

STATE OF NEW YORK

JUDICIARY

—REQUEST FOR BID/PROPOSAL—

APPENDIX B

(This is not an order)

BID MUST BE MADE ON THIS SHEET
OR AS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED

NEW YORK STATE
OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION
CONTRACT & PROCUREMENT ADMINISTRATION
42 KARNER ROAD, ALBANY, NY 12205

(Agency Name and Address)

Direct Inquiries to: BETTY FALTERMEIER,
SR. COURT ANALYST
Telephone No.: (518) 285-5011

Price to include delivery to (describe exact location and method of delivery)

PER ATTACHED RFP/SPECIFICATIONS

Bid/Proposal Number: OCA/CPA-329 Issue Date: 07/02/08	Commodity Group:
Opening Date: September 9, 2008 Time: 11:00 AM	Commodity Name: Community Dispute Resolution Centers

OFFICE OF GENERAL SERVICES "GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS" (DECEMBER 1998) ARE FULLY INCORPORATED HEREIN.

<p>Agency's Specification of item(s) Required (include quantities)</p> <p>UCS ATTACHMENT I, ATTACHMENT III AND ATTACHMENT IV ATTACHED & INCORPORATED HEREIN.</p> <p>THE UCS IS SEEKING PROPOSALS FOR THE OPERATION OF COMMUNITY DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTERS THROUGHOUT NYS.</p> <p>TERM: FEBRUARY 1, 2009 - MARCH 31, 2013</p>	<p>Bidder's Quotation and Specific Description of Item Offered</p> <p>BIDDERS ARE TO SUBMIT ALL REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION AND PRICING IN THE FORMAT PRESCRIBED BY THE ATTACHED RFP SPECIFICATIONS.</p>
---	---

NOTICE TO BIDDERS

Pursuant to the Rules and Regulations of the Chief Administrator for the Courts, sealed bids for furnishing the item(s) in this Request for Bid will be received at the above address. When submitting a bid, you must:

1. Complete this form in its entirety using ink or typewriter and return with all other documents.
2. Explain any deviations or qualifications if your bid deviates from the specifications. If necessary, attach a separate sheet setting forth such explanations.

3. Sign the bid. The bid must be completed in the name of the bidder (corporate or other) and must be fully and properly executed by an authorized person.

4. INDICATE THE BID NUMBER, THE BID OPENING DATE AND TIME ON THE ENVELOPE CONTAINING THE SEALED BID.

5. Mail the bid to the above agency address in sufficient time for it to be received before the specified bid opening. **LATE BIDS WILL BE REJECTED.**

BIDDER HEREBY CERTIFIES THAT THE ABOVE QUOTED (OR OTHERWISE NOTED) PRICES ARE APPLICABLE TO ALL CUSTOMERS FOR COMPARABLE QUANTITIES, QUALITY, STYLES OR SERVICES.

BIDS MUST BE SIGNED

Bidder's Firm Name:		Employer's Federal Identification Number	
Address Street	City	State	Zip
Bidder's Signature		Official Title	
Printed or Typed Copy of Signature		Area Code/Telephone Number: Email address:	

DOCUMENT ENCLOSURE CHECKLIST

Page 1

All of the following documents and information, must be **fully executed** as indicated (**Notarized where required**) and returned as specified. Failure to include **any** of the required documents, copies or information **may** result in rejection of the bidder's proposal.

- Document Enclosure Checklist
- Cover Letter. Must include written proof from the Attorney General Charity Registration that you have timely filed.
- Attachment I - UCS Standard Clauses
- Attachment III - Vendor Responsibility Questionnaire
 - Paper questionnaire
 - Questionnaire filed on line via OSC VendRep System (see NOTE, page 3 Checklist)
- Attachment IV - Lobby Law Legislation
- Request for Bid/Proposal Form with original blue ink signature of authorized representative. Must be completed for each proposed (Attached)
- Program Narrative - Proposers must complete the Narrative Questionnaire (Attached)
- Appendix C and C-1 - Completed budget worksheets (Attached)
- Appendix D - Audited Financial report (See specifications for itemization)
- Appendix E - References List of three (3) references including names and phone numbers of person having direct knowledge of bidder's performance. Each reference should indicate a description of the work performed for the reference organization.

DOCUMENT ENCLOSURE CHECKLIST

Page 2

Appendix F - Organizational strategic plan, resource development plan and mission statement. (See specifications for itemization)

Original and 10 copies of proposal response and all required paperwork. Original to be clearly indicated.

Note: All documents which require signatures must bear the original signature of the **same authorized individual** and signatory notarizations **must** be that of the person whose signature is affixed to required documents.

Name of Firm: _____ Date: _____

Authorized Signature: _____

Name in Print: _____ Title: _____

DOCUMENT ENCLOSURE CHECKLIST

Page 3

NOTE

ATTACHMENT III
STATE OF NEW YORK
UNIFIED COURT SYSTEM

VENDOR RESPONSIBILITY QUESTIONNAIRE: INSTRUCTIONS

(This page is **not** the Vendor Responsibility Questionnaire)

The NYS Unified Court System (UCS) is required to conduct a review of a prospective contractor to provide reasonable assurances that the vendor is responsible. The Vendor Responsibility Questionnaire, a required component of all UCS solicitations, is designed to provide information to assist UCS in assessing a vendor's responsibility prior to entering into a contract with the vendor. Vendor responsibility is determined by a review of each prospective contractor's legal authority to do business in New York State, business integrity, financial and organizational resources, and performance history (including references).

Vendors are invited to file the required Vendor Responsibility Questionnaire online via the New York State VendRep System or may choose to complete and submit a paper questionnaire. To enroll and use the New York State VendRep System, see the VendRep System Instructions available at www.osc.state.ny.us/vendrep or go directly to the VendRep System online at <https://portal.osc.state.ny.us>. For direct VendRep System user assistance, the OSC Help Desk may be reached at 866-370-4672 or 518-408-4672 or by email at helpdesk@osc.state.ny.us. Vendors opting to file a paper questionnaire can obtain the appropriate questionnaire from the VendRep website www.osc.state.ny.us/vendrep or may contact the Office of the State Comptroller or the Unified Court System at (518) 285-5011 for a hard copy of the paper form.

Vendors who elect to file the questionnaire online **must check the appropriate box on the Document Enclosure Checklist** and complete the information requested below. The signature is only an acknowledgment by the vendor that the questionnaire has been completed and certified directly on the Office of the State comptroller's VendRep system.

Sign below if the Vendor Responsibility Questionnaire was filed online via the OSC VendRep System:

Solicitation Number or Procurement Name: _____

Company Name: _____

Name and Title: _____

Signature : _____ Date: _____

Please include this page **or** the downloaded paper questionnaire with original blue ink signature with your bid response.

**RFB #OCA/CPA-329
COMMUNITY DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTERS
GENERAL SPECIFICATIONS**

**BID OPENING: 09/9/08
11:00 AM**

In addition to such other terms, conditions and provisions presented herein, the NYS Unified Court System Standard Request For Bid Clauses & Forms - Attachment I, Vendor Responsibility - Attachment III and UCS Attachment IV are incorporated herein.

