



FILED
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
OAKLAND
2017 JUN -1 PM 5:18

AGENDA REPORT

TO: Sabrina B. Landreth
City Administrator

FROM: Chantal Cotton Gaines

SUBJECT: Measure Z MOUs for Evaluation
Services

DATE: May 22, 2017

City Administrator Approval

Date:

6/1/17

RECOMMENDATION

Staff Recommends That The City Council Adopt A Resolution Authorizing The City Administrator To Enter Into Memorandums Of Understanding (MOUs) Or Agreements With Alameda County And State Agencies As Needed Related To The Safety and Services Act (Measure Z) Evaluation To Enable The Evaluation Contractors To Receive Data From These Agencies To Support Measure Z Evaluation Goals.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2014 Oakland Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act (Safety and Services Act, or Measure Z) requires an annual evaluation to be conducted by a third-party independent evaluator. Staff brought the Request for Proposals (RFP) scope of work, created by the Safety and Services Oversight Commission (SSOC) to the Public Safety Committee in 2016 and later brought back contract recommendations that Council approved in November 2016. In order to fulfill evaluation goals, the City is working to facilitate the creation of data-sharing agreements between the evaluators and various government entities, such as Alameda County Probation.

The attached resolution is intended to provide authorization for the City Administrator to enter into any Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with State and County agencies necessary for Measure Z evaluation. The creation of such agreements will enable the evaluator to be able to receive data from State and County partners for the evaluation in a safe and confidential manner over the remaining years of the Measure Z legislation. Note: this authorization is only related to Measure Z evaluation.

BACKGROUND/LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

In July 2014 the City Council adopted Resolution No. 85149 C.M.S. which sent the Safety and Services Act or Measure Z, to the November 4, 2014 General Municipal Election ballot. The voters of the City of Oakland adopted the Act with 77.05 percent of the vote, which surpassed the 66.7 percent approval requirement. The Act maintains the existing parcel tax and parking tax surcharge for a period of 10 years in order to improve police, fire, and emergency response services as well as community strategies for at risk youth and young adults. The Safety and

Item: _____
Public Safety Committee
June 13, 2017

Services Act creates the Safety and Services Oversight Commission (SSOC) to evaluate, inquire, and review the administration, coordination, and evaluation of strategies and practices mandated by the Act. The Act specifies commission duties, which includes duties related to involvement in the evaluation process as further explained below.

The Safety and Services Act states specific evaluation requirements in two places within the measure. One place is in the SSOC duties (Section 4A6) with requirements for the SSOC's interactions with the evaluation and the other place is in Section 48 which is the requirement that explains the annual evaluation and audit in the Accountability and Reporting section. Section 4(A)6 states the following:

SSOC duties related to the evaluation:

- (b) Make recommendations to the City Administrator and, as appropriate, the independent evaluator regarding the scope of the annual program performance evaluation. Wherever possible, the scope shall relate directly to the efficacy of strategies to achieve desired outcomes and to issues raised in previous evaluations.*
- (c) Receive draft performance reviews to provide feedback before the evaluator finalizes the report.*
- (e) Review the annual fiscal and performance audits and evaluations.*

Section 4B is where the act sets the requirement of the annual evaluation. It states:

B. Annual Program Evaluation: Annual independent program evaluations pursuant to Section 3(C) shall include performance analysis and evidence that policing and violence prevention / intervention programs and strategies are progressing toward the desired outcomes. Evaluations will consider whether programs and strategies are achieving reductions in community violence and serving those at the highest risk. Short-term successes achieved by these strategies and long-term desired outcomes will be considered in the program evaluations.

In November 2016 the City Council approved Resolution No. 86487 C.M.S. which authorized contracts with Mathematica Policy Research to perform the Oakland Unite evaluation and with Resource Development Associates (RDA) to perform the evaluation of the Oakland Police Department Measure Z geographic and community policing services.

ANALYSIS AND POLICY ALTERNATIVES

The evaluation of Measure Z-funded violence intervention services and of Measure Z-funded geographic and community policing services will inform the City and other stakeholders about the impact of those services and strategies. The City will collaborate with State and County partners, such as Alameda County Probation and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation to establish agreements regarding their participation in the data portion of Measure Z evaluation activities. Such agreements will allow those agencies to share data necessary for the evaluation with the evaluation contractors.

