016**

---

The Public Ethics Commission will be presenting the Safety and Services Oversight Commission (SSOC) with an introduction to the City's Government Ethics Act (GEA).

**Date and Time:**

Monday, April 25<sup>th</sup> at 6:30pm

**The presentation will include:**

- **PEC Introduction** – PEC staff member, Jelani Killings, will give a brief introduction of the Public Ethics Commission and its role in City government
- **GEA Introductory Video** – A 10 minute video covering key provisions of the Government Ethics Act including: gift restrictions, conflicts of interest, revolving door restrictions, and more
- **Government Ethics Act Fact Sheet** – The one-page fact sheet summarizes the most common GEA provisions and advises public servants to contact the PEC with any questions regarding compliance with the law.

For questions, please contact Jelani Killings at [jkillings@oaklandnet.com](mailto:jkillings@oaklandnet.com) or 510-238-2061.



## Government Ethics for Public Servants

Public Servants are entrusted by the public to use City time, property and resources efficiently and in a legal and ethically responsible manner. While Public Servants are encouraged to practice the highest integrity in their service to the City, the Oakland Government Ethics Act (GEA) provides a minimum standard for government ethics, and below is a summary of some of the provisions of GEA to help you comply with the law and avoid administrative fines or criminal penalties.

- 1. Gift Restriction.** You cannot accept any gift that could reasonably influence you in the performance of your official duties. You also cannot accept gifts of more than \$50 cumulatively per year from a person doing business with your department or a person who attempted to influence you in any legislative or administrative action in the preceding 12 months. O.M.C. 2.25.060(C)(3).
- 2. Form 700.** If you are required to file a Form 700 according to the City's Conflict of Interest Code (O.M.C. 3.16), you must submit the Form 700 by the April 1 each year. You must report all gifts and other income as required by the Form 700, and you cannot accept gifts of more than \$250 cumulatively in a calendar year from a single source, unless the gift is exempt from reporting or falls within an exception under the California Political Reform Act. O.M.C. 2.25.060(C).
- 3. Conflict of Interests.** You cannot make, participate in making, or seek to influence a decision of the City on a matter in which you have a financial interest as defined by the California Political Reform Act. O.M.C. 2.25.040(C).
- 4. Use of City Position and Resources.** You cannot use your City position to induce or coerce any person to provide private advantage or benefit to you or anyone else. You cannot use or permit others to use public resources for a campaign activity or for personal or non-City purposes. O.M.C. 2.25.060(A).
- 5. Confidential Information.** You cannot disclose to any other person confidential information acquired in the course of your official duties. O.M.C. 2.25.040(D).
- 6. Revolving Door Restriction: Permanent Post-Service Restriction.** Upon departure from the City, you cannot represent any person or entity other than yourself or the City before any court, or before any state, federal, or local agency in connection with a particular matter in which the following exist:
  - (a) The City is a party or has a direct and substantial interest; and
  - (b) You participated personally and substantially in the matter as a City public servant. O.M.C. 2.25.050(A).
- 7. Revolving Door Restriction: One-Year Ban on Representing Other Persons before Former Department.** For one year after leaving your City position, you cannot lobby on behalf of any other person with any officer or employee of the department, board, commission, or other unit of government, for which you served. (The word "department" includes the City of Oakland for a public servant who is an outgoing Mayor, Councilmember, or their senior staff.) O.M.C. 2.25.050(C).
- 8. Prohibition on Nepotism.** You cannot make, participate in making, or seek to influence any decision of the City regarding an employment or contract action involving a relative. O.M.C. 2.25.070(D).

The restrictions listed above are just a few of the provisions found in the Oakland Government Ethics Act. To learn more about the GEA, view a summary and text of the law and watch a ten-minute **Government Ethics Act Video** available at [www.oaklandnet.com/pec](http://www.oaklandnet.com/pec).

If you have questions about a government ethics law, and before you take action that could be in violation of the law, you can contact the **Public Ethics Commission** for advice by phone at (510) 238-3593, in person (City Hall, Room 104), or by email ([ethicscommission@oaklandnet.com](mailto:ethicscommission@oaklandnet.com)). We are here to help you!



---

**TO:** SAFETY & SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (SSOC)  
**FROM:** Chantal Cotton Gaines  
**SUBJECT:** Third Party Evaluation Request for Proposals  
**DATE:** March 21, 2016

---

At the February 29, 2016 Safety and Services Oversight Commission (SSOC) meeting, staff presented the draft evaluation scope of work and informed the SSOC that the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee, consisting of Commissioner Nunez, Commissioner Alvarado, and Commissioner Henderson Watts, would be reviewing the scope of work once more before bringing it back for approval by the SSOC. The updated scope of work based on meeting with the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee is attached to this memo. The “Revised Proposed Scope of Services and Structure” section below contains a summary of the main changes. The proposed timeline below has been updated to reflect the current timing expected for the evaluation.

The SSOC should consider as a whole how the evaluation can be utilized to enhance performance and inform future funding decisions and work. With that framework in mind, staff recommends that the SSOC review, comment upon, discuss, and approve this scope of work for evaluation services. Upon SSOC approval, staff will present the Request for Proposals (RFP) scope of work to the City Council Public Safety Committee then prepare to post the RFP.