Background:

In 1981, the State of New York enacted Article 21-A of the New York State Judiciary Law and created the Community Dispute Resolution Centers Program (CDRCP). This initiative provides community-based forums for the resolution of civil and minor criminal disputes through dispute resolution processes other than litigation. Pursuant to this legislation, the New York State Unified Court System, Office of Alternative Dispute Resolution and Court Improvement Programs, contracts with and provides funding to not-for-profit centers throughout the State that provide arbitration, conciliation and mediation services.

The Community Dispute Resolution Centers (CDRCs) serve several vital functions. First, the centers empower parties to play a greater role in deciding the procedural and substantive outcomes of their disputes that they might otherwise do in litigation. Second, the centers help courts streamline their dockets by providing dispute resolution services to those people who are able and willing to resolve their conflict without the assistance of a Judge. Third, the centers collaborate with other human services organizations in their communities and connect parties with available services and resources. Finally, centers serve as promoters of peaceful communities and help individuals become more effective communicators and negotiators, not only through direct delivery of services but also through ongoing training and community outreach efforts.

The Office of Alternative Dispute Resolution and Court Improvement Programs strongly encourages centers to employ volunteers for two primary reasons: first, an active volunteer pool often infuses the center with a level of enthusiasm and diversity of life experience that is seldom attainable solely with paid staff; second, use of volunteers allows paid staff to focus on outreach and case development, volunteer recruitment and management, and ongoing program monitoring.

Purpose & Scope:

It is the intent of this Request for Proposals (RFP) to award contracts for CDRCs in the counties listed in Attachment IV. On behalf of the Office of Alternative Dispute Resolution and Court Improvement Programs, the Office of Court Administration, Contract & Procurement Administration Unit (C&PA) is soliciting sealed proposals for the purpose of establishing one or more contracts to provide the services herein.

Proposal due date:

All proposals must be received **on or before 11:00 AM, September 9, 2008** to receive consideration.

Pre-Bid Conference:

A pre-bid video conference will be held on July 22, 2008 at 11:00 AM at the following locations:

Office of Court Administration
98 Niver Street
Cohoes, NY 12047
Contact: Mark Collins, (518) 238-4355

7th Judicial District Administrative Office
Hall of Justice
99 Exchange Blvd., Room 165
Rochester, NY 14614
Contact: Aggie Zicari, (585) 454-4242

All questions for the pre-bid conference must be provided **in writing** by close of business July 15, 2008.

Please notify Betty Faltermeier, bfalterm@courts.state.ny.us, Fax: (518) 869-4735 or Phone: (518) 285-5011, a **minimum** of two (2) business days in advance of planned attendance. While attendance is not mandatory, it is strongly recommended.

Questions

All questions must be addressed **in writing** only, by e-mail or by fax, to:

Betty Faltermeier
Senior Court Analyst
NYS Office of Court Administration
42 Karner Road
Albany, NY 12205
Fax: 518-869-4735 Email: Bfalterm@courts.state.ny.us

The **deadline** to submit questions is July 15, 2008 at 4:00 pm.. Questions may not be entertained after this deadline. Responses will be provided at the pre-bid conference. A Questions & Answers (Q&A), listing all the questions received with the responses will be posted on the UCS website at www.nycourts.gov/admin/bids.

A preliminary "Q&A" handout will be provided at the conference. Audio/video recording of the pre-bid conference and subsequent bid opening is permitted, **provided** a true and complete copy of the recording is delivered to OCA-CPA within 5 business days thereafter.

IMPORTANT: All questions regarding this solicitation must be directed solely to the attention of the above-designated person. Contact by any prospective bidder, or any representative thereof, with any other personnel of the UCS/OCA in connection with this RFB/RFP may violate the Procurement Lobbying Act (see Attachment IV), will jeopardize the respective bidder's standing and may cause rejection of its proposal.

Contract term:

The term of any awarded contract shall be for a period of four (4) years and two (2) months commencing **February 1, 2008 - March 31, 2013**. The UCS reserves the right to once extend any awarded contract for a period, not to exceed twelve (12) months, subject to the approval of the NYS Attorney General (hereinafter OAG) and the NYS Office of the State Comptroller (hereinafter OSC).

Method of Award:

Award shall be made to the responsible proposer who receives the highest point value by county until funding is exhausted as indicated in **Award Criteria**. Responsible shall be defined to include, but not be limited to, compliance with these specifications, references, bidder's performance history, financial stability, resources, cost factors and experience with comparable awards/contracts.

Paperwork:

Complete the paperwork on the forms provided with this solicitation unless otherwise specified herein. **Do not retype or amend any portion of this solicitation.** Failure to comply may result in disqualification of proposer's response.

Copies:

In addition to one (1) complete, original blue ink-signature proposal with all required appendices, bidders **must** include ten (10) complete copies of same. Failure to do so may result in rejection of proposal.

Please Note: Original may be bound or contained in a three ring binder, however all copies of the proposal should not be submitted in a three-ring binder, or in any other bound fashion. Please submit the copies bound only by rubber bands, staples, clips or similar devices.

Submission of Paperwork:

Proposals must be submitted on bidder's letterhead and be clearly marked, "**RFP# OCA/CPA-329**" in the top left or right of the first page. **Original signature proposals and all required copies must be contained in a sealed envelope or carton and the statement clearly marked on the exterior, "SEALED PROPOSAL DELIVER IMMEDIATELY - DO NOT OPEN. RFP#OCA/CPA-329 DUE DATE 11:00 AM September 9, 2008"**.

Implied Requirements:

Products and services that are not specifically requested in the RFP, but which are necessary to provide the functional capabilities proposed by the bidder, shall be included in the offer.

Silence of the Specifications:

The apparent silence of the specifications contained as a part of this package as to any detail or to the apparent omission of a detailed description concerning any point, shall be regarded as meaning that only the best commercial practices are to prevail. All interpretations of these specifications shall be made on the basis of this statement.

Liability - Personal Injury:

Awarded contractor(s) shall hold harmless the State of New York, the Unified Court System and the Office of Court Administration with respect to any injuries sustained by contractor's employees, agents, subcontractors, etc. during the contract period.

Unacceptable Bids/Proposals:

The UCS may reject any proposals from bidders who previously defaulted on contract obligations, as surety or otherwise, upon any obligation to the State of New York; who have been declared not responsible, or disqualified, by any agency of the State of New York; or have any proceeding pending relating to the responsibility or qualifications of the bidders to receive public contracts.

Alternate Proposals:

In the event satisfactory bids are not received, the CPA reserves the right to consider alternate proposals containing deviations from specifications. Bidders shall explain in detail where such alternatives deviate from or qualify the terms of the proposal and specifications as issued.

Failure to Provide Data:

Failure to submit any documents or information requested by the CPA in a timely manner, may result in rejection of bidder's proposal.

Inquiries:

Prospective bidders are to direct any inquiries regarding this solicitation **in writing by July 15, 2008** and solely to the attention of:

Betty Faltermeier
Senior Court Analyst
Office of Court Administration
42 Karner Road
Albany, NY 12205

Fax: (518) 869-4735

E-mail: bfalterm@courts.state.ny.us

The bid number must be indicated on the subject line. Due to current issues with email; email from unknown senders will NOT be opened unless the bid number is indicated on the subject line.

