

**CHRONIC INEBRIATE PROGRAM AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND
THE UNLV CENTER FOR EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT**

THIS AGREEMENT, made and entered into this 20th day of September, 2006, by and between the CITY OF LAS VEGAS, a municipal corporation of the State of Nevada, hereinafter referred to as "CITY", and The UNLV Center for Evaluation and Assessment, hereinafter referred to as "SUBRECIPIENT," whose primary mailing address at the date of execution is 4505 Maryland Parkway Box 453003, Las Vegas, Nevada 89154.

I. SCOPE OF SERVICE

A. ACTIVITIES

Subrecipient will be responsible for administering an evaluation of the Chronic Inebriate Program as cited in the Scope of Services I.B.1, and specified in the approved Proposal Exhibit "A" and Scope of Services Exhibit "B", hereinafter referred to as "Program" or "Project." It is expressly agreed and understood that the total amount to be provided by the CITY under this Agreement shall not exceed funds, hereinafter referred to as "Funds" to be allocated in accordance with the Program Budget as detailed in Exhibit "C," attached hereto. SUBRECIPIENT hereby agrees to utilize said Funds made available pursuant to this Agreement to supplement rather than supplant funds otherwise available.

B. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1. *Scope of Services to be provided. For full scope of services See Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein.*

Purpose of Services:

To perform descriptive and outcome evaluations of the Chronic Inebriate Program.

Tasks to be Performed:

See Exhibit "A" and Exhibit "B" attached hereto.

Level of Service to be Provided:

See Exhibit "A" and Exhibit "B" attached hereto.

Measurable Goals for Grant period:

Complete the Tasks and Services by the dates in the Timeline, Exhibit "F".

Changes in the Scope of Services as outlined herein must be in accordance with Chronic Inebriate Program regulations, made by written amendment to this Agreement and approved and signed by both the Subrecipient and (1) by the Mayor (with City

Council approval) if funding amounts over \$24,999 are involved or (2) by the Director of Neighborhood Services or the Director's designee if funding amounts of less than \$25,000 are involved. In addition, the Director of Neighborhood Services Department is authorized to sign amendments, which revise the Agreement language without any funding impact. Any such changes must not jeopardize the Chronic Inebriate Program funding to the City.

2. *The following are either opportunities, which may enhance, or constraints which may limit the ability of SUBRECIPIENT to effectively implement said Program in the City of Las Vegas.* NONE
3. The SUBRECIPIENT hereby appoints the following representatives to attend *scheduled meetings in partnership with the City of Las Vegas, Neighborhood Services Department:*

**Dr. Ralph E. Reynolds
Dr. Robert P. Parker
UNLV Center for Evaluation and Assessment
4505 Maryland Parkway Box 453003
Las Vegas, NV 89154
702-895-3253**

**Dr. Donald G. Anderson
Delphi Research of Nevada, Inc.
1431 Pueblo Drive
Boulder City, NV 89005
702-293-2241**

C. PROGRAM REPORT

SUBRECIPIENT will be required to collect for and provide to the CITY Program accomplishments and usage records beginning July 1, 2006 or the date first written above, until June 30, 2007, with a six-month no cost extension which may be granted if program has not concluded, unless this Agreement is modified at the express consent of the CITY and SUBRECIPIENT. SUBRECIPIENT shall submit, no later than the 7th of the month, the Monthly Program Report, Exhibit "D", which shall provide a narrative to demonstrate compliance with the objective as stated above. Failure to submit said Report in a timely manner may delay reimbursement to SUBRECIPIENT. In addition to the monthly reports, SUBRECIPIENT shall submit two Status Review Reports, biannually, and a Final Evaluation Report at the conclusion of the Program. If action to correct such substandard performance is not taken by SUBRECIPIENT within a reasonable period of time as determined by the CITY, after being notified by CITY either (1) contract suspension procedures, or (2) termination procedures will be initiated, as set forth in Section V.B. of this Agreement. Reports shall follow the format of Exhibit "D". Monthly Reports must be submitted even if a request for reimbursement is not submitted for that month. Said report shall contain, but not be limited to, the following data:

1. Information on activities completed monthly/quarterly, problems encountered during the reporting period, successes, activities planned for the next month/quarter.
2. Statement of project goals identified in Subrecipient contract/agreement and measurable accomplishments toward achieving goals and objectives.
3. Written narrative and description of services and expenditures will be included in each Monthly Status Report.
2. The Subrecipient will provide a copy of all written Reports developed for the Project to the City including materials which help document the progress of the Project such as: announcements, media releases, photographs, video footage, project timelines, participant progress, surveys, and questionnaires.
3. The Subrecipient will provide a final, brief, written report with the final invoice, which summarizes the Project's successes and lessons learned.

