ITEMS REQUIRING BOCC APPROVAL
(4 Items)

1. PREVENTION/SECONDARY INTERVENTION SERVICES -- DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
FUNDING -- DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
(Request sent to 67 vendors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention/Secondary Intervention Services</th>
<th>Mental Health Association of South Central Kansas</th>
<th>Youth for Christ Wichita, Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Name</td>
<td>Paths 4 Kids</td>
<td>YFC City Tech II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Pando Initiative, Inc.</td>
<td>Casa of Sedgwick County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catholic Charities Wichita</td>
<td>Derby Community Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sedgwick County Health Department</td>
<td>Kansas Children's Service League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prairie View</td>
<td>John Waller</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the recommendation of Britt Rosencutter, on behalf of the Department of Corrections, Linda Kizzire moved to accept the proposal and execute a service provider agreement with Mental Health Association of South Central Kansas for $62,439.00. Ellen House seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

A committee consisting of Chris Collins-Thoman and Brenda Gutierrez-Varela - Department of Corrections; Jeannette Livingston, Assistant Director - SCDDO; Delores Craig-Morland, Ph.D., consultant from WSU, and Britt Rosencutter, Purchasing Agent - Purchasing evaluated all proposal responses based on the criteria set forth in the RFP. The committee agreed unanimously to accept the proposal as stated above.

Youth for Christ Wichita, Inc. has not been awarded funding at this time due to a lack of evidence based practice, lack of an understanding and engagement of the Risk-Needs-Responsivity model, and a lack of measurement in outcomes.

The Sedgwick County Community Crime Prevention Fund utilizes current research to target grant dollars to achieve the greatest crime prevention impact and assist youth at risk of offending to improve the quality of their lives.

Note:
Sedgwick County is allocating approximately $582,000.00 annually in support of prevention, early intervention, and secondary intervention programs targeted to youth at risk for juvenile delinquency.

Questions and Answers:

Russell Leeds: Back on May 2nd of this year the largest part of this item came before the Bid Board for approval for programming, could you briefly explain how this particular program supplements? In that instance it was described as early intervention services and this is secondary intervention services. Could you just give us an understanding how this supplements the ones that were previously approved?

Chris Collins-Thoman: For a number of years, we've had a continuum of prevention services and with our first round of awards, we were missing that sector of middle (correction: elementary) school aged youth and so we requested the second round because we had the additional funding available. The vendor indicated they had not been notified of the first round, although we have proof that they were. It was an effort to ensure we were expending the dollars appropriately and covering the entire continuum of prevention services.

Russell Leeds: Do we have experience with the Mental Health Association in this area?

Chris Collins-Thoman: Yes. We have contracted with them previously.
Russell Leeds: Did Youth for Christ bid on the original RFP but for different services?

Chris Collins-Thoman: Yes. In the original award process, they bid on mentoring services but we had a competitive mentoring service at the time that was chosen.

Linda Kizzire: Since Youth For Christ was not awarded due to a lack of evidence based practice, I assume you have some type of a model that you use on this evaluation process?

Chris Collins-Thoman: There is actually more than one. We have the evidence-based practice, which is something we attempt to ensure for either the entire program or components within the program. Then we have the risk-needs-responsivity model, which is a correctional model of identifying the risks and identifying what the needs are and then appropriately responding. In both of those models, we did not find Youth for Christ's submission to support what we needed.