The questions and responses from the pre-bid conference and email will be uploaded to the web site <http://www.nycourts.gov/admin/bids> shortly after the pre-bid conference.

Notice to parties accessing solicitations or bid documents issued by the New York State Unified Court System via the internet

The electronic versions of such solicitations & bid documents are intended solely as a convenience to the bidder and vendor community.

Any and all individuals, firms or organizations accessing any Request for Bid(s) (RFB), Requests for Proposal(s) (RFP), Specifications or any related documents from this website shall remain solely and wholly responsible for reviewing the respective solicitation & bid documents on the internet regularly, **up to the scheduled date and time of the bid/proposal due date**, to ensure their knowledge of any amendments, addenda, modifications or other information affecting the solicitation or bid documents in question. The New York State Unified Court System (UCS) - Office of Court Administration (OCA) shall have no responsibility or liability with respect to any party or submission which does not address any and all such amendments, addenda, modifications or other information posted on this website or which purports to respond to any solicitation/bid change not issued by UCS - OCA. Further, UCS - OCA shall not be responsible or liable for any losses or damages caused by any party's failure or inability to access such data for any reason whatsoever, including, but not limited to, power failures, system failures, inaccessibility of on-line service providers, or log-on or transmission delays.

Online RFB/RFP Package Disclaimer:

Bidders accessing any UCS/OCA solicitations and related documents from the NYS UCS website <http://www.nycourts.gov/admin/bids> shall remain solely and wholly responsible for reviewing the respective solicitation and bid documents on the internet regularly, up to the scheduled date and time of the bid/proposal due date, to ensure their knowledge of any amendments, addenda, modifications or other information affecting the solicitation or bid documents in question.

Please ensure all Attachments and/or Appendices are downloaded from the web site. They are under the column headed "Addenda" and are required for completion of the solicitation.

All times indicated are E.S.T. or E.D.S.T.
(Eastern Standard Time or Eastern Daylight Savings Time)

All responses are to be in English.

Note: Should internet service be unavailable, please contact the person indicated as primary contact for a hard copy of the solicitation and addenda.

The following attachments are provided for informational purposes:

- Attachment V** List of CDRCs statewide
- Attachment VI** List of counties that are subject to this RFP and approximate grant awards for the initial 12-month period
- Attachment VII** Evaluation sheets that reviewers will use to rate the proposals
- Attachment VIII** Demographic information by county, please download applicable counties at:
http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/maps/new_york_map.html
- Attachment IX** Applicable laws, regulations and program policies as outlined in the CDRCP Program Manual, please download at:
http://www.nycourts.gov/ip/adr/Info_for_Programs.shtml
- Attachment X** Scope of responsibilities and available funds for intake assistance services (Sixth Judicial District Applicants Only)

.....

DETAILED SPECIFICATIONS

FUNDING

UCS is particularly interested in proposals that creatively use funding provided under this RFP to leverage community resources to the maximum extent feasible so that services provided to disputants in the CDRCs are enhanced.

Pursuant to Judiciary Law § 849-d (2), the UCS may award up to \$40,000.00 per county served in unmatched grant funding. Any additional CDRCP funding beyond the \$40,000.00 per county served that the UCS awards must be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis by local revenue. Proposers must submit a program narrative and budget in accordance with the requirements set forth in this RFP.

In addition to providing funding pursuant to Judiciary Law § 849-d (2), the Unified Court System will award additional funds that do not require a local match. The Office of the Judicial District Administrative Judge will award such funds (“Special Project funds”) as are delineated in Attachment IV to proposers that are selected pursuant to this RFP to administer a CDRC in one or more of the counties where there is available Special Project funding. In most cases, the Special Project funding supports dispute resolution services for cases referred from Family Court; however, in certain counties, Special Project funding supports dispute resolution services for cases referred from other trial courts.

The selected proposer(s) shall use the available Special Project funding to provide dispute resolution services—including intake, screening, mediation, and dispositional reporting—for cases that the CDRC receives from the local court(s). Additionally, the selected proposer(s) shall develop protocols in collaboration with the local court(s) that are consistent with the policies set forth in the Program Manual of the Community Dispute Resolution Centers Program.

The Administrative Judge’s Office for the Sixth Judicial District provides additional Special Project funds to CDRCs for petition intake assistance and referral services. Within the Sixth Judicial District, CDRC staff will help litigants in the Family Courts complete various forms, including petitions for custody, visitation, and orders of protection. These staff will also connect litigants to various complementary services provided by not-for-profit and governmental agencies, such as domestic violence programs, programs for low-income families, and mediation where appropriate. In each county within the Sixth Judicial District, the selected CDRC will negotiate a schedule of coverage with the Family Court Chief Clerk. *The Proposer is encouraged to contact the Family Court Chief Clerk in each county where the Proposer applies to provide services to ascertain the needs of the particular Family Court as those needs relate to petition intake and referral services.*

A list of the counties that are subject to this RFP as well as the approximate grant awards for the initial 12-month period in each of those counties is included in Attachment VI. **All proposed budgets must include as revenue the available Special Project funding set forth in Attachment VI, and the program narrative components and budget expense lines must describe how that particular funding would support the proposed program.**

ELIGIBILITY OF PROPOSERS

Pursuant to Judiciary Law § 849-a (3), the UCS may only consider proposals submitted by nonprofit corporations that are organized for the resolution of disputes or for religious, charitable or educational purposes. In accordance with the requirements set forth in this RFP, each proposer must submit a photocopy of correspondence issued by the Internal Revenue Service that indicates the proposer's status as a tax-exempt organization (Internal Revenue Code § 501(c)(3)).

AWARD SELECTION CRITERIA

- A. UCS intends to award one or more contracts to provide dispute resolution services in each county listed in Attachment VI until funding is exhausted.
Note: Proposers may submit proposals to serve a single county or multiple counties. In the event that none of the proposals received pursuant to this RFP proposes to provide services to one or more counties, the UCS reserves the right to employ alternate measures to ensure that dispute resolution services are provided to the residents of those counties.
- B. Each award shall be made in consultation with the Office of Alternative Dispute Resolution and Court Improvement Programs' Selection Committee and the respective District Administrative Judge.
- C. Proposals will be scored using the Evaluation Instrument included herein as Attachment VII.