**PROPOSED TIMELINE (updated since shared at the February 29, 2016 SSOC Meeting)**

The timeline below is the best case scenario and is subject to change if needed. Dates could also change if more time is needed at any step in the process.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Task</b>
January	SSOC Update; Staff to work with the Ad Hoc Committee on draft
February 29	Staff discusses evaluation scope of work with the SSOC
March 28	SSOC receives the proposed evaluation RFP and recommends Approval
April 26	Staff presents the proposed evaluation RFP to the Public Safety Committee for input
April 29	Post the RFP
May	Bidders Conference (voluntary)
Three (3) weeks after post date	Proposals due
Within two (2) weeks after proposal due date	Readers review (2 weeks)
June 27 (or special meeting)	SSOC receives the staff recommendation for evaluator contract
July 12 and July 19	Public Safety and full Council Approval
July / August	Staff begins to work with selected evaluator

## **REVISED PROPOSED SCOPE OF SERVICES AND STRUCTURE**

The attached draft scope of services text will be placed into the RFP once finalized. The changes since the February 29<sup>th</sup> meeting are shown in this document as underlined or strike-through tracked changes. The rest of the RFP is general deadlines, etc. stock language thus staff did not include it with this report. The following information summarizes changes proposed by the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee.

The main changes within this revised draft, based on input from the Ad Hoc Evaluation Committee are as follows:

- The program level and strategy level evaluations for Oakland Unite annual evaluations have been combined due to similarity.
- A definitions section was added where a definition of recidivism is provided. Some of the terms still need to be defined within the document.
- A statement was added to state that the City prefers a separate proposer for each section of the evaluation to make sure that each evaluation has the attention it deserves (but will consider one proposer bidding on multiple pieces of the scope).
- Some information has been slightly reformatted to make it stand out more.

For questions, please contact Chantal Cotton Gaines at [ccotton@oaklandnet.com](mailto:ccotton@oaklandnet.com) or 510-238-7587.

### **Attachments (1)**

Attachment A: Scope of Services to the RFP

## ATTACHMENT A: Evaluation Services RFP Scope of Services

Below is the revised proposed Scope of Services for the 2015-2020 Measure Z evaluation. This information is provided for the SSOC to discuss the elements, particularly the evaluation types, the required elements (questions for each type of evaluation), and the timeframes for each in the context of the overall timeline.

Staff plans to take this scope of services to the Public Safety Committee of the City Council after getting approval by the SSOC.

### Evaluation Services

#### SCOPE OF SERVICES

The scope of services includes the following subsections: budget/budget narrative, evaluation overview, evaluation purpose, evaluation timeline and design, and the required elements for all the Oakland Unite violence prevention and intervention services, and the evaluation and the required elements of the ~~g~~Geographic ~~p~~olicing and ~~e~~Community ~~p~~olicing services. This evaluation does NOT include an evaluation of the Ceasefire programs.

#### Budget and Budget Narrative

The contract period for this evaluation will be between one and four years depending on the portion of the RFP proposers choose to bid on. The options are as follows:

1. For the annual Oakland Unite (program ~~level~~ and strategy level) and policing evaluations, the contract period will be July 2016 through December 2017. Upon mutual agreement, the City and the contracted evaluator may renew the annual contract for three (3) additional 12-month periods, subject to satisfactory performance, availability of City funds, and City Council approval.
2. For the four year comprehensive evaluation of Oakland Unite, the contract period will be July 1, 2016 through December 2020.

More detailed information about each type of evaluation is provided in subsequent subsections.

Proposal budgets should reflect the costs for a one-year period. Annual funding available for the external evaluation contract(s) is as follows:

- Annual evaluations include:
  - The Oakland Unite evaluation (program and strategy level)
  - The Oakland Geographic and Community Ppolicing evaluations;

wWhile proposers can bid on either the annual Oakland Unite (program ~~level~~ and strategy level) evaluation AND the Oakland ~~g~~Geographic and ~~e~~Community ~~p~~olicing evaluation together OR one or the other, the total amount for these annual evaluations

## Measure Z 2015-2020 Evaluation Services Scope of Services

should not exceed \$327,984 for July 2016-December 2017 and should not exceed \$339,456 in January 2018-December 2018 (this equates to roughly 66 percent of total evaluation funds annually).

- Four-year comprehensive evaluation (only of some Oakland Unite programs): this four year evaluation should not exceed \$172,500 annually for a total of \$690,000 over four years. Proposers interested in bidding on this evaluation should still reflect their costs in annual terms.

[The annual Oakland Unite evaluation and the four-year evaluation should be linked in some meaningful way.](#)

### External Evaluation Overview

The City of Oakland is seeking qualified consultants to evaluate the performance of the community-focused violence prevention/intervention services ([Oakland Unite](#)) and the [g](#)Geographic and [e](#)Community [p](#)Policing services funded by Measure Z (these are the two service categories which Measure Z requires to have a third-party independent evaluator). The selected contractor(s) will work with designated stakeholders to plan and conduct the evaluation, produce evaluation reports, and present reports and evaluation findings to the SSOC, City Council Public Safety Committee, and the full City Council. [Candidates must have cultural competency, especially for interacting with stakeholders.](#) Strong candidates for this series of evaluation contracts would include research firms, research firms with a college/university partnership, or college/university firms. The ideal candidate would bring expertise in one or both of the following: research methods and best practices in the field of violence prevention/intervention and/or best practices and evidence expertise in law enforcement policies and practices especially related to crime prevention and community policing.

Applications may include a partnership of two or more entities. The lead agency may be a non-profit, for-profit, university, or public agency or organization. The City will look favorably upon submittals with university partnerships or agencies that specialize in work related to one or more of the aforementioned services.