D. FINANCIAL REPORT

1. MONTHLY REPORTING OF REIMBURSEMENTS

The CITY shall reimburse the Subrecipient only for expenses paid or incurred as outlined in Exhibit "C", provided the expenditures are made after the Project's start date and before the completion date as indicated in Section I.D. Disbursement of grant funding is through reimbursement process only. The Request for Release of Funds form must be included as a separate attachment, to your Monthly Program report. A Request for Release of Funds form, as detailed in Exhibit "E", must be used to request reimbursement from the City of Las Vegas, Neighborhood Services Department for funds expended for the 2006/2007 Fiscal Year.

2. DOCUMENTATION OF COSTS

All costs shall be recorded by budget line-items and be supported by properly executed payrolls, time records, invoices, contracts, or vouchers, or other official documentation evidencing in proper detail the nature and propriety of the charge. All checks, payrolls, invoices, contracts, and vouchers, orders or other accounting documents pertaining in whole or in part to the Agreements, shall be thoroughly identified and readily accessible.

E. TIME OF PERFORMANCE

This Agreement provides for funding of SUBRECIPIENT'S program rendered in accordance with this Agreement from July 1, 2006 or the date first written above, until June 30, 2007, with a six-month no cost extension which may be granted if program has not concluded, inclusive. The SUBRECIPIENT agrees to perform the described services by the deadline set forth in the Timeline, Exhibit "F" attached hereto. The CITY shall bear no liability to fund or provide payment for

SUBRECIPIENT program services in the event that no State General Funds are received during fiscal year 2006-2007. Furthermore, the CITY shall be liable only for payment proportional to the extent that Funds are received by the CITY. SUBRECIPIENT program expenses incurred after July 1, 2006, but prior to execution of this Agreement may be reimbursed upon approval of the CITY and contingent upon SUBRECIPIENT conformance with 29 CFR Part 95.

II. CITY GENERAL CONDITIONS

A. COMPLIANCE WITH THE SUBRECIPIENT PROGRAM MANUAL AND OTHER APPLICABLE STATUTES AND REGULATIONS

SUBRECIPIENT agrees to abide with all Policies, Regulations and Chronic Inebriate program criteria as specified in the Neighborhood Services Public Services Program Manual. SUBRECIPIENT shall obtain any and all Federal, State, and local permits and licenses required to execute the Project or Program as described in the Agreement's Scope of Services. SUBRECIPIENT further agrees to abide by all applicable Federal, State, and Local codes, regulations, statutes, ordinances, and laws.

B. IRS REGULATIONS

SUBRECIPIENT agrees to comply with all applicable IRS regulations, specifically regarding employees, depositing of payroll taxes, filing of payroll tax returns, and issuance of W-2's at year-end. All persons working for a non-profit agency, whether full or part-time, are considered employees, pursuant to IRS Publication 15A. If a private contractor or instructor is hired, a W-9 must be completed if he/she is paid \$600 or more, and an IRS Form 1099 must be issued to that person at year-end, as well as filed with the IRS. 1099 instructions can be obtained on the IRS website.

C. SUBRECIPIENT RETAINS EXCLUSIVE RIGHT OF PERFORMING SERVICES

SUBRECIPIENT has requested financial support of the CITY to enable SUBRECIPIENT to provide the services contemplated herein. The CITY shall have no relationship whatsoever with the services contemplated herein except with the provision of financial support and the receipt of Reports as provided herein. In any and all events, the services contemplated herein shall be rendered at the time, in the manner and under circumstances determined solely and exclusively by SUBRECIPIENT, subject only to review by the City of Las Vegas, Neighborhood Services Department Director or other designee of the Neighborhood Services Director, to assure continuing eligibility for Chronic Inebriate Program funding.

D. INDEMNIFICATION

SUBRECIPIENT agrees to protect, defend, indemnify and save harmless the CITY from and against any and all liability, damages, claims, suits, liens, and judgments of whatever nature, including but not limited to, claims for contribution and/or indemnification for injuries to or death of any person or persons, caused by, in connection with, or arising out of any activities undertaken pursuant to this Agreement. SUBRECIPIENT'S obligation to protect, defend, indemnify, and save harmless as set forth in this paragraph, shall include reasonable attorneys' fees incurred by the

CITY in the defense and/or handling of said suits, demands, judgments, liens, claims and the like and reasonable attorneys' fees and reasonable investigation expenses incurred by the CITY in enforcing and/or obtaining compliance with the provisions of this paragraph.

E. THIRD PARTY CONTRACTS

SUBRECIPIENT shall provide reasonable advance notice to, and obtain express consent from the CITY prior to obtaining, through funds made available pursuant to this Agreement, professional services pursuant to a written contractual agreement with a third party, an example of said contractual agreement to be provided by the City. Such advance notice shall demonstrate the necessity of such services and shall provide for adequate remedy in the event that professional services are not rendered in a manner consistent with the terms of this Agreement.

F. ON-SITE MONITORING

Projects and Programs funded under this Agreement will be subject to on-site monitoring by duly authorized CITY representatives, CITY-contracted independent auditors, or any combination thereof. Said representatives will be announced, at a minimum, 24 hours in advance of such visits, which shall occur during normal operating hours. The representatives shall be granted access to any and all records pertaining to said Program. Representatives may, on occasion, interview Program recipients who volunteer to be interviewed.

