MINUTES OF
NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION
MEETING

HELD ON AUGUST 24, 2017

James Walsh, Deputy Commissioner
Adult Programs and Community Partnerships
AVA RICE: Good morning. My name is Assistant Commissioner Ava Rice of Contract and Procurement, and this is a Pre Pre-Conference, Proposal Conference, Request for Proposal for Procurement Title, Individual Corrections Achievement Network (I-CAN). E-PIN: 0721710001.

The New York City Department of Correction, DOC, is committed to providing comprehensive reentry services to all men and women in DOC custody. DOC's reentry services are designed to address the unique needs of the incarcerated individuals and to promote long-term success and stability.

The Individualized Corrections Achievement Network, (I-CAN), is one of DOC's key reentry initiatives providing skill building and discharge preparation services to inmates during their incarceration and after their release.
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This Pre Pre-Proposal Conference is for the purpose of providing additional information, background, and to address questions and concerns. In the room are from DOC:

JAMES WALSH: My name is Jim Walsh. I'm the Deputy Commissioner for Adult Programming.

When we go around asking, we would like to know who you are and who you represent, and how you found out about the conference. If you could let us know that too.

JENNIFER GEILING: Jennifer Geiling from the Mayor's Office, Contract Services.

ARZIKI PHENYO: Hi. My name is Arziki Phenyo. I am the director of The Stimulus Effect. We're an educational services provider here in the city. We would be new to this program, new to this space.

How did we find out? I guess I just learned a few minutes ago. I
believe we were on the
prequalification list, and we
received the information for the
draft RFP. So we're definitely
interested.

AVA RICE: If I could interject,
most of the defenders are on a
prequalified list. That's through
the Mayor's Office, Contract
Services.

I also want to reiterate that
everyone that speaks, please state
your name and the name of your
organization. And if you have a
difficult name, please spell it.

This is being recorded via a
stenographer.

JENNIFER SOREL: I'm Jennifer
Sorel, and I am with the Mayor's
Office of Contract Services.

PHILLIP INTATANO: Phillip
Intatano With the Department of
Corrections, Contract Manager

CAMERON SUTTON, JR.: Cameron
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Sutton, Jr., Senior Contract Manager,
Central Office of Procurement as well.

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: Hi. I'm Susan Gottesfeld, the Osborne Association, and we received an invitation.

RICH KLEIN: I'm Rich Klein from the Fortune Society. We were informed by our contacts at Robinhood Foundation about this particular meeting today.

CARLO DiFAVA: Carlo DiFava, Deputy Agency Chief Contracting Officer at the Department of Correction.


DARRIN BROWN: Darrin Brown, with an "I," Osborne Association, currently running the I-CAN contract.

PHIL TERWIEL: Phil Terwiel, Assistant Commissioner, Adult Programs, DOC. That's T-E-R-W-I-E-L.

VALERIE GREISOAH: Valerie Greisoah, Acting Assistant Commissioner, Adult Programs. Greisoah is G-R-E-I-S-O-A-H.

KIMBERLY JONES: Kimberly Jones, Program Associate, Adult Programming, DOC.

KIMBERLY YOUMANS: Kimberly Youmans for the program. (Inaudible)

LACYANN DUNKLEY: Lacyann Dunkley, Contract (Inaudible).

ELIZABETH BRUNBAUER: Elizabeth Brunbauer from America Works.

JENNIFER GEILING: How did you hear about this?

MS. GRUNBAUER: We were on the qualifying list.

AVA RICE: So good morning to all and those that are joining us via the conference call. Please remember
to speak up. None of us are shy, but please state your name and the name of your organization every time you speak.

JIM WALSH: I just wanted to take a couple of minutes to kind of go over a quick history of what got us here today just to give you some context and perspective for those that are not familiar with what we're doing.

In 2015, Commissioner Pont developed, in collaboration with a lot of staff in the ADC a 14 point reform agenda designed to reduce the violence in the institutions. To keep part of that reform agenda was offering programming, five hours of programming, to the adults and the young adults and the adolescents.

My responsibility is to the approximately 8,000 adults. And over the course of the last two years, we have been -- we developed and are in
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the process of implementing our
program plan to offer five hours of
programming to adults. Osborne and
Fortune have been key program
providers in our system since I got
here.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER VIA TELEPHONE:
(Inaudible)

JENNIFER GEILING: How did you
hear about the conference today?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER VIA TELEPHONE:
It was E-mailed to me by Erica Ford,
and then (inaudible) into
conferencing.

JIM WALSH: Our program plan
real simply involves half of our
five-hour programming being offered
by community providers, and half of
our programming would be being
offered by DOC staff.

For the two and a half hour
programming they're looking for
community providers which was really
designed to address the reasons
people come to prison, to identify what their needs are, to provide for their needs in the institution, and to have a mechanism for them to connect with providers upon release.

Our programming that we do, we kind of categorize it more as the idle time reduction, more recreation activities both outside and inside the facilities, more work with counselors, and that's where we are. We're ready to go a full five hours of programming.

That's some real high overview of where we're at in terms of the program plan. We have a couple of new people joining us. If they could identify themselves and who you represent.

DUSTIN BECKER: I'm Dustin Becker from America Works.

PARKER KRASNEY: Parker Krasney.

I'm with the Mayor's office.

JENNIFER GEILING: Jennifer
Geiling. I'm here with the Mayor's office of Contract Services, and our office oversees city procurement.

There's about $15 billion worth of procurement that comes through our office every year. $5 billion of that is the human service sector.

Did someone just join?

So we oversee all of that, and we oversee their relationships with our vendors and our providers who are important partners in delivering all of the services that impact New York City communities. Some of the tools that the Mayor's Office of Contract Services used to facility procurement include HHS Accelerator, which we're all familiar with here. And my colleague Jen Sorel is here, an expert in Accelerator.

And we also have a new tool that has just rolled out on August 1st called Passport. Hopefully both the providers and the DOC folks in the
room have heard of Passport. But
Bendex is now online. No more paper
Bendex. And performance evaluations
are happening as well through
Passport.

The intention is that eventually
all of the city's procurement will go
through the Passport platform. So
the other 10 million that doesn't
happen through Accelerator will
certainly go through Passport.

And the third tool that the
Mayor's office is managing is called
the Nonprofit Resiliency Committee.
That's what brings us all here today.

The Resiliency Committee was
launched by Mayor de Blasio in
September of 2016. It is launched in
collaboration with the nonprofit
human service sector. So we've
partnered with over 70 nonprofits and
coalitions as well as some
foundations to identify ways that we
can streamline administrative
processes, collaborate together around program and service design, and build organizational infrastructure.

The committee is co-chaired by Deputy Mayor Buery and Deputy Mayor de Blasio, and we work together to change policy and practices and help create an environment that allows for more sustainable and resilient organizations.

I just want to shout out a couple of policy changes to providers who are here. As of July 1st, we have a new advanced recruitment policy. We are now moving fiscal (inaudible) to the digital space. All that documentation will be provided by providers through the document vault of Accelerator and shared with CPA firms and agencies.

