AB 109 Management of a Network of System of Services, RFP #2111-518

APPLICANT

Name: Felton Institute

Program elements (maximum score of 100)					TOTAL POINTS	
I. Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
II.1. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-25)	19.5	18	18	20		18.9
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (5)	4	4	4	4	4	
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (5)	4	3	3	4	3.5	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? (5)	3.5	3	3	4	3.4	
4. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (5)	4	4	4	4	4	
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (5)	4	4	4	4	4	
II.2. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10)	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.5		6.5
1. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry Services delivery model? (5)	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	3	3	3	3	3	
III.3 Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates capacity to deliver services. (0-25)	21	18	21	20		20.1
1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (5)	4	4	4	4	4	
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (5)	4	3	4	4	3.8	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5)	4	4	4	4	4	
4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (5)	4	3	4	4	3.8	
5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (5)	5	4	5	4	4.5	
II.5 Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-30)	24	24	24	24		24.1
1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (6)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (6)	5	5	5	4	4.8	
3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6)	4	4	4	5	4.3	
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (6)	4	4	4	4	4	
5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6)	6	6	6	6	6	
II.6 Budget (0-10)	9.5	9	9	9.5		9.3
1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5)	5	4.5	4.5	5	4.8	
2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5)	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	
TOTAL SCORE	**80.5**	**75.5**	**78.5**	**80**		**78.9**
Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. • To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)	0	0	0	0		
IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
V. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VI. Timeline (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VII. Additional Supporting Documentation (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

REVIEWER COMMENTS: Please identify any strengths and weaknesses in the application as well as any outstanding questions you may have relating to the content of the proposal that may impact your scoring.

AB 109 Management of a Network of System of Services, RFP #2111-518

APPLICANT

          Name: HealthRIGHT 360

Program elements (maximum score of 100)					TOTAL POINTS	
I. Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
II.1. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-25)	24	23	23.5	23.5		23.55
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
4. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (5)	4	3	4	4	3.8	
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (5)	5	5	4.5	4.5	4.75	
II.2. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10)	10	10	10	10		10
1. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry Services delivery model? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
III.3 Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates capacity to deliver services. (0-25)	25	25	25	25		25
1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
II.5 Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-30)	26	26	25	26		25.8
1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (6)	6	6	6	6	6	
2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (6)	5	5	5	5	5	
3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6)	6	6	6	6	6	
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (6)	4	4	3	4	3.8	
5. To what extent does the organization have the <u>technical</u> capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6)	5	5	5	5	5	
II.6 Budget (0-10)	9	9	9	10		9.3
1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5)	4	4	4	5	4.3	
TOTAL SCORE	**94**	**93**	**92.5**	**94.5**		**93.65**
Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. • To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**		
IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
V. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VI. Timeline (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VII. Additional Supporting Documentation (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

REVIEWER COMMENTS: Please identify any strengths and weaknesses in the application as well as any outstanding questions you may have relating to the content of the proposal that may impact your scoring.

AB 109 Evidence-Based Reentry Employment, RFP #2111-522

APPLICANT

Name: Goodwill

Program elements (maximum score of 100)				GROUP TOTAL POINTS	
I. Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
II.1. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-20)	17	17	17	17	
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (4)	4	4	4	4	
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (4)	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? (4)	3	3	3	3	
4. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (4)	3	3	3	3	
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (4)	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	
II.2. Evidence-Based Program: Demonstration of Evidence (0-20)	16	14.5	17	15.9	
1. To what extent does the research base confirm the effectiveness of the proposed services? (7)	5.5	5.5	6	5.7	
2. Is assessment of program implementation to fidelity clearly documented? (7)	5.5	5	6	5.5	
3. Are any adaptations to the research evidence clearly described and limited to low-risk adaptations? (6)	5	4	5	4.7	
II.3. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10)	10	10	10	10	
1. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry Services delivery model? (5)	5	5	5	5	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	
II.4 Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates capacity to deliver services. (0-20)	19.5	19.5	20	19.7	
1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (4)	3.5	3.5	4	3.7	
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (4)	4	4	4	4	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (4)	4	4	4	4	

4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (4)	4	4	4	4	
5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (4)	4	4	4	4	
II.5 Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-25)	**22**	**21.5**	**22**		**21.8**
1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (5)	5	5	5	5	
2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (5)	4	4	4	4	
3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (5)	4	4	4	4	
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (5)	4	3.5	4	3.8	
5. To what extent does the organization have the <u>technical</u> capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (5)	5	5	5	5	
II.6 Budget (0-5)	**4**	**4**	**4**		**4**
1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5)	4	4	4	4	
TOTAL SCORE	**88.5**	**86.5**	**90**		**88.4**
Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. • To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)		0			
IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
V. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VI. Timeline (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VII. Additional Supporting Documentation (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

REVIEWER COMMENTS: Please identify any strengths and weaknesses in the application as well as any outstanding questions you may have relating to