G. ACCESS TO RECORDS

At any time during normal business hours, SUBRECIPIENT'S records, with respect to matters covered by this Agreement shall be made available for audit, examination, and review by CITY representatives, CITY-contracted independent auditors, or any combination thereof. Such records shall be made available at a location convenient to the CITY.

H. INSURANCE

If SUBRECIPIENT uses a vehicle in providing its services, it shall carry or provide a Comprehensive Automobile Liability Insurance covering bodily injury and property damage, with a minimum comprehensive single limit liability of \$1,000,000.

The CITY shall be named as an additional insured in all policies of insurance obtained for the Program including, but not limited to, comprehensive general liability, bodily injury and property damage policies in an amount not less than \$1,000,000 for any person, and \$5,000,000 per occurrence and \$1,000,000 property damage. The CITY shall be furnished evidence that the foregoing insurance coverage(s) are in effect, and the CITY shall be notified at least thirty (30) days prior to the cancellation or material change of any such coverage.

I. LIMIT ON ASSIGNMENT OF INTEREST

SUBRECIPIENT may not assign any part of its rights in this Agreement without consent of CITY. Any such assignment of rights without consent of CITY shall result in the forfeiture of all compensation, or any part thereof, as determined by CITY.

III. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

A. AUDIT REQUIREMENTS

This Agreement is subject to other requirements of United State's Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular No. A-21 "Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and other Non-Profit Organizations" and its relevant attachments "A" through "O"; and Circular A-122, entitled "Cost Principles for Non-Profit Organizations." These requirements are subject to the exceptions in 20 CFR Part 667.

This Agreement is also subject to an OMB A-133 Audit pursuant to the Single Audit Act. Effective July 1, 1997, the Office of Management and Budget requires that grant recipients who receive \$300,000 in federal funds aggregate, conduct an A-133 audit. In order to ensure Program compliance to the greatest extent feasible, the Neighborhood Services Department has established a policy, effective July 1, 1997, which requires a Subrecipient receiving annual federal funding of \$50,000 or more for two consecutive years to submit an audited financial statement. Such Subrecipient must submit the audited financial statement no later than six (6) months after the conclusion of the second program year of federal funding.

All Subrecipients who fall under the requirements of OMB A-133 Auditing rules must submit a full and complete copy of such audits to the Neighborhood Services Department. It is the responsibility of the SUBRECIPIENT to ensure that audits are completed in a proper and timely manner. Failure to submit copies of the A-133 Audit will render the SUBRECIPIENT as non-compliant. This means that no funds may be drawn until the City of Las Vegas Neighborhood Services Department has received and reviewed the copy of the audit. Please refer to the Public Services Program Subrecipient Manual as provided for further guidance on this matter.

B. RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AUDIT

The SUBRECIPIENT agrees to maintain financial records pertaining to all matters relative to this Agreement in accordance with standard accounting principles and procedures and to retain all records and supporting documentation applicable to this Agreement for a period of three years, except those records subject to audit findings shall be retained for three years after such findings have been resolved. In the event the SUBRECIPIENT goes out of existence, the SUBRECIPIENT shall turn over to the City all of its records relating to this Agreement to be retained by the City for the required period of time.

The SUBRECIPIENT agrees to permit the City or the City's designated representatives to inspect and audit its records and books relative to this Contract at any time during normal business hours and under reasonable circumstances and to copy there from any information that the City desires concerning SUBRECIPIENT'S operation hereunder. The SUBRECIPIENT further understands and agrees that said inspection and audit would be exercised upon written notice. If the SUBRECIPIENT or its records or books are not located within Clark County Nevada, in the event of an inspection and audit, SUBRECIPIENT agrees to deliver the records or books or have the records or books delivered to the City or the City's designated representatives at an address within the City of Las Vegas as designated by the City. If the City or the City's designated representatives find that the records delivered by the SUBRECIPIENT are incomplete, the SUBRECIPIENT agrees

to pay the City or the City's representatives' costs to travel (including travel, lodging, meals, and other related expenses) to the Contractor's offices to inspect and audit, as deemed necessary, all records of this project relating to finances, as well as other records including performance records that may be required by relevant directives of funding sources of the City.

C. FINANCIAL RECORDKEEPING

Financial records pertaining to all invoices, materials, payrolls, personnel records, and other data concerning matters related to this Agreement may be requested from SUBRECIPIENT by duly authorized CITY representatives, CITY-contracted independent auditors, DOL and/or the Comptroller of the United States, or any combination thereof.

D. RECORDS

Program records shall be maintained in accordance with all FEDERAL, STATE and CITY requirements with respect to all matters covered by this Agreement. Such records shall be maintained for a period of four years after the term of this Agreement expires (effectively a five year retention period).

E. PROGRAM BUDGET

Invoice expenditures eligible for payment by the CITY will be in accordance with the Project budget delineated in Exhibit "C" and subject to any conditions imposed in the Scope of Services, to include monthly or quarterly reports and narratives when seeking reimbursement from the City for Project costs. SUBRECIPIENT shall not make any changes in the Project budget unless permission is obtained in writing from the CITY.