We have new human service contracts that were revised and released July 1st, so you should be
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seeing those increased privacy protections for your organization as well as for your client. We streamlined a lot of them.

Then we have a collaborative communication handbook that is being released and is the foundation for this draft RFP process. So the providers came together through the Resiliency Committee and created a handbook that outlines ways that city agencies can work together with our nonprofit partners to develop RFPs, and obviously the programs that they facilitate in a more collaborative way where we are able to realize the intended outcomes and realize impact through our programs and services.

I want to thank the Department of Corrections for raising their hand to volunteer at this RFP as part of the first wave of our RFPs that will come through this collaborative process.
It's a very new approach for the city. We haven't really done this before. But as you all know, there was an RFP that was released. There was feedback. The Department of Corrections listened and took that feedback and revised the RFP. They issued a letter that indicates all the changes that they've made as a result of the feedback and also indicated questions and provided answers that came in through the first RFP.

And now we're here today to review a second draft of that RFP. So this is a draft, and we're all here together to work through where there might be questions around -- or we might be more clear around instructions or questions around design. And then we will circle back again, and eventually this will lead to a formal RFP.

So that's the context. You can
find out more about the resiliency committee at nyt.gov/nonprofit and then click the tab for nonprofit resiliency.

Carl, did you have anything?

CARL: No.

Anybody who dialed in, can they just state their name and organization. Is anybody on the line?

At this point we would open up the floor for any questions or concerns regarding what is in the RFP.

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: Susan Gottesfeld, the Osborne Association.

Can you just describe the payment structure, because I've seen its performance? I can't tell from this, and attachment F is not on the PDF or the hard copy document, and that's what's referred to as the payment document.

VALERIE GREISOAH: Valerie
So primarily servers will be primarily a cost-based budget performance structure, so we would be asking providers to submit an invoice once a month with their expenses based on parts of the budget.

Proposed lease services, there are targets which were revised in this version, and so providers are expected to reach the targets, submit an invoice based on the cost, OTBS, personnel costs, and different parts of the budget. And because it is performance based for the services, if the targets are met, then DOC would reimburse at a hundred percent. Then if targets are not met, then the reimbursement would match the level of performance.

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: This is Susan Gottesfeld from Osborne again. A follow-up question. How is this different than the
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previous structure with the penalty?

VALERIE GREISOAH: So two key changes. In a previous structure there were also financial penalties and that's something that's been taken out and replaced by a more corrective action process for anything that doesn't go according to the contract for services. That's the first change.

And the second is the timings themselves were revised.

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: Susan Gottesfeld again.

I did see everybody's targets, and I thank you for providing them. They make sense I think, so that's great. I mean I'll pose this as a question, but if you don't have a different answer, I will put it on the record as a statement.

The post-release service structure, even given your explanation, does not occur to me as
any different than a performance-based cost reimbursement contract, which was a major issue in the initial draft, and then they would make it very difficult to respond. It's something I hope we can continue to discuss here and now if that's appropriate or further thinking and then another conversation later.

You know, the difference is that in cost reimbursement, the provider has already incurred the expense, and being reimbursed, that a portion of an outcome is in effect the exact same thing as a performance-based penalty in a cost reimbursement contract. It makes it very, very risky financially to undertake it.

VALERIE GREISOAH: Our goal was to make this a performance-based contract, at least for the (inaudible) services, so that the reimbursement would match the level
By establishing targets very reasonable and achievable, and based on the research that we did to figure out what's achievable, we wanted to make sure that the reimbursement matches performance.

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: The suggestion that you would make to consider them is if you're going to have a performance-based portion of the contract structure, to have that be a milestone-based payment, like a unit-based payment rather than a payment based on a cost reimbursement, because cost reimbursement and performance-based are very different. And fundamentally when meshed together, they don't become a new thing. They just remain a cost-reimbursement contract, and now there's a penalty.

So instead of paying for -- instead of the payment being based on
a reimbursement of cost, have the payment be a true performance-based payment then for the community-based milestones and pay per outcome the way that the performance occurs now. It would make more sense, it would be clean, and it would actually be performance based, and what you're describing is not.

So that would just be a suggestion we would have to consider.

MR. WALSH: Can you do me a favor and use an example. Give me an example that illustrates what you're talking about.

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: Darrin is my director. He's on my staff. So I pay him every other week. That's our payment structure. And I pay the rent every month, and I buy supplies as they come in, and we pay for transportation for participants, et cetera, et cetera.

So I bill on the 20th of every
month. I already paid Darrin. I've already paid my rent. And if we don't meet performance for that month, and the performance payment -- which I can't even say it's a performance payment, because that's very confusing to call it that, but the payment would be based on a portion of what I've already spent.

Do you understand what I'm saying? Then I'm in the hole. That was the fundamental problem of the payment structure of the original RFP. That's what made it sort of impossible to respond to.

So I think if it were -- it just makes it so that you can never catch up or get even; right? If you fall behind, that is very, very difficult, and that's like the (inaudible) problem, right, the thing that brings organizations under.

So when you have a performance-based contract where it's
truly performance based and you're getting paid per outcome, which the outcomes can be any manner of things, it could be percentages, or units, or whatever, and the agency has the ability to negotiate the price of that outcome, we can manage our risk much more.

Say we don't make our payment for that month, and now I'm in debt; right? I have a budgetary debt in my organization. The solution -- there is no solution at that point, because the solution at that point -- sorry Darrin. I don't mean this for real. I could let Darrin go. I could let Darrin go to reduce -- I could let someone go to reduce my costs, or I could stop giving participants metro cards, or I could, I guess, default -- I could cut my costs somehow.

But if I only ever get paid back what I spent, that's the death
spiral; right? The hole just gets deeper and deeper, and that's what -- we spent a lot of time at the last RFP bidders conference talking about that. So I don't know what conversation could be helpful to really delineate it. There is a true real difference between a cost reimbursement model and a performance-based model.

And what you're describing is not performance-based, it's a cost reimbursement with a penalty. Still, that's the outcome. Does that make sense?

In that model we can't mitigate the risk. We can't project out to budget through a year in a way that we feel has some control over not ending in a deficit.

MR. WALSH: So instead of using Darrin as an example, let's use a target for an impost release and pick one. I'm trying to understand.
SUSAN GOTTESFELD: I will give you another example. So for a performance-based contract, maybe there's other organizations that disagree, would never project that we're going to get a hundred percent performance. So we would never budget to spend every possible dollar we could earn, because that would be a foolish thing to do. That's not good business sense.

So for intakes, we have a target of a hundred intakes a month, and we get paid $10 an intake. So we'll get a thousand bucks a month for intakes. We would make sure that our staff costs would not -- maybe they would be $990 a month. So that if we missed an intake that month, we're still okay. We can still pay our staff, we can still pay the rent, and then we can plan for the next month. We're going to try to get 11 or 12, but we're not in trouble right now.
Does that make sense?

MR. WALSH: Are you saying that you want to be paid her intake?