The agreements will outline the roles of each partner in the evaluation, and will specify the precautions the evaluator will take to ensure the safety and confidentiality of all data shared. Individual-level data will **not** be shared with the City through any of these agreements. The

evaluators will use data from relevant partners to determine aggregate outcomes related to Measure Z participants, such as recidivism. Evaluation findings will be shared with the City and other stakeholders to guide decision-making about how to best allocate Measure Z resources to reduce violence in Oakland.

This authorization to enter into these MOUs will be in effect for the entire length of Measure Z even when the Measure Z evaluator contracts are up for renewals. This is because these types of MOU agreements are necessary regardless of the evaluator in order for the City to get evaluations that factor in as many data points as possible for Measure Z clients. Staff will work with the City Attorney's Office for each MOU to ensure that language is written in that allows the City or the State or County partner to terminate the MOUs for any reason with proper notice.

FISCAL IMPACT

This authorization to enter into MOUs will not cause fiscal impacts.

PUBLIC OUTREACH / INTEREST

No public outreach was required outside of the City's standard noticing process.

COORDINATION

The Office of the City Attorney for this report reviewed this report and the accompanying resolution.

SUSTAINABLE OPPORTUNITIES

Economic: No economic opportunities have been identified.

Environmental: No environmental opportunities have been identified.

Social Equity: The Safety and Services Act provides services to community members at highest risk of violence in order to provide increased opportunities. The Act also emphasizes community policing and violent crime reduction. The evaluation services provide data to assist in future funding decisions for valuable Measure Z funds.

ACTION REQUIRED BY THE COUNCIL

Staff Recommends That The City Council Adopt A Resolution Authorizing The City Administrator To Enter Into Memorandums Of Understanding (MOUs) Or Agreements With Alameda County And State Agencies As Needed Related To The Safety and Services Act (Measure Z) Evaluation To Enable The Evaluation Contractors To Receive Data From These Agencies To Support Measure Z Evaluation Goals.

For questions regarding this report, please contact Chantal Cotton Gaines, at (510) 238-7587.

Respectfully submitted,



CHANTAL COTTON GAINES
Assistant to the City Administrator

ATTACHMENTS (1):

- A. Evaluation RFP Scope of Services

FILED
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
OAKLAND

2017 JUN -1 PM 5:13

Approved as to Form and Legality

DRAFT

Oakland City Attorney's Office

OAKLAND CITY COUNCIL

Resolution No. _____ C.M.S.

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR TO ENTER INTO MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING (MOUS) OR AGREEMENTS WITH ALAMEDA COUNTY AND STATE AGENCIES AS NEEDED RELATED TO THE SAFETY AND SERVICES ACT (MEASURE Z) EVALUATION TO ENABLE THE EVALUATION CONTRACTORS TO RECEIVE DATA FROM THESE AGENCIES TO SUPPORT MEASURE Z EVALUATION GOALS.

WHEREAS, in July 2014 the City Council adopted Resolution No. 85149 C.M.S., which sent the "Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act of 2014" which became known as "Measure Z" on the to the November 4, 2014 General Municipal Election ballot; and

WHEREAS, the City of Oakland voters passed Measure Z, the 2014 Oakland Public Safety and Services Violence Prevention Act ("Measure Z"), in November 2014, approving a series of taxes for a period of 10 years to support violence intervention objectives, including programs and services that provide support for at-risk youth and young adults to interrupt the cycle of violence and recidivism, and for youth and young adults at highest risk of violence as guided by data analysis; and

WHEREAS, the Safety and Services Act creates the Safety and Services Oversight Commission (SSOC) to evaluate, inquire, and review the administration, coordination, and evaluation of strategies and practices mandated by the Act; and

WHEREAS, the measure requires that 3 percent of total revenue be taken first before all other allocations and that the 3 percent be used for evaluation and audit services, support to the oversight commission, and staff related to those functions; and

WHEREAS, The Safety and Services Act Section 4B requires an annual independent program evaluation which shall include: 1) performance analysis and evidence that policing and violence prevention intervention programs and strategies are progressing toward the desired outcomes; and 2) an analysis as to whether programs and strategies are achieving reductions in community violence and serving those at the highest risk; and

WHEREAS, staff conducted a Request for Proposals (RFP) process, with a scope of work created and approved by the SSOC, and advertised in the East Bay Times (Oakland Tribune), on iSupplier, and sent out via various listservs in the City, and received three bids; and

WHEREAS, City Council approved evaluation contracts in November 2016 through Resolution 86487 C.M.S.; and

WHEREAS, the City wishes to enter into Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with Alameda County and various state agencies to facilitate the creation of data-sharing agreements in order to fulfill the goals of the Measure Z evaluation; and