F. METHOD OF PAYMENT

The CITY shall reimburse valid invoices for approved Project budget expenditures identified in Exhibit "C" of this Agreement. Before paying such expenses, the CITY will review invoice expenditures to determine their consistency with the approved eligible expenditures, the scope of services, pursuant to this Agreement. The CITY reserves the right to refuse reimbursement for expenses, which are EVOLVE-ineligible or which are not within the scope of this Agreement. Monthly and quarterly reimbursement requests shall include reports and narratives as detailed in "Scope of Services" section of this Agreement.

G. UNEXPENDED FUNDS

In the event that CITY staff anticipates the total amount of funds allocated for this Agreement will not be expended in the time and manner prescribed in this Agreement, the CITY reserves the right to such unexpended portion for other Projects/programs operating under the CITY'S Chronic Inebriate Program. An extension of the June 30, 2007 deadline may be authorized in writing by the CITY Neighborhood Services Director or the Director's designee.

H. ACCOUNTING METHODS

Expenditures charged to CITY fiscal year 2006-2007 funds will be accounted separately from all other revenue sources. These records shall be maintained by SUBRECIPIENT.

I. REAL PROPERTY, NON-EXPENDABLE PERSONAL PROPERTY, DEPRECIATION SCHEDULES, AND DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY

In accordance with the United States Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circulars A-87, Cost Principles of State and Local Governments, and A-21, Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and other Nonprofit Organizations, the following shall apply:

- 1) Non-expendable personal property will be defined as any property either tangible or intangible other than real property as defined herein which has a unit acquisition cost of \$500 or more and a useful life of more than one year.
- 2) Real property will be defined as land, including land improvements, structures and appurtenances thereto, but excluding movable machinery and equipment.
- 3) Non-expendable personal property shall be depreciated on a 5-year, straight-line schedule, as is the accounting standard used for the City of Las Vegas in its financial management. SUBRECIPIENT will be required to maintain property records for and report to the City during the 5-year depreciation period. If the property is disposed of prior to the 5-year depreciation period, the CITY shall provide the SUBRECIPIENT with disposition instructions upon request. If the property is disposed of for cash during this period, it constitutes Program Income which must be reported in accordance with the Section III C. & D., Program Income, portion of this Agreement. Examples of non-expendable personal property are vehicles and computer equipment. If said property is a vehicle, the City shall be named as a lien-holder on the title.
- 4) When non-expendable personal property has been fully depreciated in accordance with the CITY'S 5-year straight-line schedule, and the property is disposed of for cash, the SUBRECIPIENT may retain such funds provided that SUBRECIPIENT notifies the CITY in writing and that SUBRECIPIENT uses such funds for the exclusive benefit of the Program.
- 5) The SUBRECIPIENT must transfer upon expiration of the term of this Agreement any EVOLVE funds on hand at the time of expiration and any accounts receivable attributable to the use of EVOLVE funds provided pursuant to this Agreement. In addition, any real property as described above either acquired or improved in whole or in part, in excess of \$25,000, shall be used to meet one of the national objectives pursuant to 20 CFR Part 652 until five (5) years after expiration of this Agreement, or for such longer period of time as deemed appropriate by the CITY. If not used as such, SUBRECIPIENT must dispose of such real property in a manner that results in the reimbursement of EVOLVE funds for the amount of the current fair market value of the property less any portion of the value attributable to expenditures of non-EVOLVE funds for acquisition of or improvement to the property. This reversion of assets will not be required after such period of time deemed appropriate by the CITY.

IV. MODIFICATION OR TERMINATION OF AGREEMENT

A. AMENDMENT OR REVISION REQUIRED BY CITY

SUBRECIPIENT and the CITY hereby agree to amend or otherwise revise this Agreement should such modification be required by CITY/STATE and/or any applicable federal statutes or regulations.

B. TERMINATION

If SUBRECIPIENT fails to fulfill in a timely and proper manner its obligation under this Agreement or shall violate any of the covenants, agreements or stipulations of this Agreement, the CITY shall thereupon have the right to suspend or terminate this Agreement and specify the effective date thereof. Such notice shall be given no less than ten (10) days before the effective date of such termination and sent to "SUBRECIPIENT" at 4505 Maryland Parkway Box 453003, Las Vegas, Nevada 89154.

C. PROVISIONS REQUIRED BY LAW DEEMED INSERTED


Each and every provision of law and clause required by law to be inserted in this Agreement will be deemed to be inserted herein, and this Agreement shall be read and enforced as though it were included herein and if through mistake or otherwise any such provisions not inserted, or is not correctly inserted, then upon the application of either party this Agreement shall forthwith be physically amended to make such insertion.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have entered this Agreement the day and year first above written.