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: Yes. We would much rather be paid per intake than be paid back a portion of what we've already spent.

MR. WALSH: So what we're saying is here's what we think is a reasonable number of intakes that should be done, and I think there's also an opportunity to collaborate on that number and say is this a reasonable number or not.

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: Sure.

MR. WALSH: So is that the difference?

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: That's the difference.

MR. WALSH: You do a hundred and you get paid the full amount. You do 80, you will get 80 percent. You want to be paid for every one that you do.
SUSAN GOTTESFELD: I mean per one is probably the simplest way to do it, and it allows a negotiation for the price per intake rather than just -- the major difference between performance is that you're paid for outcomes, and cost reimbursement is just -- you're paid back what you spent.

In any situation where an organization has a real possibility of only getting paid back a portion of what they've already spent, and there's no cost control mechanism, because spending less doesn't earn you any more, there is a problem there.

So of course there's going to be performance-based. We'd rather be paid per thing, milestone per unit, and negotiate with the Department what a reasonable cost -- price for that unit would be. That would make sense. That is performance based.
Ronald Day: I'm Ronald Day from Fortune Society.

If we had already placed 90 participants into employment, the Fortune Society, or Osborne, with a contract of 2.5 million, then that would be considered reasonable because it was already done with this particular clientele in these particular circumstances.

The research doesn't necessarily talk about people in this particular -- you can talk to them and say well, we work with people that are released from Rikers, for example, but under different context, for example.

So Osborne and Fortune -- if it was already 90 people that were being replaced for 2.5 million, and 80 people that were already being housed, or even similarly, then an argument could be made that that's reasonable.
What we're saying here is that -- is it reasonable, and then the payment is based upon achieving all the different milestones. I think that's the point that Susan is making. It's not you miss a payment in employment, and you miss a payment in housing, because you haven't met those milestones, and you miss payment in some other milestone as well, then it's just compounded, the amount of reimbursement.

VALERIE GREISOAH: Did someone just join?

PATRICIA CONNELLY: Patricia Connelly, Maxximus.

VALERIE GREISOAH: Thank you. I just wanted to mention that in terms of achieving targets, we really did focus on what's achievable for the individuals that we serve and set that are relatively low.

In other words, if what we found is that it was reasonable to have two
job placements or five job placements per month, we actually said that revised targets would be very reasonable.

So if we said that generally speaking we can expect five, we actually started at three. So our anticipation is that if all the steps are put in place to achieve job placements, the actual achievement would be way above target. And so it's our expectation that with the right steps in place, those targets would be achievable, and there wouldn't be a financial consequence.

And then the other thing I wanted to mention is that the RFP in great part builds on the lessons learned from the current I-CAN contract. And so we have milestones (inaudible) contract currently, and we've run into some issues with that to assert targets or performance levels not being met. That's part of
I'm sorry. Did someone just join by phone?

MELISSA WOTTON: I'm Melissa Wotton from American Works. I tried to join in earlier, but I had trouble and had to call back a couple of times. It's been okay so far.

ARZIKI PHENYO: Arziki Phenyo from the Stimulus Effect.

What I was wondering is is there opportunity for latitude in terms of kind of differentiating or kind of individualizing services that are provided, the different individuals, because it's a lot easier to meet those targets, and maybe somebody who needs more behavioral support or even academic, would we be able to kind of restructure, recalibrate?

And if there were additional costs there, would that be reimbursed to make sure that the targets, reasonable targets that we
collaborate on, are met? I mean from the outside, being an educational service provider, we know from working with adults and kids. If he wants somebody to graduate, he wants somebody to pass this test, it's a lot easier if they get help with this, or they get help with concentration, or they get output for basic skills.

Would we be able to kind of recalibrate that? And again, would we be able to be reimbursed for maybe additional services or supports that are provided towards helping them meet those goals.

VALERIE GREISOAH: We absolutely welcome ideas and trust expertise in our organizations. RFP sets the general framework.

For example, we'd like the providers to have work ready in a flash, but then it's up to the provider to figure out and welcome
ideas on how to structure that.
Absolutely.

DUSTIN BECKER: Dustin Becker from America Works.

You mentioned that there's some concerns from the current system, milestone-based opinions. Could you maybe sort of elaborate on that so that we could perhaps discuss and address some of those concerns in this case?

VALERIE GREISOAH: Just around target. We wanted to, as an organization, set targets around what we wanted to achieve for the population, that a certain number of them get help with housing, jobs. We wanted to make sure that this RFP enables us to meet our goals with respect to those kinds of outcomes.

DUSTIN BECKER: Okay. But milestones could potentially be set to address those specific concerns, the specific outcomes that the DOC
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would like to see.

VALERIE GREISOAH: That was our intent for the current RFP, and I guess we've struggled to reach targets, or there were no targets, so I can't really say we didn't reach them. But because it was focused on milestones, and there were no targets, we couldn't really say targets were met or not met.

It's a little hard to measure performance when you don't know what the high level of performance or the low level of performance was. You don't know what you're aiming towards.

DARRIN BROWN: Darrin Brown from Osborne.

I want to like comment on that part, especially about meeting the performance. How will DOC identify the discharged individuals, and what tool will be used? It says moderate to high risk. In order to meet
performance -- in order to meet those performance targets, we would need to know or have good discharge data for the DOV. How are we going to move forward with that?

VALERIE GREISOAH: Moving forward, we'll be sending a list of all individuals who are being discharged daily. We're putting that progress in place. So all of our partners will have a daily list of individuals being discharged.

DARRIN BROWN: That would be done on a time basis?

VALERIE GREISOAH: It will be automatic, sent from DOC daily.

DARRIN BROWN: Another thing talks about units of service in five hours of grouping per unit. How will DOC account also for the contractors to be able to do administrative as well as other paper work that relates to collecting that data so that we can get rid of -- specifically say
this is performance-based things we've met?

VALERIE GREISOAH: So given that most groups would be groups for five hours, and you will also have an hour lunch, or everyone will have an hour lunch, that leaves two hours in a day to prepare for class, to enter attendance outcomes, and we won't be asking for too much paperwork. We're just asking for daily attendance at the end of the day. So I don't see that taking too long.

DARRIN BROWN: That accounts for the administrative paperwork. It's about five staff, five units. We're also accounting for those vacation times, sick times, and the other things that come into play.

VALERIE GREISOAH: Absolutely. So in the budget we've accounted for a floater so that there's someone available if there's sick time or vacation time.
DARRIN BROWN: Is that a floater per facility?

VALERIE GREISOAH: Per number of staff.

DARRIN BROWN: What would that number be?

VALERIE GREISOAH: I will have to get back to you.

ARZIKI PHENYO: This is Arziki Phenyo again from the Stimulus Effect.

Just tagging along on Darrin's earlier question about the data that would be released about the different individuals, what would be included in there, what kind information is in that day, and would providers be able to, if needed, conduct like pre-assessments to really be able to know exactly what their needs are, and people would tailor it, and could that be budgeted for.