WHEREAS, such MOUs will outline the roles of each partner in the data portion of the evaluation, and will specify the precautions the evaluator will take to ensure the safety and confidentiality of all data shared; and

WHEREAS, evaluation findings will be shared with the City and other stakeholders to guide decision-making about how to best allocate Measure Z resources to reduce violence in Oakland; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the City Administrator is authorized to complete all required negotiations, certifications, assurances, and documentation required to execute, modify, extend, and/or amend MOUs with State and County partners necessary for the evaluation contractors to be able to receive data from such partners necessary for the evaluation, without returning to Council, for the length of the Measure Z legislation; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, That in accordance with Article IV, Section 401(6) of the City Charter, the MOUs authorized by this resolution shall be approved by as to form and legality before execution, and a copy of the fully executed agreements shall be placed on file with the Office of the City Clerk.

IN COUNCIL, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, _____

PASSED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES- BROOKS, CAMPBELL WASHINGTON, GALLO, GIBSON MCELHANEY, GUILLEN, KALB, KAPLAN, AND PRESIDENT REID

NOES-

ABSENT-

ABSTENTION-

ATTEST:

LATONDA SIMMONS
City Clerk and Clerk of the Council of
the City of Oakland, California

ATTACHMENT A: Evaluation Services RFP Scope of Services

Below is the SSOC-approved Scope of Services for the 2015-2020 Measure Z evaluation. The SSOC primarily discussed the evaluation types and the required elements (questions for each type of evaluation) in the context of the overall timeline.

Evaluation Services**SCOPE OF SERVICES**

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

Budget and Budget Narrative

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

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

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

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

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

While proposers can bid on either the annual Oakland Unite (program and strategy level) evaluation AND the Oakland Geographic and Community Policing evaluation together OR one or the other, the total amount for these annual evaluations should not exceed \$327,984 for July 2016-December 2017 and should not exceed \$339,456 in January 2018-December 2018 (this equates to roughly 66 percent of total evaluation funds annually).

- Four-year comprehensive evaluation (only of some Oakland Unite programs): this four year evaluation should not exceed \$172,500 annually for a total of \$690,000 over four

years. Proposers interested in bidding on this evaluation should still reflect their costs in annual terms.

The annual Oakland Unite evaluation and the four-year evaluation should be linked in some meaningful way.

External Evaluation Overview

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

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

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

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

1. Evaluation of the Human Services Department (HSD) Oakland Unite community-focused violence prevention/intervention services funded by Oakland Unite. Evaluation of these services will include:
 - a. Program and strategy level evaluation (annual with a mid-year and Fall time annual report)
 - b. Comprehensive, larger study of key programs (four-year evaluation)

2. Evaluation of the Oakland Police Department (OPD) services funded by Measure Z (excluding the Ceasefire strategy). Evaluation of these services will include:
 - a. Geographic policing and crime reduction team evaluation (annual)
 - b. Community policing services evaluation (annual)

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

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

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

Evaluation Content

Purpose

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

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

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

Timeline and Design

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

The proposer(s) will propose the evaluation design based on their expertise in what is most effective to provide the most useful data to local decision makers. The City will work with the selected contractor to determine the best metrics to evaluate for the design of each of the types of evaluations listed below. Not all programs can be evaluated in terms of recidivism, but if this metric is chosen for some program evaluation, please note that the City prefers the use of the

Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) definition. This definition can be found in the Definition section of this RFP. Additionally, the City prefers for an evaluator to use a Results-Based Accountability (RBA) structure if possible. The RBA definition is also in the Definitions section of this RFP.

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

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

Proposers can bid on either: (1) only the annual evaluation (for program and strategy level evaluations), (2) only on the comprehensive evaluation, or (3) on both of these evaluation types. The City will prioritize having different evaluators for each study, however, is willing to review proposals which include both evaluations in the proposed scope. The specific evaluation design will slightly vary for each evaluation; particularly around the metric used for the evaluation. The City will work with the selected contractor to develop report timeframes to coincide with the milestone timeline attached in (*Attachment E*). The City would benefit from two (2) reports per year.

Geographic Policing Services

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

1. Geographic policing and crime reduction team evaluation - this evaluation would look at the Crime Reduction Teams (CRTs) in each of the five (5) police areas and investigate questions as stated in the “Required Elements for Geographic Policing and Community Policing Evaluation” subsection below. This evaluation will not address Ceasefire. This

evaluation would occur annually with no more than one (1) year worth of data evaluated each time.