CITY OF LAS VEGAS


**THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA LAS VEGAS
CENTER FOR EVALUATION AND
ASSESSMENT**

By: 
OSCAR B. GOODMAN, Mayor


By: 

ATTEST:

Its: _____

By: 
BARBARA JO RONEMUS, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

 8/22/06
Thomas R. Green Date

The UNLV Center for Evaluation and Assessment

A PROPOSAL

TO DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT AN EVALUATION

OF THE

CHRONIC INEBRIATE PROGRAM

FOR

THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS

SUBMITTED
JUNE 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	2
2.0	UNDERSTANDING THE REQUIREMENT.....	2
2.1	REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROPOSAL.....	2
3.0	SECTION I: DEVELOP LOGIC MODEL	2
3.1	TASK 1: DESIGN LOGIC MODEL	2
4.0	SECTION II: ASSESS PROGRAM OUTCOMES.....	3
4.1	TASK 2: ASSESS BENEFITS TO CLIENTS AND PROGRAM SPONSORS (OUTCOME EVALUATION)	3
4.1.1	<i>Evaluation Questions.....</i>	3
4.1.2	<i>Sub-task: Data Collection.....</i>	3
4.1.3	<i>Sub-task: Data Analysis.....</i>	4
5.0	SECTION III: ASSESS PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.....	4
5.1	TASK 3: ASSESS PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION (PROCESS EVALUATION).....	4
5.1.1	<i>Evaluation Questions.....</i>	4
5.1.2	<i>Sub-task: Data Collection.....</i>	4
5.1.2.1	Instruments.....	4
5.1.2.1.1	Delivery of Planned Client Services	4
5.1.2.1.2	Program Fidelity	4
5.1.3	<i>Sub-task: Data Analysis.....</i>	5
5.1.3.1	Document/Interview Analysis.....	5
5.1.3.2	Frequency Calculation	5
6.0	PROJECT COSTS.....	6
7.0	DELIVERABLES	6
8.0	PROJECT TIMELINE.....	6
9.0	CORPORATE CAPACITY	7

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Manager (Manager) of the City of Las Vegas Neighborhood Services Department (City) met with the leader of the UNLV Center for Evaluation and Assessment (Center) to discuss an evaluation program in March 2006. The outcome of that meeting was a request that the Center submit a proposal to develop and implement an evaluation of the *Chronic Inebriate Program* to address the 18 month period of the Program implementation. This proposal is responsive to that request and is submitted as agreed to the Manager for consideration.

2.0 UNDERSTANDING THE REQUIREMENT

2.1 REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROPOSAL

The Manager set forth the following requirements for the proposal from DRN and the Center (Consultants) to the City of Las Vegas to design and conduct an evaluation of the *Chronic Inebriate Program*. To be responsive, the proposal must address the following:

1. The development of a logic model, including a service delivery flow chart, to depict the Program and the planned evaluation.
2. The design and implementation of an outcome evaluation to assess the extent to which:
 - the Program was cost effective for the City of Las Vegas and other community agencies;
 - the group of clients as a whole benefited from the Program services;
 - individual client or client sub-group effects varied by level and type of treatment; and
 - the extent to which the Program was perceived as a viable, functioning inter-agency system by participants and stakeholders.
3. The design and implementation of a process evaluation to document and to assess:
 - Costs of services per client;
 - The level of involvement of each client and of sub-groups of clients; and
 - The nature and levels of services delivered to clients.

This proposal is divided into three (3) sections. Section I addresses the development of the logic model. Section II addresses the design and implementation of the outcome evaluation. Section III addresses the process evaluation. Sections I and III are divided into specific tasks and sub-tasks. Costs for the evaluation are detailed in the Summary Budget.

3.0 SECTION I: DEVELOP LOGIC MODEL

3.1 Task 1: Design Logic Model

Logic models are important elements of any evaluation system. They serve several functions. The first is to clarify the relationships among the elements of the program. The second is to clarify the linkage between evaluation activities and program objectives. Finally,

logic models serve as valuable communication tools for program administrators and evaluators to use in talking to the various stakeholders about the program and the evaluation.

The first task of the proposed evaluation will be to construct a logic model for the evaluation of the *Chronic Inebriate Program* currently being implemented by the City of Las Vegas. This logic model will first outline the program theory underlying the Program. Based on the program theory, the model will depict goals and objectives, process and outcome evaluation procedures/measures, evaluation data to be collected, and the criteria to be used for judging the level of objective attainment.

The process for developing the logic model is for the Consultants to work with the Neighborhood Services Manager (Manager) and with other designated Program administrators (Staff) to write and revise drafts until a final version is developed that is agreed upon as reflecting the Program and the planned evaluation. The evaluation can proceed when the logic model is designed and in place.

4.0 SECTION II: ASSESS PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Section II activities, which focus upon the outcomes of the Program, are designated as Task 2.

4.1 Task 2: Assess Benefits to Clients and Program Sponsors (Outcome Evaluation)

The system for assessing Program outcomes will be guided by two (2) evaluation questions. The questions proposed below will be discussed with the Manager and staff and a final set of guiding questions agreed upon. The Consultant, Manager, and staff will also meet to discuss and to develop agreement on the set of indicators to be used in determining Program outcomes.