I'd like to get a little more information about what the assessment
process would be so we can know exactly what the needs are for the individuals.

VALERIE GREISOAH: Absolutely. So the discharge information will be basic information about who the person is, so name, booking case, date of discharge. It would be information to help you know who got released, when and how to reach out to them.

Conducting previous assessments is part of the program, part of the contract. Our providers will have time during groups and during other times to do the one-on-one assessments.

MR. WALSH: Responding to Susan's question again, I'm really trying to get a handle on the two approaches, and this is kind of thinking out loud.

So in one approach what we're proposing -- we're saying this is
what we'd like our partners to do, and this is reasonable in our mind.

The other approach, what you do is really determined by you; right? If you do five intakes, you do five. if you do a hundred, you do a hundred; right? Is that accurate?

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: That's accurate. I don't know where you're going with this.

MR. WALSH: I'm just trying to understand the difference between the two concepts. We're saying what --

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: It's the payment part. It's not the production of the work part, it's the mechanism of payments that is the issue.

So I think, just to close that gap, there are no -- there are lots of things to do and outcomes to seek, but there are no targets currently attached to any of those things. And I think we're perfectly fine with
having targets, numbers attached to these goals, particularly in the community, because that is on us, right, to be serving people. And the environment is -- we're not in a jail. It's within our control and you know, we have -- it's within our control, and we have control over that environment.

I think the targets, the revised targets are fine actually. So it's -- there's no issue with having targets. It's the mechanism of payment and the compounding of the two ideas of cost reimbursement and performance-based payments that is problematic.

So when we are getting paid per unit, or in some city contracts, for example, we do have a percentage payment for a quarter.

So like if we have a no re-arrest goal, like 75 percent no re-arrest, which we have in some city
contracts, that goal has a unit cost attached to it.

So if we achieve that goal, we get paid this outcome, but we're not getting paid back what we already spent. For example, in the cost reimbursement, this is a good example of when this can be a problem.

When we have a vacancy, we will have a financial penalty for having a vacancy because we have a line we're not spending on while we're trying to hire someone. So if we -- say we get a hundred percent performance during that period, but we have two vacancies. You're still only going to pay us back what we've spent. We're not going to get a hundred percent payment. That's a problem.

If you set it up that way, contractually you'll have a very difficult time when that instance arises doing something other than that with us. I don't think you'd
want to penalize us financially for performing a hundred percent because we have a vacancy, or because we have somebody on maternity leave, or on SMLA, or something like that, and we're not paying on that line right now.

So when you set your cost reimbursement, you can only pay us back what we've spent, right, even though we're giving 100 percent performance?

I don't know if MOCS can help explain the difference, because I'm really trying.

MR. WALSH: If you keep the hundred percent, even with the vacancies, you get full reimbursement.

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: Not the way you're explaining your payment. You're explaining a cost reimbursement payment.

MR. WALSH: Relating to the
SUSAN GOTTESFELD: Right. So if I'm spending -- if I have a budget -- two budget lines that are $100 each, one of people is missing this month, so I've only spent $100. I reached my maximum target, and you say I'm going to pay you back everything you spent that month, you're paying me $100 that month.

So you're going to end up at the end of the year paying me less than the full contract, even though I've conformed to the maximum. Is this unfair? And that's the setup of this.

MR. WALSH: That part I'm not following.

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: Can anyone else help explain this? We can also talk about it later or some other time. But that's the situation in which I think -- which doesn't match your intention, I think, when we have
a vacancy or we've underspent
supplies that month, or whatever.

PHILLIP TERWIEL: I think you
can differentiate between outcomes
and outputs. And if you have a
simple system where you get paid for
both the number of birth
certificates, outcome, the number of
employment, the number of people
placed in jobs, outcome, and you
simply say you get paid a certain
amount for each, it's very possible
that a provider opted to go very
heavy on the birth certificates,
right, because you get paid a certain
amount and very low on the outcome of
the placement; right?

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: There's no
number of birth certificates that
would equal a job placement payment.

PHILLIP TERWIEL: I think that
under the structure we lay out in the
RFP there's a greater likelihood that
some of the outcomes are actually
achieved over the outputs.

If you have a combination of the two, then often times providers are inclined to lean more heavily into the outputs, and lean lower on the outcomes. I think that's one of the things we are trying to avoid.

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: I get that point and I think that it's really good to incentivize and -- for funders to incentivize the outcomes that are most relevant to the success of the human beings we're serving, and I would not argue with that at all.

So I get that and I wouldn't have any issue with a performance-based structure that incentivizes the outcomes that are the real meaning of the work. I think that's fine. What I'm suggesting is that what you're suggesting now is still a cost reimbursement with a performance
penalty, and I'm asking you to think a little more maybe about how that could be done as a pure performance.

I think it could be structured in a way certainly to incentivize job placements over birth certificates. You could just like not pay for birth certificates. I don't know. You don't have to pay -- you don't have to have a milestone for every little bitty piece of work.

If you're trying to place someone in a job and they don't have a birth certificate or an ID, and the thing you're getting paid for is the job placement, you're going to get a birth certificate and an ID for them.

We do lots of things we don't get paid for, because you don't have to get paid for every little itty bit along the way for the big outcome. You can just get paid for the big outcome.

So I don't know. Don't have
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birth certificates be a payable outcome. That's fine. I don't see that suggested. The suggestions for community-based outcomes I see are few, and they are the main goal. They're the housing, they're the biggies, and that's the right way to structure a contract. It's the way you're suggesting to pay them that I'm asking you to rethink. That's it.

MR. WALSH: So this is probably not new territory in New York City that these approaches suck. Like I said at our last meeting, I would like to find out what the thinking is on the approaches with nonprofits.

And if there's somebody from the Mayor's office who can help us and say this the direction we're going, and this is the preferred way, I would love to hear that. Like Valerie says, we have some experience. We're trying to learn
from our experience and do what we think is best.

If that's not an approach that work for nonprofits and our experts agree, then we'll certainly look at it. I don't know who --

JENNIFER GEILING: So this is Jennifer Geiling from the Mayor's office.

So there is -- so first of all, let me just say that I appreciate the openness of the Department of Corrections and coming here, and I appreciate providers taking the time to explain, because this is a complicated subject matter, and it's hard to grasp.

And performance-based contracting presents itself in a variety of different ways. We're throwing out output, we're throwing out outcomes.

This is a trend right now in looking at performance-based
contracting where you're paying based on -- ideally based on outcomes. But then going back, maybe on outputs and then even on milestones.

There is a working group right now, as part of the nonprofit resiliency committee that they included the ACS, MOC J, and a number of providers that have actually started to put together a blueprint for how to structure performance-based contracting from both the milestone output/outcome perspective as well as from the payment perspective.

It's not a unique conversation to have providers want to discuss line item payments for milestone performance-based contracts because the underlying philosophy with the performance-based is that you're getting that north star, that outcome out there.

So you're paying for that
outcome, and it allows a little bit of flexibility on the provider's side to reach that outcome and realize those goals. Then everybody wins, when those goals are realized.