If contractors are interested in teaming with subcontractors, the lead agency must have expertise in one or both of the aforementioned services and can partner with other agencies to cover other necessary aspects of the evaluation. Agencies may bid on the whole contract alone, bid on the whole contract with subcontractors or bid on just one portion of the contract. Partnerships designed to evidence experience in violence prevention/intervention or policing must be sustained throughout the project and may only be modified or revised with the express prior authority of the City of Oakland and upon evidence that qualifications and project goals and deadlines will be satisfied.

The contracted evaluations will consist of two core topics with sub-evaluations within each:

1. Evaluation of the Human Services Department (HSD) Oakland Unite community-focused violence prevention/intervention services funded by Oakland Unite. Evaluation of these services will include:

## Measure Z 2015-2020 Evaluation Services Scope of Services

- a. Program and strategy level evaluation (annual with a mid-year and Fall time annual report)
  - ~~b. Strategy level evaluation (annual)~~
  - ~~c. Comprehensive, larger study of key programs (four-year evaluation)~~
2. Evaluation of the Oakland Police Department (OPD) services funded by Measure Z (excluding the Ceasefire strategy). Evaluation of these services will include:
    - a. Geographic policing and crime reduction team evaluation (annual)
    - b. Community policing services evaluation (annual)

**Proposers should submit a detailed proposal for an outcome evaluation for any combination of the following (keeping the available budgets in mind):**

- **The annual Oakland Unite (program ~~level~~ and strategy level) evaluations**
- **The four-year comprehensive Oakland Unite evaluation**
- **The annual Geographic and crime reduction team and community policing services evaluations**

A description of each service area and a set of narrative questions for both are provided below. Before applying to evaluate Measure Z community-focused violence prevention/intervention and/or geographic and community policing services, it is essential that proposers understand the legislative intention and requirements to be evaluated. The Measure Z legislation (***Attachment D***) provides a description of the intended services for both core areas.

### **Evaluation Content**

#### Purpose

The purpose of the independent external evaluation(s) is to ensure that the City of Oakland effectively uses Measure Z funds on permitted activities which have the greatest impact in helping Oakland progress towards violence reduction and the three Measure Z objectives. Additionally, Measure Z requires a third party independent evaluator to ensure service delivery as stated in the legislation.

The evaluation should inform the City of Oakland and stakeholders about the impact of Measure Z-funded strategies and inform decision-makers about how to properly allocate Measure Z's resources and efforts to reduce violence in Oakland.

The evaluation is **not** a financial audit. It is performance evaluation connected to the funding spent on different activities funded under Measure Z. The separate financial audit is performed by a third party independent auditor on an annual basis and is managed by the City Controller's Bureau.

## Timeline and Design

### Community-Focused Violence Prevention and Intervention Services (Oakland Unite)

The proposer(s) will propose the evaluation design based on their expertise in what is most effective to provide the most useful data to local decision makers. The City will work with the selected contractor to determine the best metrics to evaluate for the design of each of the types of evaluations listed below. Not all programs can be evaluated in terms of recidivism, but if this metric is chosen for some program evaluation, please note that the City prefers the use of the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) definition. This definition can be found in the Definition section of this RFP. Additionally, the City prefers for an evaluator to use a Results-Based Accountability (RBA) structure if possible. The RBA definition is also in the Definitions section of this RFP.

As previously stated in this RFP, the City is interested in the following types of evaluation for the violence prevention/intervention programs:

1. Annual Program and Strategy level evaluation - this evaluation would investigate questions as stated in the “Required Elements for Oakland Unite Community-Focused Violence Prevention/Intervention Evaluation” subsection below. This evaluation would occur annually with no more than one (1) year worth of data evaluated each time. It would likely come in the form of a mid-year report for the program level evaluation and in the form of a report in the Fall time for the strategy level report.
- ~~2. Annual Strategy level evaluation—this evaluation would investigate questions as stated in the “Required Elements for Oakland Unite Community-Focused Violence Prevention/Intervention Evaluation” subsection below. This evaluation would occur annually with no more than one (1) year worth of data evaluated each time. It would likely come in the form of a Fall time of year report.~~
- ~~3.~~ 2. Comprehensive, larger study of key programs - this evaluation would be a longer evaluation, four (4) years in total. It would investigate questions as stated in the “Required Elements for Oakland Unite Community-Focused Violence Prevention / Intervention Evaluation” subsection below. This evaluation would evaluate a limited number of programs (selected by the City) and it will see if the programs are interrupting the cycle of violence and recidivism. This study would occur over the course of 4 years. The proposer should provide a proposed design which would optimize this timeframe to provide the best study possible with the resources provided.

Proposers can bid on either: (1) only the annual evaluations (for program ~~level~~ and strategy level evaluations), (2) only on the comprehensive evaluation, or (3) on both of these evaluation types. The City would prefer a different evaluator for each study, however, is willing to review proposals which include both evaluations in the proposed scope. The specific evaluation design will slightly vary for each evaluation; particularly around the metric used for the evaluation. The City will work with the selected contractor to develop report timeframes to coincide with the

## Measure Z 2015-2020 Evaluation Services Scope of Services

milestone timeline attached in (*Attachment E*). The City would benefit from two (2) reports per year.