4.1.1 Evaluation Questions

- Was the Program cost effective when compared with prior costs for managing/treating the same group of clients over the same period of time?
- To what extent and in what ways did individual clients and sub-groups of clients benefit from the services delivered through the Program?

4.1.2 Sub-task: Data Collection

The Consultants and the Program will work together to collect the following data on each of the clients:

- The length of participation in the Program;
- The individual and average levels of client expense?
- The number of scheduled meetings with Case Managers kept by the client;
- The number of arrests per client;
- The number of public nuisance instances per client;
- The days of sobriety per client; and
- The number of Program clients finding and keeping employment.

4.1.3 Sub-task: Data Analysis

The data described above will be analyzed in a number of ways. Direct comparisons between program costs, numbers of visits, and length of stay in program will be analyzed via comparisons with base line measures from a period before the program was initiated. T-tests and χ^2 tests will be used to determine the relative significance of these differences. Some higher level analysis techniques will be used after the base-level analyses are conducted. One analysis will use a recursive regression technique to create a predictive model about the probability of recidivism given the program and personal characteristics of the client. Finally, program success comparisons can be made to average available data concerning this population. The data will be presented in tables and graphs for easy interpretation by Manager.

5.0 SECTION III: ASSESS PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Section III activities are designated as Task 3. This task is divided into two (2) sub-tasks.

5.1 Task 3: Assess Program Implementation (Process Evaluation)

The system for assessing the program implementation will be guided by three (3) evaluation questions. These questions will focus data collection and analysis efforts so that the implementation can be fully characterized. The questions proposed below will be discussed with the Manager and Staff and a final set of guiding questions agreed upon.

5.1.1 Evaluation Questions

- What was the nature of the services provided through the Program to clients?
- What levels of service were provided per client and per client-category?
- To what extent did the Program deliver the services as planned to accomplish the Program goals and objectives?

5.1.2 Sub-task: Data Collection

The evaluation designed by the Consultants will include a full documentation of all services provided by the Program. The description of these activities will give the necessary context for the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations. Data sources, collection procedures and collection schedules will be specified through iterative work with the Manager and Staff of the Program. A set of instruments will be designed and employed to accomplish this sub-task.

5.1.2.1 Instruments

5.1.2.1.1 Delivery of Planned Client Services

- *Document analysis* of CLV/NS and other agency documents to determine costs, levels and nature of services delivered to clients.

5.1.2.1.2 Program Fidelity

- *Document analysis* of CLV/NS and other agency documents to determine extent to which the Program was delivered planned; and

- *Interview protocols* for interviews with Program staff to document un-intended outcomes, problems, and opportunities that arose in the implementation process.

5.1.3 Sub-task: Data Analysis

5.1.3.1 *Document/Interview Analysis*

Qualitative techniques (Miles and Huberman, 1994) will be employed in the analysis of documents and interview transcripts. Categories will be developed, items will be coded for assignment to categories, and the category assignments will be checked for inter-rater reliability. Frequencies will also be calculated as a method of determining the relative standing of categories.

5.1.3.2 *Frequency Calculation*

Frequencies will be calculated for levels of system development and of service delivery. These frequencies will be reported as total numbers and, where appropriate, as percentages.

6.0 PROJECT COSTS

The projected costs for the project are depicted in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Projected Costs

Proposal #	Description	Cost
<i>Section I, Task 1</i>		
3.1	Develop Logic Model	\$2,100.00
<i>Section II, Task 2</i> <i>Assess Program Effects (Outcome Evaluation)</i>		
4.1	Design and implement data collection and analysis procedures to assess cost effectiveness, to assess client outcomes, and to assess perceptions of value	\$10,600.00
<i>Section III, Task 3</i> <i>Assess Program Implementation (Process Evaluation)</i>		
5.1	Design and employ data collection and analysis procedures to document Program implementation	\$13,800.00
<i>Deliverable Reports:</i>		
Two "Status Review Reports" (@\$1,500.00 each)		\$3,000.00
Final Evaluation Report		\$2,000.00
Project coordination and management (7 %)		\$3,100.00
Indirect costs (4 %)		\$5,400.00
Total for Development of System		\$40,000.00

7.0 Deliverables

A Table Of Deliverables will be agreed upon between the Manager and the Consultants for the development of the logic model and flow chart, the design of the process and outcome evaluation systems, the employment of the process and outcome evaluation systems (i.e., data collection and data analysis procedures and activities), and the format and scheduling for reporting on progress and findings. The final Table will reflect the specific agreed upon deliverables, including a description of their contents and due dates.

8.0 Project Timeline

The timeline of the project will be jointly developed by the Program Director and the Evaluator. Once agreed upon, the Evaluator will create a Project Gantt Chart depicting the scheduled activities, milestones, and deliverables.

