

**State of Maine  
Master Score Sheet**

| RFP# 202502018  |                         |   |                          |                                |                     |  |
|---|-------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <u>Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative (REGION ONE)</u> |                         |   |                          |                                |                     |  |
| <b>Bidder Name:</b>   |                         | <b>Restorative Justice Institute of Maine</b> | <b>Youth LED Justice</b> | <b>Youth Advocate Programs</b> | <b>Sweetser</b>     |  |
| <b>Proposed Cost:</b>   |                         | <b>\$577,868.00</b>                           | <b>\$804,734.00</b>      | <b>\$634,136.00</b>            | <b>\$664,066.00</b> |  |
| <b>Scoring Sections</b>   | <b>Points Available</b> |   |                          |                                |                     |  |
| Section I: Preliminary Information                                    | Pass/Fail               | Pass  | Pass                     | Pass                           | Pass                |  |
| Section II: Organization Qualifications and Experience                | 20                      | 11.00   | 6                        | 11                             | 4                   |  |
| Section III: Proposed Services  | 55                      | 22.00   | 8                        | 8                              | 8                   |  |
| Section IV: Cost Proposal   | 25                      | 25.00   | 17.95                    | 22.78                          | 21.00               |  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | <b><u>100</u></b>       | <b><u>58.00</u></b>                           | <b><u>31.95</u></b>      | <b><u>41.78</u></b>            | <b><u>33.00</u></b> |  |
| <b>Bidder Name:</b>   |                         | <b>Restorative Justice Practice LLC</b>       |                          |                                |                     |  |
| <b>Proposed Cost:</b>   |                         | <b>\$1,197,000.00</b>                         |                          |                                |                     |  |
| <b>Scoring Sections</b>   | <b>Points Available</b> |   |                          |                                |                     |  |
| Section I: Preliminary Information                                    | Pass/Fail               | Pass  |                          |                                |                     |  |
| Section II: Organization Qualifications and Experience                | 20                      | 2   |                          |                                |                     |  |
| Section III: Proposed Services  | 55                      | 3   |                          |                                |                     |  |
| Section IV: Cost Proposal   | 25                      | 12.06   |                          |                                |                     |  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | <b><u>100</u></b>       | <b><u>17.06</u></b>                           |                          |                                |                     |  |

**State of Maine**  
**Master Score Sheet**

| RFP# 202502018   |                     |  |                      |   |  |
|--|---------------------|--|----------------------|---|--|
| Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative (REGION TWO) |                     |  |                      |   |  |
| Bidder Name:   |                     | Restorative<br>Justice Institute<br>of Maine | Youth LED<br>Justice | Restorative<br>Justice Project<br>Maine | Restorative<br>Justice Practice<br>LLC |
| Proposed Cost:   |                     | \$568,440.00                                 | \$806,600.00         | \$738,300.00                            | \$1,197,000.00                         |
| Scoring Sections   | Points<br>Available |  |                      |   |  |
| Section I: Preliminary Information                             | Pass/Fail           | Pass   | Pass                 | Pass                                    | Pass                                   |
| Section II: Organization<br>Qualifications and Experience      | 20                  | 13   | 6                    | 14                                      | 2                                      |
| Section III: Proposed Services                                 | 55                  | 21   | 8                    | 45                                      | 3                                      |
| Section IV: Cost Proposal                                      | 25                  | 25   | 17.61                | 19.24                                   | 0                                      |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   | <b><u>100</u></b>   | <b><u>59.00</u></b>                          | <b><u>31.61</u></b>  | <b><u>78.24</u></b>                     | <b><u>5</u></b>                        |

**State of Maine**  
**Master Score Sheet**

| RFP# 202502018   |                     |  |                     |  |  |
|--|---------------------|--|---------------------|--|--|
| Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative (REGION THREE) |                     |  |                     |  |  |
| Bidder Name:   |                     | Restorative<br>Justice Institute<br>of Maine | Penquis C.A.P       | Restorative<br>Justice Practice<br>LLC |  |
| Proposed Cost:   |                     | \$607,000.00                                 | \$605,000.00        | \$1,197,000.00                         |  |
| Scoring Sections   | Points<br>Available |  |                     |  |  |
| Section I: Preliminary Information                               | Pass/Fail           | Pass   | Pass                | Pass                                   |  |
| Section II: Organization<br>Qualifications and Experience        | 20                  | 11   | 18                  | 2                                      |  |
| Section III: Proposed Services                                   | 55                  | 26   | 54                  | 3                                      |  |
| Section IV: Cost Proposal  | 25                  | 24.91  | 25.00               | 0                                      |  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   | <b><u>100</u></b>   | <b><u>61.91</u></b>                          | <b><u>97.00</u></b> | <b><u>5.00</u></b>                     |  |

**Award Justification Statement (Region 2)**  
**RFP# 202502018**  
**JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**I. Summary**

The Maine Department of Corrections is in need of community-based organizations that have experience working with justice-involved youth or youth-at risk for justice involvement to deliver restorative practices.