BUDGET COMPONENTS

The proposal must include an annual budget. Funding requests must be submitted on the budget worksheet forms in Appendix C. Proposals to provide services to more than one county must also include the expense allocation worksheet found in Appendix C-1; this worksheet requires the proposer to allocate the following expenses among the several counties the proposer plans to serve: each personnel position and each of the non-personnel expense categories (i.e., Fringe Benefits, Supplies, Travel, Equipment, and Contractual Expenses). The organization may be required to include matching funds to secure the requested grant. A dollar-for-dollar match is required for each dollar requested above the following product: \$40,000 multiplied by the number of counties served by the proposed program. For example, if an organization proposed to administer a three-county program and requested a \$200,000 grant award, the organization would be required to include \$80,000 in local matching revenue, since the first \$120,000 (three counties @ \$40,000 each) of the \$200,000 grant award does not require a local match, but the remaining \$80,000 of that grant award must be matched dollar-for-dollar by local revenue. The requested grant award and all matching funds must be identified in Appendix C. The CDRC Program Budget includes all activities that are directly funded by the UCS CDRC grant and any other activities that are supported by funds or in-kind contributions and that are used to fulfill the match requirement. The proposer cannot use other UCS funds to match the UCS CDRC grant. The following is a list of matching-fund categories set forth in order of preference (accordingly, given two otherwise comparable proposals, a proposal that includes

more fee-for-service revenue than in-kind revenue would be more favorably evaluated than a proposal that contained more in-kind revenue than fee-for-service revenue

1) Revenue that is allocated towards the cost of the core or complementary community dispute resolution programming.

For example: local government, state executive branch, federal, private foundation, or fundraising dollars allocated for recruiting and training volunteers to provide mediation, arbitration or conciliation of minor civil, family or criminal disputes, child welfare mediation, family group conferencing, school-based peer mediation or conflict resolution programming.

2) Fee-for-service dispute resolution process revenue (mediation, arbitration, conciliation, facilitation) or dispute resolution training revenue. Both the revenue and expenses related to these activities must be included in the budget.

3) In-kind contributions of volunteer time, space or goods and services. An equal amount of in-kind revenue and expenses related to these contributions must be included in the budget.

4) Revenue that is allocated towards the cost of other complementary non-dispute resolution programming. To qualify as match, such program revenue must be shown to enhance the organization's ability to provide community dispute resolution services.

For example: local government, state executive branch, federal, private foundation, or fundraising dollars allocated to CASA, Surrogate Decision Making. Both the revenue and expenses related to these programs must be included in the budget.

DATA COLLECTION

Contractors shall be responsible for implementing and maintaining a data collection system for the CDRCs pursuant to UCS instructions. For detailed information concerning the method and scope of data collection and transmission, please reference Attachment IX and visit the following site: www.nycourts.gov/ip/adr/Info_for_Programs.shtml (Under "CDRC Program Manual," click on "Chapter 1 [Case Data Reporting]").

Note: Any and all data developed by the contractor, or any person or entity acting on contractor's behalf, remains the sole property of the UCS. Individual information about clients is confidential. Accordingly, contractor may not make any use of such information and data without the express written authorization of the UCS.

Please Note:

The documents indicated on the Document Enclosure List must also be completed, executed with original signature in blue ink, notarized where applicable and attached to the original (photocopies of the following must be attached to the copies of the proposal):

A more detailed explanation of the requirements where applicable are included below:

Program Narrative Proposers must complete the Narrative Questionnaire, which is available as a fillable portable data file (.pdf) or as a paper file.

Each question has a character limit which appears in brackets after the question itself.

- Appendix C** Budget worksheet forms.
- Appendix C-1** For proposers applying to serve more than one county, this document requires the proposer to allocate the following expenses among the several counties the proposer plans to serve: each personnel position and each of the non-personnel expense categories (i.e., Fringe Benefits, Supplies, Travel, Equipment, and Contractual Expenses).
- Appendix D** Audited financial report, organizational chart, listing of Board of Directors, certificate of incorporation, staff job descriptions and resumes, and photocopy of correspondence issued by the Internal Revenue Service that indicates the proposer's status as a tax-exempt organization. For each board member include name, address, length of current term, total years of service on the board, and number of meetings attended in fiscal year 2007-2008.
- Appendix E** List three (3) references for the organization. Each reference should be familiar with the organization's services, particularly its dispute-resolution services, if possible. The list should state each reference's name, address, telephone number, a description of the work performed for the reference organization, and the name of a contact person.
- Appendix F** Attach the organization's strategic plan, resource development plan and mission statement. If the organization does not have one of these documents in place, attach a statement to that effect.
- Attachment I** Pages **3 of 10** (Non-Collusive Bidding Certification) and **4 of 10** (Acknowledgment Form).

PROGRAM NARRATIVE COMPONENTS

All programs must comply with the Minimum Requirements set forth in Attachment IX. The narrative section consists of three parts. All applicants must complete Sections A and B. Applicants within the Sixth Judicial District **only** must complete Section C.

Organizational Questions

1. Describe the organization’s history and explain how the proposed center is in alignment with the organization’s mission as attached in Appendix F. [6375 characters]

2. Briefly explain how the organization’s strategic plan attached in Appendix F was created. If your organization does not have a strategic plan, please explain in the space below. [2125 characters]

3. Provide the following information: (a) number of board meetings held in fiscal year 2007-2008, (b) number of meetings with a quorum present, (c) total amount of financial support given by the board in fiscal year 2007-2008, (d) percentage of board members contributing financial support to the agency, and (e) major accomplishments of the board in fiscal year 2007-2008. [2125 characters]

4.

For Existing Providers listed in Attachment V:

Complete the following grid to indicate past funding the agency has secured for the proposed program. Please include total financial support, even if it exceeds the minimum match requirements and/or has not been listed in past reconciliations or budgets. Preference will be given to proposals that demonstrate the ability to secure funds in the following order of preference:

- (1) Public and private revenue to support core and complementary dispute resolution programs;
- (2) Fee for service revenue that will directly support dispute resolution programs;
- (3) In kind revenue;
- (4) Public and private revenue that supports complementary non-dispute resolution programs.

		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Category 1	Public revenue that directly supports dispute resolution programs.					
	Foundations and other grant makers					
	Individual donations					

Category 2	Fee-for-service dispute resolution revenue					
Category 3	In kind revenue					
Category 4	Public and private revenue that supports complementary non-dispute resolution programs					

For Prospective Providers not listed in Attachment V:

Complete the following grid to indicate past funding that the agency has secured in sum for its current programs. Preference will be given to proposals that demonstrate the ability to secure funds in the following order of preference: (1) Public and private revenue including grants and donations; (2) Fee-for-service revenue; (3) In kind revenue.

		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Category 1	Public and private revenue					
	Foundations and other grant makers					
	Individual donations					
Category 2	Fee-for-service revenue					
Category 3	In kind revenue					

5. Briefly explain how the organization’s resource development plan attached in Appendix F was created. If your organization does not have a resource development plan, please explain. [2125 characters]

6.
For Existing Providers listed in Attachment V:

Complete the grid to demonstrate your organization's past experience in submitting thorough ADR/CIP reports in a timely manner (for existing providers):

	Due Date	FY 2006-07 Submission Dates	FY 2007-08 Submission Dates
First Quarter reconciliation	8/15		
Second Quarter reconciliation	11/15		
Third Quarter reconciliation	2/15		
Final reconciliation	5/15		
Bi-Annual Report (mid year)	11/15		
Bi-Annual Report (final)	5/15		
Yearly Agency Audit	varies		

For Prospective Providers not listed in Attachment V:

Describe the organization's capacity to prepare and submit audits, budgets, and reconciliation reports in a timely manner. [2125 characters]

7. Using the grid below, describe the organization's technological infrastructure, including the organization's current inventory of computers, photocopiers, fax machines, and telephones (including voicemail).