9.0 CORPORATE CAPACITY

UNLV Center for Evaluation and Assessment

The UNLV Center for Evaluation and Assessment (CEA) was formed in 2004 to deliver program evaluation, research design, and the highest level of data analysis and data storage services to community, statewide, national, and international clients. CEA has a core team of senior scientists including Co-Directors Dr. Ralph E. Reynolds and Dr. Gregory Schraw. Also, CEA retains the services of the following 9 senior scientists on a project by project basis: Dr. Keith Zvach -- data base construction, quantitative data analysis, growth modeling, and survey design expert; Dr. Krista Muis -- quantitative analysis, mathematics education, and research design expert; Dr. LeAnn Putney -- qualitative data analysis and data collection expert; Dr. Michael Nussbaum -- database construction, quantitative data analysis, and survey design expert; Dr. Jeff Shih -- quantitative analysis, mathematics education, and research design expert; Dr. Gale Sinatra -- quantitative analysis, early reading education, and research design expert; Dr. Lori Olafson -- qualitative data analysis and data collection expert; Dr. W. Paul Jones -- expert in assessment and Bayesian Statistics; and Dr. Bobby Hoffman -- quantitative data collection and analysis expert.

Also, CEA serves as a training venue and a practicum site for many highly skilled doctoral students from the Department of Educational Psychology's nationally ranked (top 20) evaluation and assessment doctoral program. Graduates of this program have already taken program evaluator positions at Clark County School District and faculty positions at institutions of higher learning across the country. Students of this quality ensure the highest standards of data collection and input on all CEA projects. Even though the Center is only 2 years old, CEA evaluators have already completed or have ongoing at least 10 evaluation projects for Clark County School District, 3 evaluation projects for NDE, and numerous projects with private entities across the country. For example, CEA is now conducting a major evaluation of the Waterford Early Math program for Merrill publishing and recently completed a project with the Omaha City School District. A major future goal for the CEA is to become the primary federal grant evaluator for UNLV scientists submitting grants to federal entities such as NSF and IES.

Principal Evaluators

Ralph E. Reynolds, Ph.D., Co-Principal Evaluator

Dr. Reynolds is Professor of Educational Psychology, Chair of the Department of Educational Psychology, and Co-Director of the Center for Evaluation and Assessment (CEA) at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The Department that Dr. Reynolds has chaired for the past five years was just ranked in the top twenty such departments in this country. He is one of the most published and most cited of current educational psychologists. With Dr. Gregory Schraw, he founded the Center for Evaluation and Assessment, which is already playing a key role in the evaluation of educational and other programs in southern Nevada. In 1998, he was ranked as one of the top 20 educational psychologists in the world for his record of publishing in the most prestigious journals. In the same year, Dr. Reynolds was elected President of the International Society for the Scientific Study of Reading. Dr. Reynolds received the Palmer O. Johnson award for research from the American Educational Research Association in 1978. This is the highest research award for original research contribution given by AERA.

Dr. Reynolds has published more than forty articles, and he has two books currently in preparation. His articles are among the most cited of any active educational psychologist. His book, *Evaluation In The Classroom*, was used for fifteen years as a supplemental text in courses at the University of Illinois and elsewhere. In addition to his prolific publishing record, Dr. Reynolds has made more than one hundred presentations at major conferences in the U.S. and other countries. Dr. Reynolds has been working in the field of program evaluation for more than twenty years. In addition to conducting several research projects in collaboration with the Clark County School District, he was a major contributor to the full vs. half day kindergarten study conducted by the Clark County School District, and he was responsible for the joint venture contract between Research and the Center for Evaluation and Assessment to evaluate the current Block Scheduling Program in the Clark County School District.

Donald G. Anderson, Ed.D, Co-Principal Evaluator

Dr. Anderson is Senior Research Scientist for the UNLV Center for Evaluation and Assessment. He has been involved in the design and implementation of many projects including: the PT3 grants to UNLV; the Fresno Unified School District Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative; the Project STARS and Teaching American History grants to the Clark County School District; and the Southern Nevada Water Authority and Clark County Public Education Foundation evaluation projects.

Dr. Anderson completed a 29-year career in education that culminated in a five and one-half year assignment as Director of Research & Development for the Clark County School District. He earned his Doctorate in Educational Leadership from Brigham Young University (1983) with dual emphases upon organizational behavior and instrument validation. Prior to his assignment as Director of Research & Development, he served for fifteen and one-half years as an elementary school principal and eight years as a teacher, distinguishing himself as an innovator and reform leader in both roles.

Robert P. Parker, Ph.D., Co-Principal Evaluator

Dr. Parker is a Senior Scientist with the Center and is President of R. P. Parker, Inc., an independent research and Evaluation consulting firm. He has been involved in public education for more than forty years as a high school and community college teacher, a Professor of Literacy Education and Department Chair at Rutgers University (1970-1990), a private school principal, a Head Start Program Director in Northern Nevada, a grant writer, and, most recently, the Coordinator of Research and Evaluation for the Clark County School District (2003-2006).

Dr. Parker is the author or editor of five books and the author/co-author of more than thirty professional articles. Dr. Parker also has conducted project and program evaluations in high schools, community colleges, and four-year colleges in three states and two countries (the U.S. and Canada). In his recent position with the Clark County School District, he designed, implemented, and managed two major program evaluations: the Full/Extended Day Kindergarten (FEDS) Study and the Block Scheduling Program Evaluation (still underway). He is currently working on research and evaluation projects for the Center for Evaluation and Assessment.