### Geographic Policing Services

The contractor(s) will propose the evaluation design based on their expertise in what is most effective to provide the most useful data to local decision makers. The City will work with the contractor to determine the best metrics to evaluate for the design of each of the types of evaluations listed below. As previously stated in this RFP, the City is interested in the following types of evaluation for the geographic and community policing evaluation:

1. Geographic policing and crime reduction team evaluation - this evaluation would look at the Crime Reduction Teams (CRTs) in each of the five (5) police areas and investigate questions as stated in the “Required Elements for Geographic Policing and Community Policing Evaluation” subsection below. This evaluation will not address Ceasefire. This evaluation would occur annually with no more than one (1) year worth of data evaluated each time.
2. Community policing services evaluation - this evaluation would look at the Community Resource Officers (CROs) throughout the city and investigate questions as stated in the “Required Elements for Geographic Policing and Community Policing Evaluation” subsection below. This evaluation would occur annually with no more than one (1) year worth of data evaluated each time.

The overall goal of the policing evaluation is to see if the policing services are meeting the goals and benchmarks set within Measure Z. The police evaluation should include community interviews about the officers and their interaction with the community. This evaluation should also make recommendations for changes which could be made to improve the programs.

### **Required Elements for Oakland Unite Community-Focused Violence Prevention / Intervention Evaluation**

To address the aforementioned purpose, the Measure Z Community-Focused Violence Prevention and Intervention Services evaluations must address the following questions to the extent possible given available data (this information is organized by the type of evaluation):

1. Program level evaluation (annual 1-year evaluations as a mid-year report) -
  - Are the programs and strategies serving those at highest risk?
  - How are the identified highest risk participants served?
  - Did programs meet all of their deliverables and provide the service in the way they stated they would?
  - What is the actual acceptance rate of new clients versus those referred to and applied to the program but was not accepted? (this investigates beyond the VOC form).
  - What are the program outcome goals and are they measurable? (were the target levels of performance met)?

## Measure Z 2015-2020 Evaluation Services Scope of Services

- What are the strengths and challenges of those served?
- How did programs support/develop client strengths and address client challenges?
- Are the programs ~~assessing~~ progressing towards desired outcomes?
- Measurement of client satisfaction and engagement. Conduct exit surveys to assess if clients have advanced in some way (resume development, housing attainment, relationship building, etc.).
- What are client retention levels?
- How are the families of the clients engaged/integrated into the client's program?
- What are the opportunities to strengthen and increase client involvement and satisfaction?
- What additional supports do programs need to be successful?
- If possible, client tracking across programs: how many programs are touching the same targeted individuals?
- How are programs helping clients transition out of intensive support programs? (Achieving self-determination and self-sufficiency)

### 2. Strategy level evaluation (annual 1-year evaluations as a report which comes out every Fall) -

This will be a random sampling of a few programs within different strategies or it will be an evaluation of some or all programs within a randomly selected strategy. Elements will include:

- What program activities lead to the best high risk young adult outcomes? The evaluator should address promising practices that might be replicated at other sites, as well as problematic practices that should be addressed.
- How could Measure Z funds be allocated more efficiently to reduce crime and violence? Is there too much of an investment in strategies that are relatively expensive for a relatively small outcome?
- Are community-focused violence prevention / intervention programs remaining comparable to national best practice models?
- Did programs and strategies align with the guiding principles and essential service elements approved by SSOC and City Council for Measure Z resource allocation and outlined in the RFP?
- Using the Guiding Principles and Essential Service Elements into potential evaluation questions.
- Organizational support: staff training, turnover, continuity of case managers for clients, etc.

### 3. Comprehensive, larger study of key programs (4-year evaluation) -

Consider looking at one program year and then following the clients for some years thereafter. In this study, the evaluator should pick approximately 4-5 programs to study. The required elements include:

- To what extent have Measure Z programs decreased violence and crime in Oakland? To what extent can Measure Z Community-Focused Violence Prevention services be credited with decreases in shootings, assaults, or family violence? To what extent does



## Measure Z 2015-2020 Evaluation Services Scope of Services

Measure Z decrease truancy, recidivism, and other negative indicators among the general Oakland youth population?

- What has been the relative impact on violence between different programs and different strategies? The evaluation should provide a variable violence prevention / intervention gauge by which programs and strategies can be measured for assessing impact.
- Do Measure Z-funded programs show better results among some populations than among others?
- If the program was also funded by Measure Y, review how the program performance relates to the specific Measure Z objectives.

### Methodology Guidelines

The City strongly encourages proposers to integrate the following methodology guidelines wherever possible:

- Use measures of crime and violence reduction as primary metrics. Where it is possible to evaluate neighborhood or police beat overall crime and violence, this should take precedence over assessing individual participant behavioral changes alone.
- Use benchmarks related to results, rather than to program activities. If direct measurement of data on results is impossible, then the evaluation should lay out how other metrics can properly be used as proxies for the missing data.
- Make comparisons between Measure Z clients and comparable individuals from the general, underserved population either in Oakland or in a comparable city (quasi-experimental design). Data on program outcomes are more meaningful if they can be compared to what would have happened without a similar program intervention.

### **Required Elements for Geographic Policing and Community Policing Evaluation**

#### Annual Evaluation of Geographic and Community Policing Services

To address the purpose mentioned in the “Purpose” subsection, the annual Geographic and Community Policing Services evaluation must address the following questions to the extent possible given available data (this information is organized by the type of evaluation):

##### 1. Geographic policing and crime reduction team evaluation -

- How are Crime Reduction Team (CRT) members chosen? How does OPD train CRT officers for their work?
- What work are the CRTs performing and how is it determined and prioritized?
- What is the success rate of the CRTs projects? Are some CRTs doing a better job than others in implementing violence reduction efforts?
- How do CRTs compare to national best practice standards?
- How do Area-based CRTS interact with the Ceasefire strategy CRT teams?
- How much does interdepartmental collaboration affect the CRT and CRO project outcomes? Does that affect the violence reduction outcomes?
- How does the CRT model compare to national targeted, crime reduction team models?