	Number	Average Age	Oldest	Newest
Computer				
Fax				
Phone				
Copier				

8. Discuss the organization's capacity to resolve computer-related issues and its back-up protocols. Describe how the organization will use technological components, including web-site, to meet the needs of staff, referral sources, clients, neutrals, and the Unified Court System, and identify any equipment that the program plans to purchase in its first year. If your organization has a comprehensive plan to enhance and/or acquire additional technological capacity, please detail below. [4250 characters]

9. Please describe the facilities that are available for the center including the proposed main office and any other satellite offices. For each proposed office, identify the following: (1) the number of program staff who will work at the office; (2) the number of rooms available for simultaneously holding arbitration, conciliation, or mediation sessions; (3) whether there is a waiting area; (4) the degree to which the organization will need to furnish staff areas, session rooms or the waiting area (5) and, considering accessibility and convenience, why this location was selected for use as a CDRC. Also list other community locations that are available to you. [no limit]

10. Describe in detail the range of dispute resolution programming that the center will provide to members of the public and how those services respond to local community needs. Include a definition for each dispute resolution process that the center will provide. Describe any fees that the program will charge clients for its dispute resolution services. [12,750-21,250 characters]

11. Please explain the mechanisms that the center will use to monitor the quality of intake and screening services. Please include information about staff training, policies and procedures, written manuals, and any other pertinent processes or mechanisms. Please reference rather than attach any written materials. [4250 characters]

12. Please explain the mechanisms that the center will use to monitor the quality of dispute resolution services (mediation, conciliation, and arbitration). Please include information about training, apprenticeships, continuing education, mediator evaluation, and any other pertinent processes or mechanisms. Please reference rather than attach any written materials. [4250-8500 characters]

13. Describe the agency budgeting process including the development of budgets and the monitoring of revenues and expenditures. Explain the specific roles of all involved staff. [4250 characters]

14. Describe the agency's recruitment, hiring and employee evaluation practices and how they encourage a diverse workplace of qualified and dedicated staff. [6375 characters]

15. If the proposer is a multi-purpose agency, please describe the method or basis for allocating indirect costs. Indirect costs are those that benefit more than one program and, therefore, are shared. They include general maintenance and operation expenses, general office and administrative expenses, general overhead, etc. Some common methods of allocating indirect costs are based upon time, space, units of service, or percentage of funding. [2125 characters]

16.

For Existing Providers listed in Attachment V:

Attach resumes of all staff and a proposed organizational chart in Appendix D. Please provide a staffing plan for the program. Describe the capacity of the organization to administer the proposed program, including descriptions of the proposed supervisory structure of the program. [no limit]

For Prospective Providers not listed in Attachment V:

Attach the job descriptions for all functions and a proposed organizational chart in Appendix D. In the space below provide a staffing plan for the program. Describe the capacity of the organization to administer the proposed program, including descriptions of the proposed supervisory structure of the program. [no limit]

17. Define all fringe benefits available to staff, including those that are required by law, as well as all eligibility requirements and restrictions. [4250 characters]

County-Specific Questions. Complete one (1) copy of this section for each county for which you are applying. If you are proposing a program in three (3) counties, complete one (1) for each county for a total of three (3) submissions.

ENTER COUNTY NAME HERE:

18. For Existing Providers listed in Attachment V:

Please complete the following grid with information about your currently active mediation panel. For each box, please include both total numbers and percentages.

For Prospective Providers not listed in Attachment V:

Please complete the following grid with information about the mediation panel you expect to use to provide the services described in question 8.

Sex		Ethnicity		Age	
Male	/ %	American Indian	/ %	Under 20	/ %
Female	/ %	Asian		20-29	/ %
Total	/100%	Black	/ %	30-39	/ %
		Latino	/ %	40-49	/ %
		White	/ %	50-59	/ %
		Other	/ %	60-69	/ %
		Total	/100%	70+	/ %
				Total	/100%

19. Please compare your response to question 18 regarding the composition of your mediator panel with the demographic data about your county as provided in Attachment VIII. Discuss how the organization will recruit a panel of neutrals who reflect the diversity of the community the organization will serve. If the organization has faced particular challenges recruiting a diverse panel of neutrals in the past, please explain the challenges, strategies that have been attempted, and possible new approaches. [4250 characters]

20. For Existing Providers listed in Attachment V:

For each of the last three calendar years, provide the total number of cases and percentage of cases in which volunteers provided dispute resolution services. In the column entitled Next Contractual Period, estimate the percentage of cases in which volunteers will provide dispute resolution services during the contractual period covered by this RFP.

For Prospective Providers not listed in Attachment V:

In the column entitled Next Contractual Period, estimate the percentage of cases in which volunteers will provide dispute resolution services during the contractual period covered by this RFP.

	2005	2006	2007	Next Contractual Period
Volunteers	/ %	/ %	/ %	%

21. For Existing Providers Only:

Complete the grid below to indicate the years of experience of the currently active volunteer mediators.

Years of Experience	Number of Active Mediators
0-2	
3-4	
5-9	
10-14	
15-19	
20+	

22. Provide a detailed plan to recruit, utilize, and retain neutrals. Please refer to your responses to questions 18-21. Preference will be given to proposals that demonstrate an ability to recruit, utilize, and retain *volunteer* neutrals. [4250 characters]

23.

For Existing Providers listed in Attachment V:

For the last fiscal year indicate the number and percentage of referrals the center has received from its six most frequent referral sources. Also complete column entitled Next Contractual Period with the percentage of referrals the program expects to receive from these referral sources.

For Prospective Providers not listed in Attachment V:

Identify the six most frequent sources of case referrals in the column labeled Referral Source. Complete the column labeled Next Contractual Period with the percentage of referrals the program expects to receive from each source.

Referral Source	FY 2007-08	Next Contractual Period
	/ %	%
	/ %	%
	/ %	%
	/ %	%

	/ %	%
	/ %	%

24. For Existing Providers:

In the chart below report the number of cases for which the center provided services in fiscal year 2007-8 as well as the number of cases in which it expects to provide services in the first three years of the proposed contract period. For each year specify the number of cases in which dispute resolution services are provided in the DR Provided column. Those cases where dispute resolution services are not provided, but intake and other related services are provided should be reported in the NO DR column.

For Prospective Providers:

In the chart below project the number of cases for which the center expects to provide services in the first three years of the proposed contract period. For each year specify the number of cases in which dispute resolution services are provided in the DR Provided column. Those cases where dispute resolution services are not provided, but intake and other related services are provided should be reported in the NO DR column.