2. Community policing services evaluation - this evaluation would look at the Community Resource Officers (CROs) throughout the city and investigate questions as stated in the “Required Elements for Geographic Policing and Community Policing Evaluation” subsection below. This evaluation would occur annually with no more than one (1) year worth of data evaluated each time.

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

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

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

1. Program level evaluation (annual 1-year evaluations as a mid-year report) -
 - Are the programs and strategies serving those at highest risk?
 - How are the identified highest risk participants served?
 - Did programs meet all of their deliverables and provide the service in the way they stated they would?
 - What is the actual acceptance rate of new clients versus those referred to and applied to the program but was not accepted? (This investigates the work being done at the agency going beyond the work of simply filling out a Victims of Crime (VOC) form).
 - What are the program outcome goals and are they measurable? (were the target levels of performance met)?
 - What are the strengths and challenges of those served?
 - How did programs support/develop client strengths and address client challenges?
 - Are the programs progressing towards desired outcomes?
 - Measurement of client satisfaction and engagement. Conduct exit surveys to assess if clients have advanced in some way (resume development, housing attainment, relationship building, etc.).
 - What are client retention levels? Does retention vary by risk level? Supply narratives of providers and clients on factors that affect or end retention.
 - How are the families of the clients engaged/integrated into the client’s program?
 - What are the opportunities to strengthen and increase client involvement and satisfaction?
 - What additional supports do programs need to be successful and how would the program need to be restructured to maximize impact?
 - If possible, client tracking across programs: how many programs are touching the same targeted individuals?

SSOC Approved – Measure Z 2015-2020 Evaluation Scope of Services

- How are programs helping clients transition out of intensive support programs? (Achieving self-determination and self-sufficiency)

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

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

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

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

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

- To what extent have Measure Z programs decreased violence and crime in Oakland? To what extent can Measure Z Community-Focused Violence Prevention services be credited with decreases in shootings, assaults, or family violence? To what extent does Measure Z decrease truancy, recidivism, and other negative indicators among the general Oakland youth population?
- What has been the relative impact on violence between different programs and different strategies? The evaluation should provide a variable violence prevention / intervention gauge by which programs and strategies can be measured for assessing impact.
- Do Measure Z-funded programs show better results among some populations than among others?
- If the program was also funded by Measure Y, review how the program performance relates to the specific Measure Z objectives.

Methodology Guidelines

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

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

Required Elements for Geographic Policing and Community Policing Evaluation

Annual Evaluation of Geographic and Community Policing Services

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

1. Geographic policing and crime reduction team evaluation -

- How are Community Resource Officers (CROs) chosen? How does OPD train CRO officers for their work?
- How are Crime Reduction Team (CRT) members chosen? How does OPD train CRT officers for their work?
- What work are the CRTs performing and how is it determined and prioritized?
- What is the success rate of the CRTs projects? Are some CRTs doing a better job than others in implementing violence reduction efforts?
- How do CRTs compare to national best practice standards?
- How do Area-based CRTs interact with the Ceasefire strategy CRT teams?
- How much does interdepartmental collaboration affect the CRT and CRO project outcomes? Does that affect the violence reduction outcomes?
- How does the CRT model compare to national targeted, crime reduction team models?
- How many officers participate in procedural justice training and what are the outcomes after the training?
- Evaluate client satisfaction with the police department to assess community policing. This could be a survey or another tool.

2. Community policing services evaluation --

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

Methodology Guidelines

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

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

Definitions

- Recidivism: A subsequent criminal adjudication/conviction while on probation or parole supervision. (source: based on the CPOC definition). (The City will discuss this definition further with the chosen evaluator).
- Results-based Accountability: implies that expected results (also known as goals) are clearly articulated, and that data are regularly collected and reported to address questions of whether results have been achieved. (source: Harvard Family Research Project).

- Highest risk: Cohorts of youth and young adults who are 1) Directly impacted by violence, and/or 2) Most likely to be involved in perpetuating violence. (source: Human Services Department).
- Procedural justice: the idea that how individuals regard the justice system is tied more to the perceived fairness of the *process* and how they were treated rather than to the perceived fairness of the *outcome*. (source: U.S. Department of Justice).
- Cultural competency: A set of congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency, or among professionals that enables effective work in cross-cultural situations. (source: HRSA).
- VOC: This is a benefits application for victims of crime. It is managed through California Victim Compensation Program which is a program of the Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board. More information available online at: http://www.vcgcb.ca.gov/docs/forms/victims/apps/victimcompensationapp_eng.pdf