## Measure Z 2015-2020 Evaluation Services Scope of Services

### 2. Community policing services evaluation –

- How successful has the community policing program been at reducing violent crime? Increasing public trust of the police department? Can the information in the community policing database (SARAnet) be linked to decreases in violent crime or other improved community outcomes?
- Are the Community Resource Officers (CROs) implementing the SARA problem solving model in alignment with recognized best practices? If not the SARA model, what model is being used?
- Can the SARAnet database be used to draw conclusions about: A) whether there is a link between quality beat project completion to crime and violence reductions; and B) whether some beats/CROs are doing a better job than others of implementing a quality community policing model?
- To what degree do CRO activities reduce violent crime? What proportion of CRO time or project volume is spent on quality of life issues? Does addressing quality of life issues reduce violent crime?
- How much time are CROs spending on their beats compared to other OPD duties? What proportion of CRO time is spent in on neighborhood projects versus general presence in the neighborhood? If the average CRO spends over 40 percent of their time doing non-area-specific work, what does that mean?
- Does the performance of Measure Z-funded CROs differ from CROs funded from other funding sources?
- How do CROs under Measure Z differ from PSOs under Measure Y?
- How is the community policing program holding to national best practice models?

### Methodology Guidelines

The City strongly encourages proposers to integrate the following methodology guidelines wherever possible:

- Use measurable metrics for evaluating officer (CRO) activity.
- Use measurable metrics for evaluating CRT activity
- Factor in the results of each the CRO and CRT activities in addition to simply tracking their schedules.
- Interview and or survey the community about police interactions related to community policing.

### Definitions

- Recidivism: A subsequent criminal adjudication/conviction while on probation supervision. (source: CPOC)
- Results-based Accountability: implies that expected results (also known as goals) are clearly articulated, and that data are regularly collected and reported to address questions of whether results have been achieved. (source: Harvard Family Research Project).
- Highest risk: ...

## Measure Z 2015-2020 Evaluation Services Scope of Services

- [Constitutional policing: ...](#)
- [Cultural competency: ...](#)
- [VOC: ...](#)

Handout provided at the Special Meeting of the SSOC on Monday, April 18, 2016

## Potential Changes for SSOC RFP:

### Recommendations by *Make Oakland Better Now!* (presented by Paula Hawthorn):

*[See section 1. Program level evaluation (annual 1-year evaluations as a mid-year report)]*

1. *Current Text:* Are the programs and strategies serving those at highest risk?

*Change to read:*

*Are the programs and strategies serving those at highest risk with good readiness?*

- *Identify measures of readiness (e.g., current educational equivalency, history of emotional issues, drug dependence etc.)*
- *Identify factors used to define level of risk. (Are factors predictive?)*

2. *Current Text:* What are the strengths and challenges of those served?

*Change to read:*

*Breaking out clients into cohorts of risk and readiness (e.g., High Risk w/ High readiness, Low Risk w/ Low readiness, what are the strengths and challenges of those served, and how are those strengths and challenges determined?*

3. *Current Text:* Are the programs progressing towards desired outcomes?

*Change to read:*

*Propose and provide metrics of a client's progress towards desired outcomes. Compare clients' progress metrics: against pre-program and versus a viable "comparison" group not receiving services*

4. *Current Text:* What are client retention levels?

*Change to read:*

*What are client retention levels? Does retention vary by risk/readiness cohort? Supply narratives of providers and clients on factors that end retention.*

5. *Current Text:* If possible, client tracking across programs: how many programs are touching the same targeted individuals?

*Change to read:*

*How did the program match services to client needs? Did cohort members receive similar service bundles? Which services were most commonly used? Least often used? How often are services combined? What are the most common combinations?*

6. *Current Text:* What additional supports do programs need to be successful?

*Change to read:*

*What additional specific supports do programs need to be successful and how would the program need to be restructured to maximize impact?*

7. On page 6 of 9, current text: Measurement of client satisfaction and engagement. Conduct exit surveys to assess if clients have advanced in some way (resume development, housing attainment, relationship building, etc.)

*Change to read:* Measurement of client satisfaction and engagement. Conduct exit surveys to assess if clients have advanced in the areas addressed in the program.

8. On page 6 of 9, Item #2, current text:

- Did programs and strategies align with the guiding principles and essential service elements approved by SSOC and City Council for Measure Z resource allocation and outlined in the RFP?
- Using the Guiding Principles and Essential Service Elements into potential evaluation questions.

*Change to read:*

- Did programs and strategies align with the guiding principles and essential service elements approved by SSOC and City Council for Measure Z resource allocation and outlined in the RFP?
- ~~Using the Guiding Principles and Essential Service Elements into potential evaluation questions.~~

### **Recommendations by Staff:**

On pages 8 of 9 and 9 of 9, fill in the missing definitions with the information below:

**Highest risk:** Cohorts of youth and young adults who are 1) Directly impacted by violence, and/or 2) Most likely to be involved in perpetuating violence.

(Taken from HSD definition from supplemental report)

**Constitutional policing:** Promote community policing and crime reduction, but also advance the broad constitutional goals of protecting everyone's civil liberties and providing equal protection under the law.