AB 109 Evidence-Based Reentry Employment, RFP #2111-522

APPLICANT

Name: LFCD

Program elements (maximum score of 100)				GROUP TOTAL POINTS	
I. Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
II.1. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-20)	15	14.5	15		14.8
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (4)	4	4	4	4	
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (4)	3	3	3	3	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? (4)	3	2.5	3	2.8	
4. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (4)	2	2	2	2	
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (4)	3	3	3	3	
II.2. Evidence-Based Program: Demonstration of Evidence (0-20)	9.5	9.5	9.5		9.5
1. To what extent does the research base confirm the effectiveness of the proposed services? (7)	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	
2. Is assessment of program implementation to fidelity clearly documented? (7)	3	3	3	3	
3. Are any adaptations to the research evidence clearly described and limited to low-risk adaptations? (6)	3	3	3	3	
II.3. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10)	4.5	2.5	4.5		3.9
1. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry Services delivery model? (5)	3	2	3	2.7	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	1.5	0.5	1.5	1.2	
II.4 Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates capacity to deliver services. (0-20)	16	16	16.5		16.1
1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (4)	3	3	3	3	
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (4)	3	3.5	3.5	3.3	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (4)	3	3	3	3	
4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (4)	3	2.5	3	2.8	
5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (4)	4	4	4	4	
II.5 Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-25)	16	11.5	14.5		14
1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (5)	4	3	4	3.7	
2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (5)	3	2.5	3	2.8	
3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (5)	3	2	3	2.7	
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (5)	2	1	1	1.3	
5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (5)	4	3	3.5	3.5	
II.6 Budget (0-5)	3.5	3	3.5		3.3
1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5)	3.5	3	3.5	3.3	
TOTAL SCORE	**64.5**	**57**	**63.5**		**61.6**
Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. • To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)	0	0	0	0	
IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
V. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VI. Timeline (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VII. Additional Supporting Documentation (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

AB 109 Evidence-Based Reentry Employment, RFP #2111-522

APPLICANT

Name: Rubicon Programs

Program elements (maximum score of 100)				GROUP TOTAL POINTS	
I. Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
II.1. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-20)	19	20	20	19.7	
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (4)	4	4	4	4	
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (4)	4	4	4	4	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? (4)	3	4	4	3.7	
4. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (4)	4	4	4	4	
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (4)	4	4	4	4	
II.2. Evidence-Based Program: Demonstration of Evidence (0-20)	18.5	18.5	18.5	18.5	
1. To what extent does the research base confirm the effectiveness of the proposed services? (7)	6	6	6	6	
2. Is assessment of program implementation to fidelity clearly documented? (7)	7	7	7	7	
3. Are any adaptations to the research evidence clearly described and limited to low-risk adaptations? (6)	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	
II.3. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10)	10	10	10	10	
1. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry Services delivery model? (5)	5	5	5	5	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	
II.4 Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates capacity to deliver services. (0-20)	20	20	20	20	
1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (4)	4	4	4	4	
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (4)	4	4	4	4	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (4)	4	4	4	4	
4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (4)	4	4	4	4	
5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (4)	4	4	4	4	
II.5 Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-25)	25	24	25	24.7	
1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (5)	5	5	5	5	
2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (5)	5	4	5	4.7	
3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (5)	5	5	5	5	
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (5)	5	5	5	5	
5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (5)	5	5	5	5	
II.6 Budget (0-5)	5	5	5	0	
1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5)	5	5	5	5	
TOTAL SCORE	**97.5**	**97.5**	**98.5**		**92.9**
Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. • To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)	5	5	5		**97.5**
IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
V. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VI. Timeline (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VII. Additional Supporting Documentation (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

AB 109 Family Reunification, Mentoring and Civil Legal Aid, RFP #2111-521

APPLICANT

Name: Bay Area Legal Aid (Civil Legal Services)

Program elements (maximum score of 100)					TOTAL POINTS	
Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
I. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-25)	25	25	25	25		25
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
4. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
II. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10)	10	10	10	10		10
1. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry Services delivery model? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
III. Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates capacity to deliver services. (0-25)	23	25	24	22		23.5
1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (4)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (4)	5	5	5	5	5	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5)	3	5	4	2	3.5	
4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
IV. Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-30)	30	29	29	29		29.25
1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (6)	6	6	6	6	6	
2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (6)	6	6	6	6	6	
3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6)	6	6	6	6	6	
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (6)	6	6	6	6	6	
5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6)	6	5	5	5	5.25	
V. Budget (0-10)	10	10	10	10		10
1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
TOTAL SCORE	98	99	98	96	97.75	100.68
Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. • To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)	3	3	3	3	3%	
IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
V. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VI. Timeline (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VII. Additional Supporting Documentation (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

NOTES: Please speak to any strengths and weaknesses that you identify in the application as well as any specific questions that you would like to ask the respondent surrounding the proposal.