	2007-08		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12	
	DR	No DR						
Agricultural - Credit								
Agricultural - Non Credit								
Admin Hearing								
Child Permanency								
Civil – Housing Dispute								
Civil – Large Claim								
Civil – Small Claim								
Criminal – Felony								
Criminal – Misdemeanor/ Violation								
DSS Conciliation								
Juvenile Delinquency								
Lemon Law								
Manufactured Housing								
Matrimonial								

Other								
Parenting Issues								
Peer Mediation								
Permanency								
PINS/Pre-PINS								
Youth Issues								
TOTAL								

25. Provide a detailed outreach plan of how your organization will develop and maintain referrals with courts and other community institutions, and how this plan will achieve the projections provided in questions 23 and 24. Also identify any factors known to the organization’s staff or directors that could inhibit the development of a productive referral relationship with any Judge, court employee, or other current or potential referral source in the community to be served. [4250-8500 characters]

26. Provide a detailed description of how the center will promote the center’s services to the public, and how this effort will specifically help achieve the projections detailed in questions 23 and 24. [4250 characters]

Sixth Judicial District Applicants ONLY: Complete this section.

27. Intake Assistance and Referral Services – Describe how the CDRC will supervise staff assigned to provide intake assistance and referral services. [2125 characters]

28. For each county, describe how the program will help litigants in Family Court complete petitions for custody, visitation, support, orders of protection, and other judicial services. [2125 characters]

29. Describe how the program will connect litigants with appropriate community and governmental services. [2125 characters]

SUMMARY RATING SHEET

PROPOSER: _____

AREA TO BE SERVED: _____

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| A. ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITY
(30 POINTS) | A. _____ |
| B. APPROPRIATENESS AND QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED
PROGRAM (73 POINTS) | B. _____ |
| C. APPROPRIATENESS OF STAFFING PLAN (20 POINTS) | C. _____ |
| D. REASONABLENESS OF COST (35 POINTS) | D. _____ |
| E. APPROPRIATENESS OF INTAKE ASSISTANCE
AND REFERRAL SERVICES (SIXTH JUDICIAL
DISTRICT PROPOSERS ONLY) (10 POINTS) | E. _____ |

TOTAL _____

EVALUATOR (Print) _____

(Signature) _____

DATE ___ / ___ / ___

Attachment VII
Evaluation Form

DETAIL RATING SHEETS

PROPOSER _____

REVIEWER _____

AREA TO BE SERVED _____

A. DEMONSTRATED ORGANIZATIONAL ABILITY (30 POINTS TOTAL)

1. Evaluate the extent to which the proposer demonstrates that the organization:
- Has demonstrated success in securing funding and other resources to support dispute resolution or other programming.
 - Has a plan likely to secure funding and other resources in the future
- (10 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: questions 1, 4, 5, Appendix F]

- 8-10 points: Proposer has met both of the following criteria:
- Proposer has 3 or more years experience securing resources including funding.
 - Proposer has plan likely to secure funding and other resources in the future.

- 5-7 points: Proposer has met one of the two following criteria:
- Proposer has 3 or more years experience securing resources including funding.
 - Proposer has plan likely to secure funding and other resources in the future.

- 1-4 points: Proposer has met none of the following criteria.
- Proposer has 3 or more years experience securing resources including funding.
 - Proposer has plan likely to secure funding and other resources in the future.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

2. Evaluate the extent to which the proposer demonstrates that the organization has the ability or previous experience necessary to submit required reports in a timely, thorough fashion. (5 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: question 6]

4-5 points: Proposer demonstrates that it routinely meets reporting deadlines of funding sources or other institutions.

2-3 points: Proposer demonstrates that it often meets reporting deadlines of funding sources other institutions.

0-1 points: Proposer fails to demonstrate that it meets reporting deadlines of funding sources or other institutions.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

3. Evaluate the extent to which the proposer demonstrates that the organization has the technological capacity to administer the program. (5 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: questions 7 and 8]

4-5 points: Proposer demonstrates that it already possesses the technological infrastructure to: (1) deploy and maintain needed software, including the Dispute Resolution Case Management System (DRCMS); (2) connect staff who work in various satellite offices; and (3) respond to inquiries from members of the public, referral sources, clients, and neutrals.

2-3 points: Proposer demonstrates that it has developed a comprehensive plan to acquire the technological infrastructure to: (1) deploy and maintain needed software, including the Dispute Resolution Case Management System (DRCMS); (2) connect staff who work in various satellite offices; and (3) respond to inquiries from members of the public, referral sources, clients, and neutrals.

0-1 points: Proposer either fails to demonstrate that it possesses the necessary technological infrastructure outlined above or fails to describe a comprehensive plan to acquire the needed technological infrastructure outlined above.

RATING _____

Attachment VII
Evaluation Form

Basis for Rating: _____

4. Evaluate the extent to which the proposer’s Board of Directors is actively engaged in the oversight and success of the organization, including how the organization’s mission aligns with its activities. (6 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: questions 1, 2, 3 and Appendix F]

5-6 points: Proposer’s Board of Directors is engaged in all three core Board responsibilities:

- Actively monitoring and improving performance (criteria: number of board meetings held, major accomplishments of the board in fiscal year 2007-2008).
- Ensuring leadership and resources (criteria: percentage of Board members contributing to the organization financially, and total amount of fiscal year financial support derived from the Board).
- Shaping mission and strategic direction (criteria: major accomplishments of the Board in fiscal year 2007-2008, strategic plan and organization mission).

3-4 points: Proposer’s Board of Directors is engaged in two of the three core Board responsibilities:

- Actively monitoring and improving performance (criteria: number of board meetings held, major accomplishments of the board in fiscal year 2007-2008).
- Ensuring leadership and resources (criteria: percentage of Board members contributing to the organization financially, and total amount of fiscal year financial support derived from the Board).
- Shaping mission and strategic direction (criteria: major accomplishments of the Board in fiscal year 2007-2008, strategic plan and organization mission).

1-2 points: Proposer’s Board of Directors is engaged in one of the three Board responsibilities:

- Actively monitoring and improving performance (criteria: number of board meetings held, major accomplishments of the board in fiscal year 2007-2008).
- Ensuring leadership and resources (criteria: percentage of Board members contributing to the organization financially, and total amount of fiscal year financial support derived from the Board).

- Shaping mission and strategic direction (criteria: major accomplishments of the Board in fiscal year 2007-2008).

0 points: Proposer’s Board of Directors is not engaged in any of the three core Board responsibilities:

- Actively monitoring and improving performance (criteria: number of board meetings held, major accomplishments of the board in fiscal year 2007-2008).
- Ensuring leadership and resources (criteria: percentage of Board members contributing to the organization financially, and total amount of fiscal year financial support derived from the Board).
- Shaping mission and strategic direction (criteria: major accomplishments of the Board in fiscal year 2007-2008).

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

5. Evaluate the frequency with which the Board of Directors meets (4 points).

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: question 3]

3-4 points: Proposer’s Board of Directors meets with a quorum present eight or more times per year.

2 points: Proposer’s Board of Directors meets with a quorum present at least six but fewer than eight times per year.

1 point: Proposer’s Board of Directors meets with a quorum present at least four but fewer than six times per year.