EXHIBIT "B"
CITY OF LAS VEGAS
SCOPE OF SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED

The evaluation team for the Chronic Inebriate Program consists of representatives from the UNLV Center for Evaluation and Assessment. The evaluation team will provide the following evaluation services to the Chronic Inebriate program.

1. Identify the evaluation data elements and develop and/or adapt evaluation strategies and data collection procedures.
2. Develop procedures for collection of project data (including case management information) by project staff and submission of data to the evaluation team.
3. Develop interview protocols and conduct staff and stakeholder interviews.
4. Develop interview protocols and conduct interviews with a sample of program participants.
5. Analyze and summarize evaluation data.
6. Attend project meetings as needed.
7. Complete monthly review reports, as described in Exhibit D.
8. Complete status review reports, including a summary of evaluation activities and brief summary of available evaluation data.
9. Complete a final evaluation report.

EXHIBIT "C"
BUDGET

**Contractual Narrative
EVALUATION BUDGET
Chronic Inebriate Program
7/1/06 – 6/30/07**

Description	Cost
Develop Logic Model	\$2,100
Design and implement data collection and analysis procedures to assess cost effectiveness, to assess client outcomes, and to assess perceptions of value	\$10,600
Design and employ data collection and analysis procedures to document Program implementation	\$13,800

Deliverable Reports	
Monthly Reports and Two "Status Review Reports"	\$3,000
Final Evaluation Report	\$2,000
Project Coordination and Management (7%)	\$3,100

Total Direct Costs	\$34,600
---------------------------	-----------------

Indirect Costs (4%)	\$5,400
----------------------------	----------------

Total Evaluation Budget	\$40,000
--------------------------------	-----------------

EXHIBIT "D"
MONTHLY REPORTS

Chronic Inebriate Program

Dr. Lisa Morris
Neighborhood Services Department
Neighborhood Initiatives Division
400 Stewart Avenue
Las Vegas, NV 89101

Project: Chronic Inebriate Program
Month: _____

Dear Project Manager:

The attached program billing represents and includes the program activities and goals achieved and clients served. During the month we provided service and accomplished the following program objectives.

Activities/Objectives	This Month	Year To Date	Goal

EXHIBIT "E"

City of Las Vegas

Neighborhood Services Department

The UNLV Center For Evaluation and Assessment - Request for Funds

This Section: Recipient Agency Use Only

PROJECT YEAR: 2006-07

GRANT/FUNDING SOURCE: _____

REQUEST NO: _____

DATE PREPARED: _____

Payment Information

PAYABLE To: _____

Address: _____

City: _____

State: NV _____

Zip: _____

Phone: _____

Fax: _____

E-mail: _____

Period Covered: _____ through _____ (when applicable)

Project Title: _____

Council approval date (if applicable): _____

Purpose for use of Funds (attach supporting documentation for amount of this request)

Description	Amount Authorized	Subrecipient Budget Adjustments	Previous Drawdowns	Amount of this Request	Balance Available
Logic Model	2,100.00				2,100.00
Assessments	10,600.00				10,600.00
Program Implementation	13,800.00				13,800.00
Reports	5,000.00				5,000.00
Project Coordination & Mgmt	3,100.00				3,100.00
Indirect Costs	5,400.00				5,400.00
					0.00
TOTALS:	40,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40,000.00

Authorization for Request for Funds_____
Signature_____
Title_____
Name (Type or Print)_____
Phone Number

Prepared by: _____ Supervisor Review: _____

Grants Accounting: _____

Manager Approval:

Director Approval (if required):

Authorized Signature_____
Date_____
Authorized Signature_____
Date

EXHIBIT "F"
TIMELINE

Chronic Inebriate Program
Tentative Evaluation Timeline
Project Period July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007

Activities	Start Date	End Date
Attend project planning meetings as needed	7/06	Ongoing
Revise and/or develop staff, client, and stakeholder interview protocols	7/06	12/06
Identify key stakeholders to be interviewed	7/06	12/06
Identify data elements and set up database	7/06	12/06
Develop procedures for collection of project data (including case management information) by project staff and submission of data to the evaluation team	7/06	12/06
Conduct first set of interviews with staff	8/06	10/06
Conduct interviews with clients	8/06	Ongoing
Conduct first set of stakeholder interviews	10/06	12/06
Submit Monthly Review Reports to City of Las Vegas Submit 1 st Status Review Report to City of Las Vegas (Brief summary of evaluation activities and results to date)	9/06	Ongoing 12/06
Conduct second set of interviews with staff	12/06	2/07
Submit 2 nd Status Review Report to City of Las Vegas (Brief summary of evaluation activities and results to date)		4/07
Conduct final set of interviews with staff and stakeholders	2/07	4/07
Submit draft of final evaluation report to City of Las Vegas		5/30/07
Submit Final Evaluation to City of Las Vegas		6/30/07