So one recommendation would be to continue this conversation in another setting where I could have some of the folks who are involved with the performance-based contracting join, or I can bring those materials, and we can talk through it in that setting. But it is a conversation that's happening, and it is an initiative that is coming through the nonprofit resiliency committee.

RONALD DAY: Ronald Day from Fortune Society.

Often times with contracting the organization looks at the RFP and says, as Susan alluded to earlier, that we can build a budget based upon knowing that we will achieve "X"
amount of milestones across the board.

What this particular RFP does is it -- and we have to build the staffing structure based on that.

What this RPF does is it says here's the staffing structure. This is what you have to work with. Here is a hybrid model, because it's (inaudible) in one instance, and then it's performance on another instance. But it tells you this is who you hire; right?

So it takes away the organization's capacity to say I can serve this number of people. It might be in the contract that you have to serve this number of people, but I can serve this number of people based upon this staffing level, not the staffing level as often.

I'll just give you one example. We have 16 people to enroll in this particular contract. You have 1,200
people, approximately, based upon a 75 percent ratio, who come to the community. You have 420 people that will receive community-based outcomes; right? So that's 35 percent, which is in that.

Just think about the data that's associated with all of that. So we have enrollment packets that need to go into the system for 1,600 people. We have data that needs to go into the system based upon all of these other milestones.

But this particular RFP envisions one data analyst. It's not possible to have one data analyst doing all of this work. It's not achievable, because when you have 1,600 documents, and then you have -- again, this happens on a daily basis, that all of these different milestones need to be achieved. One person, it's just not going to be possible.
So the organization could say, based upon the way the contract is generally structured, is I'm going to hire two people to do this work, because I know that that's what's necessary under the circumstances. So when you look at it, it's like you have nine group facilitators. I might need more than nine because this also talks about offering services on the weekend.

One of those facilitators is going to be a floater, is going to cover for whenever someone is out. But there's also going to be a time when on the weekend, those eight facilitators who were covering during the week, it's not likely that you're going to also have them covering on the weekends.

So we need to envision the situation where you might say these eight can cover 16 units, but not really. Because if you want
services -- unless you're going to
self contract, there's some ways that
you can do it, but it might not be
based upon the structure that the RFP
has because it tells you throw
everything in but the kitchen sink.
Then you're done with "X" amount of
dollars. The organization usually
has the capacity to determine how to
do this.

MR. WALSH: I think that's one
of the reasons we're having these
conversations today, that if that's a
problem, then we look at fixing that.
That's what we're here for.

But I think I would like to take
Jennifer up on her offer to bring
this other major issue to a group who
can advise us and say take the
nonprofit's perspective, take our
perspective and kind of help us out.

JENNIFER GEILING: There's risks
on both sides; right? There's risks
for the providers in that kind of a
model too. So to be clear, and I'm sure you all know, you're running a risk; right? If you don't reach those outcomes, then you're not going to get paid.

There's start-up costs. In the case of Osborne and Fortune, you've been in it already, so that's probably limited. But we do want to include -- there are opportunities in this RFP to have new providers come in as subcontracts or what have you.

So there are some inherent risks to the providers, and then there's obviously, as Jim said, some risks we take on the city side. But there are ways of contracting for it, and somewhat controlling for it, and acknowledging them and providing the flexibility so that the city can realize the goals that we're out there to realize.

Your guys, your missions are to realize these goals too.
DARRIN BROWN: I appreciate the opportunity to be able to do that related to the RFP. I'm going to ask that we also look at the current system, and the workflow, and the staffing patterns, and the number of services we provide, and how that's actually done as well.

Yes, five hours of unit service to one hour of administrative time, when we look at the RFP and think about the amount of administering that goes along with it, it's still not enough. All I need is one staff member to call out for one visit.

MR. WALSH: We're saying two hours left in the day.

DARRIN BROWN: Still not enough.

JENNIFER GEILING: So a piece of it too is the data and the technology that's required to perform under this contract.

So understanding -- helping us to understand what it is, as Jim
said, we're trying. This is the point of this conference, to understand what it is that are lifts for the providers that don't already exist. Make us aware if we've identified the payment and it seems like we've got an idea that -- how we might be able to talk about it a little bit more and get clarity.

But if there are other lists, this is the place. We have a flag there that seems to be a concern around the number of folks who are administrative processees.

Is there anything else? Is there something around the technology -- in the data technology system that needs to be addressed? So if there's -- besides the staffing component that's been raised to handle the administrative piece, is there something around technology, or is there another part of the administrative process?
DARRIN BROWN: Before I said moderate to high risk individuals. To service high risk and moderate participants, we would need to know who those individuals are. The ICP currently doesn't work that way to give us that information.

VALERIE GREISOAH: We revised that part of the RFP. So rather than focusing on moderate to high risk to continue the RFP (inaudible).

RONALD DAY: This is Ronald Day from Fortune.

I did note that, but it does still say that. It says it in the answers that that is going to change. But in the RFP, it still says in a draft moderate to high risk. So it would be good to remove that particular language.

I would add too insofar as the cost is concerned, the RFP contemplates that there will be a driver, for example, but there's no
driver on the budget. We have a vehicle where we can pick up clients, and that is an optimal goal for Fortune as well as for Osborne, bringing clients from Rikers to the community. But if you envision that happening, there should be a salary for a driver.

So there are costs that are not necessarily contemplated in the RFP. But if you imagine that, it just -- it can't happen through osmosis. There needs to be some funding for that particular person if you're going to have a driver.

DARRIN BROWN: Darrin Brown from Osborne Associates.

The draft says reduce the total numbers of readmission of pretrial and sentencing determined to be at a heightened risk of the customers.

If we service a house that is a house that -- a unit that has everybody serviced by (inaudible)
I'll give you an example of RMS.

We would need to be in those units to have discharge days and to be able to have our community staff have a transitional type process to be able to go into those houses predischarge to be able to work with them and set it up for them to come out.

If we're not in a discharge house, we can't do that. It says it's performance based in this RFP around what we do in the community with the participants. But we have to be able to contact them, have this relationship with them, and be able to transition and know who they are in order to accomplish their performance target.

And that requires some technical tools and ability to have accurate data, not just data. And if we have to filter that data ourselves, we're talking --
JENNIFER GEILING: Is there particular data, pieces of data; would that be helpful for you all to know? What is it exactly that you want, or is that what you think is necessary in order to execute on the obligations.

DARRIN BROWN: We have discharge reports now. But those discharge reports, everyone feels they're large.

In order for us to even like filter those individuals that are being discharged, we have to kind of like filter that data, which takes a tremendous amount of time.

Then we have to make contact with them, and that's usually after release. If we're making that contract through a transitional process between the community and JBS services, what happens is it becomes more productive, it becomes more streamlined, and we have an
opportunity to service more.

If we're doing it the other way after the fact, they're discharged and now we have -- that time it takes to do that requires more staff. It requires more ability to do the job. It requires more ability to do cold calls. It requires a lot more.