0 points: Proposer’s Board of Directors meets three or fewer times per year.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

SUBTOTAL FOR PART “A” (A1 + A2 + A3 + A4 + A5) _____

B. APPROPRIATENESS AND QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED PROGRAM (73 POINTS TOTAL)

Attachment VII
Evaluation Form

1. Evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates that the center will provide intake, screening, mediation, conciliation and/or arbitration services of high quality to members of the community that the center will serve. (15 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: questions 11 and 12]

13-15 points: The proposal contains a detailed description of the mechanisms that the center will use to monitor the quality of services and these mechanisms are very likely to yield dispute resolution services of very high quality.

10-12 points: The proposal contains a detailed description of the mechanisms that the center will use to monitor the quality of services and these mechanisms are likely to yield dispute resolution services of good to high quality.

7-9 points: The proposal contains a brief description of the mechanisms that the center will use to monitor the quality of services and these mechanisms are somewhat likely to yield dispute resolution services of adequate to good quality.

4-6 points: The proposal contains a cursory description of the mechanisms that the center will use to monitor the quality of services and these mechanisms are likely barely adequate to yield dispute resolution services that comport with the minimum indicia of quality.

0-3 points: The proposal lacks a description of the mechanisms that the center will use to monitor the quality of its services and its services are likely to be poor or inadequate.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

2. Evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates that the organization will provide appropriate, accessible facilities for each county it proposes to serve. (10 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: question 9]

- 9-10 points: The proposal contains a detailed description of the facilities for each proposed center, and all of the facilities are appropriate to the needs of the community. Facilities contain rooms suitable to hold dispute resolution sessions, are close to courts and other referring organizations, and are easily accessed by all members of the public, including those with disabilities.
- 6-8 points: The proposal contains a description of the facilities for each proposed center, and the majority of the facilities are appropriate to the needs of the community. Facilities contain rooms suitable to hold dispute resolution sessions, are reasonably close to courts and other referring organizations, and can be accessed by all members of the public, including those with disabilities.
- 4-5 points: The proposal contains a description of the facilities for each proposed center, and only some of the facilities are appropriate to the needs of the community. Facilities contain rooms suitable to hold dispute resolution sessions, are close to courts and other referring organizations, and can be accessed by members of the public, including those with disabilities.
- 0-3 points: The proposal lacks a description of facilities, or describes facilities unsuitable for dispute resolution sessions, or describes facilities difficult for the public, including individuals with disabilities, to access.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

3. Evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates that the center will recruit, train, utilize and retain neutrals who reflect the diversity of the community that the center will serve. (15 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: questions 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22]

- 11-15 points: The proposal contains a plan that is highly likely to be effective in recruiting, training and retaining neutrals who reflect the diversity of the community that the center will serve. The proposal also commits the Proposer to utilize volunteer neutrals in a manner that is consistent with the both the values of the Office of Alternative Dispute Resolution and Court Improvement Programs and the mission statement of the Proposer.
- 6-10 points: The proposal contains a plan that is somewhat likely to be effective in recruiting, training and retaining neutrals who reflect the diversity of the community that the center will serve. The proposal also commits the Proposer to utilize neutrals in a manner that is consistent with the both

Attachment VII
Evaluation Form

the values of the Office of Alternative Dispute Resolution and Court Improvement Programs and the mission statement of the Proposer.

0-5 points: The proposal contains a plan that is not likely to be effective in recruiting, training and retaining neutrals who reflect the diversity of the community that the center will serve, or lacks a plan. The proposal’s explanation of utilization of volunteer neutrals is inconsistent with the both the values of the Office of Alternative Dispute Resolution and Court Improvement Programs and the mission statement of the Proposer.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

4. Evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates that the organization will provide a full range of dispute resolution programming that will adequately respond to local community needs. Also, evaluate the extent to which the proposal describes a fee policy that appropriately balances the Proposer’s fundraising needs against the needs of community members to have affordable access to the center, while also waiving fees for indigent members of the community. (10 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: question 10]

8-10 points: The proposal substantively demonstrates that the organization will provide a full range of dispute resolution programming that will adequately respond to local community needs, and describes a fee policy that demonstrates thoughtful balance of Proposer’s fundraising needs against the needs of community members to have affordable access to the center. The fee policy waives fees for indigent members of the community.

4-7 points: The proposal moderately demonstrates that the organization will provide a full range of dispute resolution programming that will adequately respond to local community needs, and describes a fee policy that demonstrates balance of Proposer’s fundraising needs against the needs of community members to have affordable access to the center. The fee policy waives fees or uses a sliding scale for indigent members of the community.

0-3 points: The proposal fails to adequately demonstrate that the organization will provide a full range of dispute resolution programming that will adequately respond to local community needs, and either describes a fee policy that is inadequate, or fails to describe a fee policy at all or that demonstrates any balance of Proposer's fundraising needs against the needs of community members to have affordable access to the center. The fee policy does not waive fees for indigent members of the community, or relies on a sliding scale that is inappropriate.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

5. Evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates that the center will work with local courts and other community institutions to generate appropriate referrals to the center. (15 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: questions 23, 24 and 25, Appendix E]

12-15 points: Proposer demonstrates a comprehensive plan to develop referrals with courts and other community institutions that is highly likely to yield a referral relationship that will generate a consistent caseload of appropriate cases. Proposer's references include commitments by Judges or representatives of other community institutions to utilize the Proposer's ADR services.

8-11 points: Proposer demonstrates an adequate plan to develop referrals with courts and other community institutions that is likely to yield a referral relationship that will generate a consistent caseload of appropriate cases. Proposer's references indicate that Proposer is likely to secure future commitments by Judges or representatives of other community institutions to utilize the Proposer's ADR services.

4-7 points: Proposer articulates aspirational goals to solicit referrals from courts and other community institutions but offers no more detailed plans than to accept appropriate cases on an *ad hoc* basis from such institutions. Proposer's references speak positively of the Proposer but do not address the likelihood that the center will be an effective provider of dispute resolution services.

0-3 points: Proposer lacks any plan to develop a referral relationship with courts and other community institutions. Proposer's references offer lackluster endorsements of the Proposer.

Attachment VII
Evaluation Form

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

6. Evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates that the center will conduct effective outreach efforts to promote the center’s dispute resolution services to members of the public. (8 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: question 26]

7-8 points: The proposal contains a detailed description of the mechanisms that the center will use to promote its services to members of the public, and these mechanisms are highly likely to yield cases.

5-6 points: The proposal contains a description of the mechanisms that the center will use to promote its services to members of the public, and these mechanisms are likely to yield cases.

3-4 points: The proposal contains a cursory description of the mechanisms that the center will use to promote its services to members of the public, and these mechanisms are somewhat likely to yield cases

0-2 points: The proposal does not describe how the center will use to promote its services to members of the public.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

SUBTOTAL FOR PART “B” (B1 + B2 + B3 + B4 + B5 + B6) _____

C. APPROPRIATENESS OF STAFFING PLAN AND PROCEDURES (20 POINTS TOTAL)

1. Extent to which the proposal demonstrates an appropriate supervisory structure for the center. (5 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: question 13, Appendix D]

4-5 points: The proposal indicates that the program director will have significant input and responsibilities during the development and monitoring of the program budget, and the supervisory structure of the proposed program is highly likely to ensure long-term stability and growth.

