

SAFETY AND SERVICES OVERSIGHT COMMISSION MEETING

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

Monday, April 18, 2016

6:30-9:00 p.m.

Hearing Room 1

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 (Mayoral).

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. Coordinator's Announcements a) Retreat	5 Minutes	AD	
6. SSOC Evaluation RFP Scope Recommendation	30 Minutes	A	Attachment 1
7. Adjournment		A	

A = Action Item

I = Informational Item

AD = Administrative Item

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.

Date	Task
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 29th 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 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: ...](#)