(Taken from: Constitutional Policing as a Cornerstone of Community Policing – April 2015)

**Cultural Competency:** A set of congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency, or among professionals that enables effective work in cross-cultural situations.

(Taken from HRSA website)

**VOC or Victims of Crime:** This is a benefits application for victims of crime. It is managed through California Victim Compensation Program which is a program of the Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board. More information available online at:

[http://www.vcgcb.ca.gov/docs/forms/victims/apps/victimcompensationapp\\_eng.pdf](http://www.vcgcb.ca.gov/docs/forms/victims/apps/victimcompensationapp_eng.pdf)

**Recidivism:** consider including 'parole' as part of the definition.



150 FRANK OGAWA PLAZA • 4<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR • OAKLAND, CA 94612 • 510-238-3121

## Memorandum

**TO:** Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Oversight Commission (SSOC)

**FROM:** Peter Kim, Manager, Oakland Unite, Human Services Department

**DATE:** April 15, 2016

**SUBJECT:** Overview of Request for Qualifications (RFQ) regarding *Professional Services to Provide Consulting, Planning and Implementation Support to Oakland Unite Violence Prevention and Intervention Strategies*

**Purpose:** Oakland Unite staff will provide an overview of the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for training and technical assistance that was issued on April 8, 2016 for discussion and feedback from Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Oversight Commission (SSOC) members.

**History:** In May and June of 2015, SSOC and City Council approved the Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act (Measure Z) spending plan for Fiscal Years 2016-2018. The approved spending plan included the use of funds to provide training and support to Measure Z violence prevention/intervention grantees.

**Status:** The City has issued a RFQ to identify a list of qualified agencies, firms, project teams or individual candidates who can complete tasks in two service categories:

- 1) Planning and Implementing Employer and Training Partner Engagement Strategies to Enhance Hiring of Oakland Unite Participants; and
- 2) Providing Professional Consultant Services for Oakland Unite Provider Network Skills and Capacity Building.

Oakland Unite seeks entities with demonstrated capacity to plan and implement the requested professional services and activities described in detail in the RFQ. Selected consulting agencies or individuals will act as partners to increase the effectiveness of the City's network of violence prevention and intervention service providers to serve high-risk clients. Services are sought for the July 2016 through June 2018 funding cycle.

**Review Process:** For each service category, three to four reviewers will evaluate proposals for the employer engagement and training and support services submitted by the due date. Instructions on how to review the applications will be given during a phone orientation. Individual reviewers will score the proposals, and top ranked bidders will be interviewed in order to finalize selection.

### RFQ Key Dates

- RFQ released Friday, April 8, 2016
- Available online: <http://oaklandunite.org/grantee-corner/funding-opportunities>
- Bidders' Conference will be held on Thursday, April 21, 2016, from 9:00 – 10:30 a.m.
- Completed Proposals will be due Thursday, May 5, 2016

**Attachment:** A segment of the full RFQ, including the detailed Scope of Work, is attached for SSOC review.

PARTIAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ) – OAKLAND UNITE VIOLENCE PREVENTION

---

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION (RFQ)**

For

**Professional Services to Provide Consulting,  
Planning and Implementation Support to  
Oakland Unite Violence Prevention  
and Intervention Strategies**

- **PLEASE NOTE:** This brief segment of the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) was prepared for information purposes only. Any contractor interested in responding to the RFQ should read the full RFQ document available at <http://oaklandunite.org/grantee-corner/funding-opportunities>

**REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION SUMMARY**

This Request for Qualifications (RFQ) is being issued by the City of Oakland, Human Services Department.

1. **Service Category #1** Planning and Implementing Employer and Training Partner Engagement Strategies to Enhance Hiring of Oakland Unite Participants. Approximately \$100,000 is allocated annually for consulting services in Service Category #1.
2. **Service Category #2** Professional Consultant Services for Provider Network Skills and Capacity Building. Approximately \$250,000 is allocated annually for consulting services in Service Category #2.

This Request for Qualifications (RFQ) is being issued by the City of Oakland to identify qualified agencies, firms, project teams or individuals (contractor) and solicit statement of qualifications to provide consulting, planning, and implementation services in support of Oakland Unite violence prevention strategies for 2016/2018.

- This Request for Qualifications (RFQ) is intended to identify a list of qualified agencies, firms, project teams or individual candidates who can complete either tasks related to **Planning and Implementing Employer and Training Partner Engagement Strategies to Enhance Hiring of Oakland Unite Participants** (Service

Category #1) or provide **Professional Consultant Services for Provider Network Skills and Capacity Building** (Service Category #2) during the 2016-2018 period.

- Whether a proposal meets these qualifications and service requirements will be determined through a review and selection process. No proposer shall have any legal or equitable right or obligation to enter into a contract or to perform the work as a result of being selected.

The City of Oakland, Human Services Department, Policy and Planning Division/Oakland Unite intends to enter into two or more “as needed” contract purchase orders to provide the consulting, planning and program implementation services outlined below in the Scope of Services section.

**DEADLINE TO SUBMIT STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS IS MAY 5, 2016 AT 2:00 PM.**

WORK is **to be commenced in July 1, 2016 and to be completed by June 30, 2017.**

**Funding:** Funds for this solicitation may be renewable annually through June 30, 2018, depending on the availability of funds (through various Federal, State, private and local grants or other available funding), successful performance of contract obligations, and compliance with City of Oakland mandates. Annual funding may increase or decrease depending on availability of funding.