2-3 points: The proposal indicates that the program director will have nominal input and responsibilities during the development and monitoring of the program budget, and the supervisory structure of the proposed program is somewhat likely to ensure long-term stability and growth.

0-1 points: The proposal divests the program director of any input or responsibility during the development and monitoring of the program budget, and the supervisory structure of the proposed program is unlikely to ensure long-term stability and growth.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

2. Evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates an appropriate allocation of responsibilities among staff of the center and that the center(s) will be appropriately staffed to meet the needs of the community. Also, evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates that human resources policies encourage a diverse workplace of qualified and dedicated staff. (15 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: questions 14, 16, Appendix D]

10-15 points: The proposal contains resumes of existing staff or job descriptions of proposed positions, and the responsibilities are allocated in a manner that enables staff to balance appropriately their responsibilities to monitor cases, solicit cases from institutions and members of the public, monitor and train neutrals, and participate in the ongoing development of the center. The human resources policies described in the proposal are very likely to encourage a diverse workplace of qualified and dedicated staff.

5-9 points: The proposal contains resumes of existing staff or job descriptions of proposed positions, but the responsibilities are not allocated in a manner that enables staff to balance appropriately their responsibilities to monitor cases, solicit cases from institutions and members of the public, monitor and train neutrals, and participate in the ongoing development of the center. The human resources policies described in the proposal are likely to encourage a diverse workplace of qualified and dedicated staff.

Attachment VII
Evaluation Form

0-4 points: There is no mechanism to assess whether staff responsibilities are allocated in a manner that enables staff to balance appropriately their responsibilities because the proposal does not include the resumes of existing staff or job descriptions of proposed positions. The human resources policies described in the proposal are unlikely to encourage a diverse workplace of qualified and dedicated staff.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

SUBTOTAL FOR PART "C" (C1 + C2) _____

D. REASONABLENESS OF COST (35 POINTS TOTAL)

1. Evaluate the extent to which the proposed program will effectively utilize state dollars for the delivery of quality services. (5 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: Appendix C, Appendix C-1, questions 9-12, 18-29]

5 points: The program utilizes state dollars very effectively for the proposed services.

4 points: The program utilizes state dollars somewhat effectively for the proposed services.

2-3 points: The program utilizes state dollars somewhat ineffectively for the proposed services.

0 points: The program utilizes state dollars very ineffectively for the proposed.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

2. Salaries and Fringe Benefits (15 points)

Evaluate the extent to which the salaries and fringe benefits for the proposed program are appropriate for the positions listed in the proposal.

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: Appendix C, Appendix C-1, Appendix D, Attachment VIII, question 17]

- 11-15 points: Salaries and fringe benefit costs are appropriate for the positions listed in the proposal, and competitive with other proposals submitted for the same geographic area.
- 7-10 points: The majority of salaries and fringe benefit costs listed are appropriate, but some are too high to be reasonable or some are too low to be competitive with other proposals submitted for the same geographic area.
- 3-6 points: Some salaries and fringe benefit costs are reasonable for the positions listed in the proposal, but most are too high to be reasonable or too low to be competitive with other proposals submitted for the same geographic area.
- 0-2 points: None of the salaries or fringe benefit costs are reasonable.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

3. Administrative cost (5 points)

Evaluate the extent to which the percentage of UCS funds that support administrative costs (including salaries and fringe benefits of non-program staff, real estate expenses that are not utilized for the direct delivery of services, and related costs) is comparable to the percentage found in the budgets of similarly sized agencies.

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: Appendix C, Appendix C-1, question 15]

- 4-5 points: Administrative costs are appropriate and provide for sufficient agency administration of the program.
- 2-3 points: The administrative cost of the proposal is appropriate, but some costs are too high or too low to provide for reasonable administration of the program.
- 0-1 points: The administrative costs are unreasonable and do not provide for adequate administration of the program.

RATING _____

Attachment VII
Evaluation Form

Basis for Rating: _____

4. Non-Personnel Service Costs (5 points)

Evaluate the extent to which the non-personnel service costs included in the budget are reasonable for the operation of the proposed program.

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: Appendix C, Appendix C-1]

5 points: All costs for non-personnel expenses are reasonable and adequately provide for the needs of the proposed program.

4 points: Most costs for non-personnel expenses are reasonable and adequately provide for the needs of the proposed program.

2-3 points: Many of the costs for non-personnel expenses are unreasonable and do not adequately provide for the needs of the proposed program.

0-1 points: Costs for non-personnel expenses are unreasonably high or low, and do not adequately provide for the needs of the proposed program.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

5. Matching Funds (5 points)

Evaluate the extent to which the proposal includes matching funds that are sufficient and appropriate to the long-term health and sustainability of the program.

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: Appendix C, Appendix C-1]

5 points: The proposal includes sufficient matching revenues to meet program requirements and relies heavily on cash funding from public and community sources and direct fees-for-service from alternative dispute resolution services.

- 4 points: The proposal includes sufficient matching revenues to meet program requirements and relies on cash funding from public and community sources and direct fees-for-service from alternative dispute resolution services, as well as in-kind contributions to the program.
- 2-3 points: The proposal includes sufficient matching revenues to meet program requirements and relies on cash funding from public and community sources and direct fees-for-service from alternative dispute resolution services, as well as in-kind contributions to the program and funding for non-dispute resolution programming.
- 0-1 points: The proposal does not include sufficient matching revenues to meet program requirements and/or relies on in-kind contributions to the program or funding for non-dispute resolution programming rather than cash funding for alternative dispute resolution from community and public sources and fee-for-service.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____

SUBTOTAL FOR PART "D" (D1 + D2 + D3 + D4 + D5) _____

E. APPROPRIATENESS OF INTAKE ASSISTANCE AND REFERRAL SERVICES (SIXTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT PROPOSERS ONLY) (10 POINTS TOTAL)

1. Evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates that the center will not only assist litigants with drafting petitions and other papers in accordance with the priorities of Family Court judicial and non-judicial personnel but also connect those litigants with government- and community-based services. (10 points)

[Reviewer: Consider the following source(s) of information: questions 27, 28, 29]

- 8-10 points: The proposal explicitly comports with the needs of the local Family Court(s) with respect to petition drafting assistance. The proposal contains detailed plans for the training and supervision of staff who will provide petition intake and referral services. The proposal also contains detailed plans to work with other community agencies and government offices to offer litigants connections to needed services.
- 4-7 points: The proposal partially comports with the needs of the local Family Court(s) with respect to petition drafting assistance, though the proposal is likely to meet those needs. The proposal contains somewhat detailed plans for the training and supervision of staff who will provide petition intake and referral services. The proposal also demonstrates vague

**Attachment VII
Evaluation Form**

plans to work with other community agencies or government offices to offer litigants connections to needed services.

0-3 points:

The proposal fails to comport with the needs of the local Family Court(s) with respect to petition drafting assistance and resource referrals or is not likely to meet those needs. The proposal fails to adequately explain how the program will train and supervise the staff who will provide petition intake and referral services. The proposal lacks a description of how the proposer will work with other community agencies and government offices to offer litigants connections with needed services.

RATING _____

Basis for Rating: _____