And those things are not in the contract or how we go about doing it. It means somebody is sitting on the phone and they call like 10 different houses. And after a while you find out that some of them are not the same address or phone.

JENNIFER GEILING: The recommendation is to be able to have contact before the discharge or before they leave the house.

DARRIN BROWN: As well as accurate data that states who they are and their contact.

JENNIFER GEILING: If you can be more specific, and if you want to
write it in on the field that you're looking for, I don't know anything about this. But if there's a way that wherever that data is housed, when it comes out in the report, it comes out in the six fields you need, then that would be helpful to know that it's a possibility.

DARRIN BROWN: As well, the RFP speaks of reducing it. If we're not using the ICP when we want to identify those individuals who are at high risk or moderate risk, then what tool are we going to use moving forward to be able to identify them?

That's the target at the end of that, which is the overgall goal of the RFP. And if we can't identify those individuals, you can take it out of the RFP, but if we don't find a way from a technical standpoint, we won't be able to identify those.

RONALD DAY: And I would add that the research does say that when...
you offer services to people that are low risk, it's actually counterproductive. So that's something we want to take into consideration.

I'm not saying that you don't offer services, but be very thoughtful about the services that are being offered. We don't want to end up going in reverse.

MR. WALSH: To that point, we're looking at things like that. One of the things that's under consideration that we proposed is housing by risk of recidivism and security level.

So we would like to put inmates together who are at low risk of recidivism and low security level, because what we do with that group should look different than the opposite end of the spectrum.

So we would like to go in that direction, but we have to go one step at a time in terms of getting our
programming in place, and then start
to do more of what really makes
sense.

You know, it's easy for me to
say we're going to do this. There
are a lot of other issues that make
it a little more difficult, but we've
identified that as something you
would like to do, and I proposed it,
and it's under consideration.

We recognize that and we're
going to get there one day.

RONALD DAY: I think just as
Jennifer said, it's worth having a
conversation about these issues that
continues, because when we talk about
responsivity of the individuals that
we're working with and their
criminogenic needs, it's going to be
really important, the point that you
made earlier about trying to
segregate individuals so that we end
up doing the work that we intended to
do.
MR. WALSH: Right.

RONALD DAY: Which is really important.

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: I'm backing up a little bit to where Ronald was talking about the driver, sort of maybe staff positions missing from the proposed plan in the RFP and just realizing that there will be plenty of things that you would have no way of knowing in terms of staffing structure and sort of not profit expenses.

I'm just wondering if it would be helpful if we shared some shared positions or the kind of costs that were -- that are not included currently or don't appear to be based on what's written in the RFP included in the thinking, if that would be helpful to sort of understanding a bigger picture of what our spending will end up looking like. Would that be -- because we can share some
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general things that are -- would go
into -- that do go and would go into
running the program aren't purely
direct service staffing; right?

VALERIE GREISOAH: We'll look at
the RFP again. Our intent was to
have a section for OTPS where we
would reimburse for metro cards and
care packages and the van. So the
positions are outlined.

We recognize there are many
other things that support the
operation.

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: Like a
portion of HR. Things that will be
helpful, we can share some of those
type of things.

VALERIE GREISOAH: I believe in
the RFP. I believe in that. We'll
doublecheck.

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: You can let
me know.

RONALD DAY: Another question
about the RFP is that a (inaudible)
warrants a further conversation is
the hiring and the firing,
particularly the firing. I know
we've worked closely with Valerie and
Billy on the hiring and don't have
any reservations about the process
that we put in place, which involves
doing MOC facilitation. But we talk
about individuals who -- in here it
says staff who don't serve on the
island also have to facilitate or do
some MOCS. I think that might have
been an error.

It said community-based staff,
and it mentioned all of the staff.
So that's something that might be
worth looking at again. But the
firing component, we've been working
with the New York City Commissioner
of Human Rights around this
particular issue, not just with
organizations that have to comply
(inaudible) but also with
organizations that are exempt, like
One thing we talked about previously, Susan brought it up, and there was a conversation about what happens in an instance where someone is fired and they feel that the organization is responsible?

Usually we would. We would be because we are the ones who make a termination decision. If DOC makes the decision to terminate, in the RFP it still says, and in the answers, that says the final is DOC, but you're not going to indemnify the organization.

So I think that that's something that's still worth having a conversation about. There could be a more collaborative approach about the actual termination so that the organization does not bear the brunt fully of lawsuits or what have you where they feel the staffers who were terminated, like it was unjustified,
unwarranted or illegal.

I think that's worth still communicating about.

MR. WALSH: I think that there's two parts to that issue. One is when something happens in a jail, that security basically is the issue. And they say to us this person can't work here anymore. That's one part. The other surrounds performance.

I don't know if you're talking about both parts of it, but we don't fire anybody. But we can say that they can't be on the Island anymore. And in the security instances, that's what happens.

And then there are investigations that then occur and, you know, decisions that are made on what happened. But the performance issues, I think we worked in language where there's going to be a lot of dialogue and consultation that includes bringing it to me in the end
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to see if this is valid where we're saying this person is a real problem for us, and we'd like you to address it. Didn't we put language in?

VALERIE GREISOAH: Yes.

MR. WALSH: If there are questions about what we'd like to do, they will come to the deputy commissioner.

RONALD DAY: I like what went into the RFP involving the corrective action plans which were not in there previously. And I'm talking less about security concerns and more about performance.

So it's a matter of -- sometimes there's a difference of opinion about something, and we can always deliberate about that. I think that Valerie -- I know you have been very fair about that in the past. I'll just say again, with the ultimate decision, it's like if you pull someone's pass, then the decision is
essentially made. It's happened when it's a security issue.

When it's an issue of performance, then this idea of doing a corrective action plan, having as much conversation as possible, insuring that the staff person is up to snuff, if you're going to put the person in a group, that was definitely something that was reasonable. That was changed.

I'm saying that ultimate decision, it sounds like -- is it that when you pull a person's past, that means that the person is fired? For us it doesn't mean that, because if this is a performance issue, it could be that wow, it's really difficult working on the Island. If you have staff that have gone out recently in an ambulance because of high blood pressure and because of other issues, it doesn't happen nearly as often in the community.
And sometimes when staff are working on the Island, as anyone in here knows, it could be very challenging. But they're working through it, and we applaud our staff, and the DOC does (inaudible) on a regular basis about this.

But just the differences I'm saying with respect to performance and that ultimate decision to terminate somebody.

MR. WALSH: We won't vote on a performance issue unless we've had discussions with the agreed-upon people. I mean I don't know what we'll do when there's still disagreement between myself and Susan or yourself. But at least we'll have a dialogue on what's going to happen.

Ultimately, I would imagine that it would be our decision. I don't know how else to do that, but I think those situations would be rare that there's that kind of a disagreement.
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on performance issues. If we end up talking about it and going through the documentation, I don't see those situations happening.

RONALD DAY: Let me just make one more point about that.

You said the differences could be that the person might not be performing as well on the Island, but if the person is fired, that means the person is jobless.

MR. WALSH: We don't fire them.