AB 109 Family Reunification, Mentoring and Civil Legal Aid, RFP #2111-521

APPLICANT

Name: Men and Women of Purpose (Mentoring)

Program elements (maximum score of 100)					TOTAL POINTS	
Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
I. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-25)	25	25	25	25		25
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
4. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
II. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10)	10	10	10	9		9.75
1. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry Services delivery model? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	4	4.75	
III. Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates capacity to deliver services. (0-25)	25	25	25	22		24.25
1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (5)	5	5	5	4	4.75	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5)	5	5	5	4	4.75	
4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (5)	5	5	5	4	4.75	
5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
IV. Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-30)	30	30	30	24		28.5
1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (6)	6	6	6	5	5.75	
2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (6)	6	6	6	5	5.75	
3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6)	6	6	6	5	5.75	
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (6)	6	6	6	4	5.5	
5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6)	6	6	6	5	5.75	
V. Budget (0-10)	10	10	10	7		9.25
1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5)	5	5	5	3	4.5	
2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5)	5	5	5	4	4.75	
TOTAL SCORE	100	100	100	87	96.75	100.378125
Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. • To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)	5	5	5	0	4%	3.75
IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
V. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VI. Timeline (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VII. Additional Supporting Documentation (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

NOTES: Please speak to any strengths and weaknesses that you identify in the application as well as any specific questions that you would like to ask the respondent surrounding the proposal.

AB 109 Family Reunification, Mentoring and Civil Legal Aid, RFP #2111-521

APPLICANT

Name: Centerforce (Family Reunification)

Program elements (maximum score of 100)					TOTAL POINTS	
Response Cover Statement (Form #1) & Table of Contents (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
I. Service Description: The extent to which the program services description aligns to the logic model and describes the measurable: inputs, services and activities; process and performance measures and outputs; and short, medium and long-term outcomes. (0-25)	23	25	25	25		24.5
1. Are services and activities quantified and clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Are the proposed services responsive to the target population? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
3. Are the program implementation and performance outcome measures appropriate to determine the impact of the program? (5)	4	5	5	5	4.75	
4. Are specific strategies for obtaining and maintaining client engagement clearly described? (5)	4	5	5	5	4.75	
5. Does the service description discuss how RNR factors will be addressed? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
II. Multi-Disciplinary Collaboration: Articulation between your organization's proposed services and the overall Reentry Services delivery model. (0-10)	10	10	10	10		10
1. To what extent do the proposed service(s) align and integrate with the County's Reentry Services delivery model? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Are strategies for interagency communications and coordination clearly described? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
III. Statement of Organizational Qualifications: The extent to which the applicant demonstrates capacity to deliver services. (0-25)	23	23	23	23		23
1. Does the applicant clearly describe a history of successful service delivery to high-risk individuals in the criminal justice population? (4)	5	5	5	5	5	
2. Does the applicant have a history of successful interagency collaboration with criminal justice and other social service providers? (4)	5	5	5	5	5	
3. Does the applicant indicate a history of local detention facility clearance? (5)	3	3	3	3	3	
4. What is the extent to which staff are qualified and adequately trained to provide effective reentry services as identified by staffing proficiencies? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
5. Does organizational leadership clearly demonstrate a commitment to and have a history of service deliver with the program scope of work? (5)	5	5	5	5	5	
IV. Performance Measures & Deliverables (0-30)	25	26	28	27		26.5
1. To what extent does the applicant detail existing data collection infrastructure, systems and processes to support the program? (6)	6	6	6	6	6	
2. To what extent does the applicant describe its plan for program performance evaluation and continual quality improvement? (6)	5	5	6	6	5.5	
3. How well does the program logic model convey the relationship between program requirements (inputs), the proposed activities (outputs), and the end results of the project (outcomes)? (6)	5	5	6	6	5.5	
4. How well does the applicant identify potential obstacles for tracking and reporting of performance measures and deliverables, and how those obstacles will be addressed and mitigated? (6)	4	4	4	4	4	
5. To what extent does the organization have the technical capacity to collect, track, analyze and report on outputs and outcome(s)? (6)	5	6	6	5	5.5	
V. Budget (0-10)	10	10	9	9		
1. The budget request and total budget is reasonable and is sufficient to achieve the proposed outcomes. (5)	5	5	5	4	4.75	
2. How well does the applicant describe how oversight of funds will be ensured to support the program, and detail how funds will not be used to supplant? (5)	5	5	4	5	4.75	
TOTAL SCORE	91	94	95	94	93.5	97.47
Preferential Points for Matching Resources: Existing or potential resources are provided to supplement funding. Points equaling up to 5% of the applicants total score will be added to the applicant's total score. The addition of these preferential points will make up the applicant's final score. • To what extent are matching resources identified that will expand capacity or continue services without duplicating existing efforts? (up to 5%)	4%	4%	5%	4%	4.25%	
IV. Organizational Chart (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
V. Résumés (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VI. Timeline (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
VII. Additional Supporting Documentation (required but not weighted)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

NOTES: Please speak to any strengths and weaknesses that you identify in the application as well as any specific questions that you would like to ask the respondent surrounding the proposal.