**Local/Small Local Business Requirement:** 50% L/SLBE participation.

**Contract Terms:** One (1) year, renewable annually for up to one (1) additional year for a total of two (2) years.

**Pre-Proposal Meeting (strongly recommended):** 9:00 AM to 10:30 AM, Thursday, April 21, 2016, Conference Room 1, 2nd Floor, 150 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Oakland, CA 94612. Topics to be discussed at this meeting include scope of services, proposal requirements, compliance with applicable programs, and mandatory registration in “iSupplier”. For iSupplier registration, go to:

<http://www2.oaklandnet.com/Government/o/CityAdministration/d/CP/index.htm>.

**Deadline for Questions:** 2:00 PM, Friday, April 29, 2016 by email to [iwarner@oaklandnet.com](mailto:iwarner@oaklandnet.com). Questions by phone or in person will not be taken. It is the Consultant’s responsibility to ensure that the email has been received. Questions and Answers from the Pre-Proposal Meeting and for any questions received before the deadline will be posted on the website at <http://oaklandunite.org> on a rolling basis.

**Statement of Qualifications Due:** 2:00 PM, Thursday, May 5, 2016 (6 hard copies). Statements of Qualifications not received by the HSD Reception Desk, 150 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza, Suite 4340, Oakland, CA 94612 by the deadline will be returned unopened.



**Contact Information:** The following City staff is available to answer questions regarding this RFQ.

1. Project Manager: Jessie Warner at [jwarner@oaklandnet.com](mailto:jwarner@oaklandnet.com) or (510) 238-6875
2. Contract Compliance Officer: Vivian Inman at [vinman@oaklandnet.com](mailto:vinman@oaklandnet.com) or (510) 238-6261

- a) The City anticipates the **tentative schedule** of events to be as follows:
- Distribution of RFQ Friday, April 8, 2016
  - Pre-proposal Meeting 9:00 AM, April 21, 2016
  - Submission of Questions Deadline 2:00 PM, April 29, 2016
  - Submission of RFQ 2:00 PM, May 5, 2016
  - Evaluation of Rankings Week of May 9th
  - Notification of Interviews Week of May 9th
  - Interviews Week of May 16<sup>th</sup>
  - Public Safety Committee June 28, 2016
  - City Council Approval July 5, 2016
  - Contract Award July 2016

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **A. Overview**

The City of Oakland Human Services Department (HSD) is pleased to release the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the July 2016 through June 2018 funding cycle. Oakland Unite, a unit of HSD, administers violence intervention and prevention services funded under Measure Z, as well as other funding dedicated to similar violence prevention goals. Oakland Unite strategies were informed through a strategic planning process and are designed to achieve the goals of the Measure Z legislation. More information about Oakland Unite strategies and funded providers is available at <http://oaklandunite.org/>

The City is seeking qualified agencies or individuals to provide services that will support the City’s violence intervention efforts for youth and young adults at highest risk for involvement in violence. Oakland City Council intends to award funds to entities with demonstrated capacity to plan and implement the requested professional services and activities. Selected consulting agencies or individuals will act as partners to increase the effectiveness of the City’s network of violence prevention and intervention service providers to serve high-risk clients.

*Grant Term:* The contract term for selected proposals is twelve-months, from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017. Oakland Unite may renew grants for an additional one-year period, depending on performance, availability of funds, and City Council approval.

*Funding Amount:* Oakland Unite plans to award an estimated \$350,000 for work performed in two service categories from June 2016 through June 2017. The actual amount available for allocation is subject to change.

***The projects described in this RFQ are broken down into two Service Categories. The City intends to fund one entity for Service Category #1 (Planning and Implementing Employer and Training Partner Engagement Strategies to Enhance Hiring of Oakland Unite Participants) and one entity in Category #2 (Professional Consultant Services for Provider Network Skills and Capacity Building).***

**II. SCOPE OF SERVICES**

The scope of services below consists of two primary areas of focus:

**Service Category #1** Planning and Implementing Employer and Training Partner Engagement Strategies to Enhance Hiring of Oakland Unite Participants

**Service Category #2** Professional Consultant Services for Provider Network Skills and Capacity Building

The City intends to fund one entity for Service Category #1 (Planning and Implementing Employer and Training Partner Engagement Strategies to Enhance Hiring of Oakland Unite Participants) and one entity in Service Category #2 (Professional Consultant Services for Provider Network Skills and Capacity Building).

Collaborative project teams are encouraged. Contractor to estimate the hours required to complete the tasks outlined in each Service Category and to provide a quotation of the hourly rate of compensation. The specific purpose of the agreement and deliverables are for:

<b>Service Category #1: Planning and Implementing Employer and Training Partner Engagement Strategies to Enhance Hiring of Oakland Unite Participants</b>	Estimated hours: _____ Hourly rate: _____
---	--

Plan and implement a strategy to increase employer and training partner engagement with program-involved partners to increase sustainable employment opportunities and job placements for Oakland Unite participants. Respondents should acknowledge the ways in which the current workforce models can be improved to serve people who are often low-skilled and disconnected from work particularly those at highest risk of violence, including formerly incarcerated and justice system-involved residents, and propose best practices in employer engagement that could be deployed.