RONALD DAY: The RFP says that the person could be terminated by DOC.

So the point I'm making lastly is this, that if a person is not doing well on the Island performing, let's say the person could be a case manager in the community and the person is just not doing well covering groups, but the person is doing great with enrollment and so forth, you don't necessarily want to
lay the person off.

But if the decision is made that there was a performance issue on the Island, the person was terminated because of that, the past was pulled, I mean the person can't really do the work anymore.

So even if the past is pulled for performance related to the Island, the person can't go back to the Island even as a case manager. The person could go back and do enrollment.

MR. WALSH: We need to look at the language and make sure that the language is clear. We're not the employer. We'll make sure that language is clear.

DARRIN BROWN: In relationship to the performance of the staff, I would like to make a suggestion.

Currently we do evaluate staff. We kind of observed their performance. DOC does as well. We
have collaborated on some of that in the past.

I might suggest a system that's in place that actually does that across the board and not particularly targeting individual staff. Yes, some staff perform better than others, but if one staff member is not performing, yes, a corrective action plan would work excellent.

But then that one staff member in a month is observed 10 times, while someone who is performing well is observed one time, that's a liability for us. It doesn't work.

It needs to be -- in any nonprofit agency I've seen it done where it's across the board, it's not going to change performance whether you view them one time or 10 times. I think we've experienced that already. But it's going to be the same kind of performance whether I know or not as the provider.
I'm going to see the same kind of performance. I don't think that we've had instances where we didn't see the same thing. When either I or (inaudible) with a DOC staff member, but I think it needs to be a system that's in place that actually addresses performance if we're going to look at performance like that. It can be identified in one individual and constantly looking at the one individual.

It's going to create all of the other stresses along with actually running that group in that environment.

MR. WALSH: We're working towards kind of what you're asking for. We'll take a look at what everybody is doing across the board, our external providers, our DOC staff, to make sure everybody is complying with what we're looking for problematically.
However, if you're saying that we can't check -- what we see is a problem, we can't check more frequently on that because it's going to be unfair, I don't know that I agree with that. If I know that somebody consistently is performing above expectations, I don't need to check them the same amount of time as somebody that we have a concern about, especially if we need to document ongoing performance problems.

I mean if I go in one time or two times and say somebody is not doing a good job, that's not a good look. But if over the course of a couple months it's consistent, then we're talking a different story. So I don't necessarily agree with that concept if someone gets looked at twice in a month, and we're fine with it. And someone might get looked at five times in a month because we have
a concern.

Nobody should read into it, but I agree we're going to look at everybody. But to say that we need to look at everybody the same amount, I'm not onboard with that.

DARRIN BROWN: My thought with that is is the system in place that says this is how we are going to evaluate performance?

MR. WALSH: There will be regular checks on everybody across the board. We don't have all the staff in place to do that yet, but when we have everything in place, that's the expectation. There will be somebody responsible for looking at our community partners, there will be somebody responsible for looking at our DOC staff across the board.

Hopefully everyone is going to be looking at the same thing and evaluating the same way in the hope that we identify errors we need to
focus on. People work for us and people work for you.

DARRIN BROWN: I would like to have it where it's collaborative (inaudible) to look at the performance because I don't know the number of hours or how long you observe the staff. I don't know in what particular unit, which may be a more difficult unit compared to another unit. I don't know under what particular circumstances that you're observing the staff member, whether the participants are more compliant or less compliant.

MR. WALSH: Well, the direction in my program says I pop in on units, and I watch, and I observe. And if I see something I'm concerned with, I will pass it along. And everybody that works for me has been asked to do the same thing. Stop at a unit, spend a little time there, see what the environment is, see what the
facilitator is doing and how they're doing.

So those are on schedule, but we plan on having people that that's going to be their responsibility to stop in on a regular basis and do that. So I think we're going to do what you're asking for.

KIMBERLY YOUMANS: Kimberly Youmans.

Generally we do not target or single out any individual. We make observations based on the schedule that we derive. And generally when we observe a unit, we facilitate it. If we find there are some issues and concerns, a report is written up and recommendations are written at the bottom.

And you do make follow-up visits, and we make that clear in the report. We give you a certain amount of time to address the issues and concerns, and we will be backed into
a follow-up visit.

So based on that, if someone is having -- if someone is performing poorly and not up to standard, you are made aware of that. We will go back, Kimberly and I, and visit. And if we see that the measures -- the corrective actions have taken place, we would then have a collaborative visit with Osborne staff.

So we don't single out individuals. But if there are concerns, we do make follow-up visits, and we will observe them.

DARRIN BROWN: Is there a possibility you said based on performance measures?

KIMBERLY YOUMANS: Right.

DARRIN BROWN: I know that we looked at some. Some of them are based off of that, the dynamics and the ability to manage the group. Some are based off of actual curriculum and understanding of the
KIMBERLY YOUMANS: Right.

DARRIN BROWN: But now I've experienced it where it's not just as we say Kim's that are observing these groups. There are other individuals observing these groups too.

As Jim Walsh said, he pops in once in a while and may have some concerns about this and opted in and had concerns about this or that.

You and I worked on corrective action plans. I think if we put a system in place, that's more of a collaborative effort, because that's about trust building.

If you tell me we're going to go visit such and such a unit at such and such a time, then I want to know the same information you do, and that is whether they can perform or not.

If we put those kind of systems in place, that we are collaboratively looking at individual performance in
relationship to the staff, it will not only feel better, but lessen the stress of the staff because yes, if an individual is not performing, and that person is now no longer allowed on the Island, now you're coming to my group to look at mine, it might create some kind of distress.

You continue to talk and talk and say don't worry about that. Just do your job and do this. But that's not the reality.

KIMBERLY YOUMANS: I know you made a comment about others coming to visit. We have developed a rubric where everyone is observed based on the same measures that would be knowledge of the material, how well the group has organized the structure, and also on --

RONALD DAY: Engagement.

KIMBERLY YOUMANS: Engagement, right. So everyone is observed based on that rubric. So it's not that one
person is observing one thing and
reporting that. It's overall.

RONALD DAY: It would behoove me
to say this because our present
(inaudible) would probably
disheartened if I didn't, and that's
about the masters degree requirement.

I know it was reduced from two
thirds to half, but I will bring it
up again, because one of the things
that we talk about is using
evidence-based practices. I know
that there's some rationale in here
for why people who have master's
degrees, particularly master's
degrees in social work, but I mean
Susan and Darrin can speak to this
I'm sure as well we have staff, many
of whom -- the majority of whom do
not have a master's degree and are
performing very well currently.

And we've had staff with
master's degrees that got stuck.
It's just the reality of our
situation. When we talk about having a rationale, is it based upon again the population that we are serving?

If I have a master's in social work, then I have many more options than someone who doesn't necessarily. We've done an analysis at the Fortune Society, not as sophisticated as we would want, but we looked at what makes for a successful person working on Riker's Island or working in a jail setting.

Part of it was the person had some nonprofit experience, and they are growing passionate around working with this particular population and very committed.