Respondents should demonstrate the following in the Statement of Qualifications:

- Comprehensive knowledge of incentives for hiring people with criminal records (Work Opportunity Tax Credit, Enterprise Zones, etc.)
- Knowledge of funding available as training/supportive services such as on-the-job training (OJT)
- Knowledge of local landscape including experience working with employers, business associations, unions, industry associations, training providers and other employment providers to enhance pathways to employment for hard to employ individuals
- Experience working with groups of employers that may be organized by industry, geography and/or involved in broad based business associations

Activities could include designing and implementing models that facilitate:

- Partnerships with large, local employers, including the City of Oakland and Alameda County, to streamline hiring of appropriate Oakland Unite participants
- Connection to career pathways through partnerships with education and training partners that could include a tiered retention strategy
- Connection to labor unions and other apprenticeship programs
- Efforts to utilize City of Oakland policies, resources and reputation to encourage hiring of people with criminal records
- Work, on an as needed basis, cooperatively with providers to improve their ability to provide job ready candidates for job openings, training opportunities and career pathways

**Please note:** Oakland Unite is not seeking a job developer. Instead this role will engage employers and training providers at a sector or association level (E.g. business associations, unions, etc.) and will connect employers with Oakland Unite employment providers.

<p><b>Service Category #2: Professional Consultant Services for Provider Network Skills and Capacity Building</b></p>	<p>Estimated hours: _____ Hourly rate: _____</p>
---	--

Plan and coordinate comprehensive training and technical assistance efforts for Oakland Unite providers, including oversight of process and contracting with training providers. Respondent will work closely with HSD-Oakland Unite staff to develop a comprehensive training and technical assistance implementation plan that may include some or all of the training topics listed below.

The list of potential training and technical assistance topics included in this RFQ resulted from suggestions from and a survey of Oakland Unite providers. The list of topics is not

exhaustive, and is included in order to provide respondents with a sense of the type and range of topics that are of interest.

The contractor will provide project management, coordination and administer contractual/payment agreements for actual training and technical assistance provided to the Oakland Unite network. In addition to working with Oakland Unite staff to allocate and administer funds to outside training partners, the respondent may also propose to deliver trainings or technical assistance on designated topics in demonstrated areas of expertise.

Training and technical assistance may be provided in different formats, such as (1) group presentation(s) or workshop(s) that provide an introduction to specific topics; (2) in-depth technical assistance to selected providers wishing to establish specific practices into their program; and/or (3) delivering a specific curriculum or training program (e.g. Motivational Interviewing).

Oakland Unite expects that large group trainings will include 80 to 100 participants. For any in-depth technical assistance targeted directly to providers, respondents should plan to serve 3 to 5 provider agencies that will be selected in collaboration with Oakland Unite staff and the community-based provider agencies.

Oakland Unite intends to prioritize intensive training and technical assistance relationships with community-based providers that can be sustained over time. Oakland Unite will work with the selected contractor to choose which topics and delivery mechanisms to prioritize. Respondents should also include funds for other training and technical assistance support in their bids, such as learning trips for providers to other municipalities, purchase of materials or curriculum for providers, provider registration at conferences, etc.

In the Statement of Qualifications, respondents should demonstrate familiarity with some or all of the violence intervention strategies employed by Oakland Unite, as well as the ability to provide project management across multiple partners to accomplish a complex project with similar activities and goals.

**Please Note:** Due to the fiscal oversight required in this Service Category, respondents will be required to submit audited financial statements or equivalent documentation for evaluation by City of Oakland staff before contract award.

**Potential training and technical assistance topics include:**

- **Building Organizational Capacity of Oakland Unite Providers.** Areas of focus may include, but are not limited to, non-profit financial management/practices, budget

and sustainability, leadership development, building and maintaining a strong board of directors, using data-driven approaches to demonstrate impact and tell a story.

- **Trauma-informed Practices.** Training and/or technical assistance on incorporating Trauma-informed practices into program delivery.
- **Motivational Interviewing.** Training and/or technical assistance on use of Motivational Interviewing techniques with program participants.
- **Behavior Change Interventions.** Training and/or technical assistance on behavior change interventions, best practices and evidence-based behavioral change including, but not limited to cognitive-based interventions.
- **Restorative Justice Practices.** Training and/or technical assistance on incorporating Restorative Justice practices into program delivery.
- **Boys and Men of Color Frameworks.** Training and/or technical assistance on incorporating Boys and Men of Color-informed practices into program delivery.
- **Science and Practice of Risk Needs Assessments.** Training and/or technical assistance on evidence-based and best practices in the development and use of criminogenic Risk and Needs Assessment tools including, but not limited to those utilized for community supervision such as Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (COMPAS).
- **Promoting Staff Wellness and Self-Care.** Training and/or technical assistance on the best practices to promote staff wellness and self-care strategies that include, but are not limited to, addressing vicarious trauma and avoiding burnout.
- **Conflict Mediation.** Training and/or technical assistance on incorporating conflict mediation tools and techniques into program delivery.
- **Family Engagement Strategies.** Training and/or technical assistance on engaging family members in programmatic efforts.
- **Promoting Job Readiness and Employer Engagement Strategies.** Training and/or technical assistance on preparing participants for employment as well as engaging employers and training partners to enhance hiring.
- **Role of Community Engagement in Systems Reform.** Training and/or technical assistance on enhancing community engagement response in systems reform including using use and understanding of data and budget processes.

**PARTIAL REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ) – OAKLAND UNITE VIOLENCE PREVENTION**

---

- **Intensive Case Management Approaches.** Training and/or technical assistance on best practices in providing intensive case management including, but not limited to, assessing needs, developing case plans, and documenting progress/case notes.

-----End of Section -----

- **PLEASE NOTE:** This brief segment of the RFQ was prepared for information purposes only. Any contractor interested in responding to the RFQ should read the full RFQ document available at <http://oaklandunite.org/grantee-corner/funding-opportunities>