Some of them were being informed they incarcerated themselves. So you're going to skew towards a certain population if half of the individuals need to have a master's in social work.

I mean I go to Columbia,
sometimes I go to Hunter and look at the folks who are in the classroom. When I was teaching, most of the students in the class were not the individuals that we have working on the Island that are very successful. So I just think that that's something that's worth another conversation, because if you say, and if we all agree, that we want the best possible work person working in that situation, the credentials aren't important, but they aren't like the be all for this particular environment.

You could have someone who has an associates degree and/or less that is doing phenomenal in those groups in connecting with people in a way that someone with a master's degree in social work cannot. It's not even possible. Some of those individuals have lots of experience.

I'm not saying that it's
impossible. I'm saying based upon our experience of not just the I-CAN program, but going back to Rye, who has been the most successful individual working. It hasn't been folks that have master's degrees, particularly a master's in social work. So I just think it's something that's worth continuing to talk about.

MR. WALSH: I believe we changed the criteria.

RONALD DAY: To half.

MR. WALSH: Half of those new hires. Not half. Everybody that's here is here.

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: Can I follow up with a question?

Like I said, if it's in there, I didn't see it. So if it's not, I apologize. It's what happens if not. So if we're in the process of hiring somebody, and say we are in agreement, this is a great candidate,
they do a mock group, these are really hard jobs to fill we know, and they're hard jobs to keep.

People burn out really fast.

People seem like a great candidate, and then they get in, and two weeks in we're like who (inaudible). This has been a hard program to staff and keep staffed, more so than any other we've experienced.

So what would happen if, say, you know, like we're not at our quota, we're not at the 50 percent. We have a great candidate who doesn't have a master's and is not bringing us to the 50 percent, you're in a position to approve hiring, which changed slightly.

But say that DOC is in the position to approve hiring, what happens in that situation?

That's not clear in the RFP. So would we be ruling out people who are great candidates at a point in time
because it doesn't -- it wouldn't
help us meet -- we're not at the
50 percent, and that person doesn't
have a master's and wouldn't bring it
up to the 50 percent, would they not
be approved for hire because of the
50 percent requirement?

I don't know if you have an
answer right now, but I would suggest
if you don't have an answer right now
for that to be clarified, or maybe
there is some mitigating language
that could be included to make clear
to people responding to the RFPs that
there's some room there, because we
always want the best person for the
job.

And if you're choosing between a
social worker who graduated two
months ago and a person with 20 years
experience in incarcerate settings,
we're probably going to both want the
more experienced person than the
brand new newbie social worker.
MILLIE CABALLERO: I just want to say a couple of things. One, I want to go back to us and how we go on to the units.

The reality is that we do our best to try to collaborate, and the greatest thing that we've done most recently is the MOCS groups and trying to be on the front end so that we are all invested in the people that we're bringing in to DOC.

I think that our team does a really great job in trying to be as delicate as possible with what are some really challenging situations when you have people that are not performing right on the unit, or they're having struggles.

I think that we try to keep you abreast as soon as we identify an issue so that your supervisors can go in and make those, you know, visits and kind of get a handle on things before we go back another time to try
to address those things. So I think that we're trying our best and being as collaborative as possible.

The other thing with the master's degree, and I feel like 50 percent, right, were asking. And I know many people that have many passions with the master's degree here within our own units. And I would hate to say that people -- it's hard to fill the positions so that we would have to consider not having people with a master's degree, because I think there's a lot of people out there in the world that want to come here and work with us and find us.

You know, it's the truth. I have lots of résumés that come through where people are passionate about this with their master's. And I think 50 percent is a fair amount; right? And one person here, one person there, I think what we
discussed was that there's room for discussion. But an overwhelming amount where we're going to just say we're going to move towards 75 or 80 percent on the other end, I think is what we're saying.

But really a phenomenal person, that's part of the reason why we've gotten involved with the MOC groups and the interviews and those types of things so that we can have that kind of conversation.

SUSAN GOTTFELD: So I actually I don't -- thinking about our staff, I think currently we're probably at 50 or more.

My suggestion is to just revisit your choice of language in the RFP. The way it looks like now, it's very black and white. It is required, blah, blah, blah. You might want to add that some of that language that you just shared, or case by case, or something like that, just because --
we're in this room right now, and I know what you're saying.

But if there's someone else who is applying for this RFP, they might say well, this is going to be hard for me to do and not realize they could have this relationship with you.

So I just suggest adding some other sentence in there to put that piece there.

MR. WALSH: Until you brought this up, I do realize that maybe I should be keeping track of this and making sure you guys are on target.

SUSAN GOTTFELD: It's not a target right now.

MR. WALSH: I will have to put a little board up in my office.

SUSAN GOTTFELD: With a little arrow, that would be great. Do we get a prize when we tip? Just kidding.

LOUIS POLESE: I'm Louis Polese.
I'm from Phipps Neighborhoods.

SPEAKER: Is there anybody else on the phone line that joined, or does anybody on the phone line have any questions? Nobody is online. Okay.

RICH KLEIN: Rich Klein from Fortune.

I just had a clarifying question about biweekly. I've seen that a few times in contracts. Sometimes it means twice a week, sometimes it means every other week. Can we get clarification on what you mean by biweekly visits with the client?

VALERIE GREISOAH: Every two weeks.

RICH KLEIN: Then there was a new provision here that wasn't in the last one. In the last RFP it said we would be required to serve post release for up to a year. Now it says at least a year, which is a very big change.
Will there be penalties for not maintaining at least a year? Can we get that changed to up to a year instead of at least a year?

VALERIE GREISOAH: We'll take a look at it. There's no penalty.

RONALD DAY: About the biweekly, if the goal, and it is, is to place people into housing and into employment, it's certainly possible that someone will be working and not be able to come to the agency. So there might be some consideration for that, because you can still engage a person, but the engagement doesn't have to be if the person came to the office.

So I think that the language is not clear enough in the RFP because it says what engagement is, but it's like they need to come and access services at the agency.

But for the case managers making a call, which they will, and checking
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on how a person is doing, who got a job two weeks after they got out, it's not possible necessarily to have that person come in for the next two and a half a months.

VALERIE GREISOAH: Any other questions?

SUSAN GOTTESFELD: We appreciate this process and the conversation very much, and we're glad and grateful that this is the direction the conversation is going.

So thank you. We appreciate DOC and MOCS for that.

DARRIN BROWN: She's really pointing at me.

I definitely, you know, appreciate the work that we've been doing. My passion is to reduce the recidivism, and this fits right into my work and my morals and values. I appreciate it.

Millie is doing some amazing work. And although sometimes I'm
PROCEEDINGS

fighting with the Kims over there, I appreciate the feedback, the work that we do, because at the end of the day, I want the performance to be of service to the participants.

KIMBERLY YOUMANS: Thank you.

Our ultimate goal is to make sure that the participants are getting all that they deserve and need.

VALERIE GREISOAH: Thank you everyone.

(Time noted: 10:32 a.m.)
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