**II. Evaluation Process**

Three Team Members met on 04/10/2025 from 9:30-12 PM and 4/11/2025 from 9-12 PM to review the 12 proposals received; consensus scoring was used per procurement standards. Each team member reviewed the proposals and completed individual notes before the consensus meeting on 4/10/2025. Each team member spent approximately 1 hour per proposal reviewing the materials for a total time spent of 41.5 hours. For this specific proposal, the time of review was approximately 4 hours. This time does not include the initial review from the RFP Coordinator. The team members were as follows:

1. Sonja Charest, Contract Administrator- RFP Coordinator (non-voting)
2. Christine Thibeault, Associate Commissioner-Fiscal Expert
3. Stephanie O'Reilly, Manager of Restorative Justice-Subject Matter Expert
4. Vic Vierra, Juvenile Community Corrections Officer-Subject Matter Expert

**III. Qualifications & Experience**

- Provides restorative services in 4 of the 7 juvenile region two counties since 2005.
- Experience with all the identified restorative processes outlined in the RFP
- Provided relevant projects

**IV. Proposed Services**

- The provider identified and described thoroughly how they will implement restorative reflections, dialogue, conferences, circles, support services and circles, mentoring, closing circles and wrap up work.
- The provider identified and described thoroughly all 5 Restorative Justice Principles.
- The provider described victim centered approach to satisfaction.
- The provided work plan was clear to follow
- The provider identified and described the mandatory training that staff will be receiving.

- The provider identified the use of surveys and data collection methods to satisfaction.

## **V. Cost Proposal**

The cost points were awarded based on the standard formula described in the RFP. Here is a list of the scores:

1. Restorative Justice Project Maine: \$738,300.00—Score 19.24

## **VI. Conclusion**

This bidder received the highest score in experience due to operating in this region since 2005. The bidder received the highest score in the proposed services because they thoroughly explained each restorative process will be delivered and described the RJ principles and Victim-Centered Approach and how they are implemented in each identified process.

**Award Justification Statement (Region 3)**  
**RFP# 202502018**  
**JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**I. Summary**

The Maine Department of Corrections is in need of community-based organizations that have experience working with justice-involved youth or youth-at risk for justice involvement to deliver restorative practices.

**II. Evaluation Process**

Three Team Members met on 04/10/2025 from 9:30-12 PM and 4/11/2025 from 9-12 PM to review the 12 proposals received; consensus scoring was used per procurement standards. Each team member reviewed the proposals and completed individual notes before the consensus meeting on 4/10/2025. Each team member spent approximately 1 hour per proposal reviewing the materials for a total time spent of 41.5 hours. For this specific proposal, the time of review was approximately 4 hours. This time does not include the initial review from the RFP Coordinator. The team members were as follows:

1. Sonja Charest, Contract Administrator- RFP Coordinator (non-voting)
2. Christine Thibeault, Associate Commissioner-Fiscal Expert
3. Stephanie O'Reilly, Manager of Restorative Justice-Subject Matter Expert
4. Vic Vierra, Juvenile Community Corrections Officer-Subject Matter Expert

**III. Qualifications & Experience**

- 58 years of experience
- Licensed mental health agency
- Restorative Justice since 2017 in Juvenile Region 3
- Identified subcontractors to support coverage of the entire region

**IV. Proposed Services**

- The provider identified and described thoroughly how they will implement dialogue, conferences, COSA's, circles, support services and circles, , closing circles and wrap up work.
- The provider identified and described thoroughly all 5 Restorative Justice Principles and how it applies to the work they are doing.
- The provider described victim victim-centered approach and how they will provide alternative options for victim involvement when necessary.
- The provided work plan was clear to follow and included and organizational chart for themselves and the subcontractors
- The provider identified and described the mandatory training that staff will be receiving.

- The provider identified how they will track demographics, completions, training, outcomes, surveys, and performance measures.

## **V. Cost Proposal**

The cost points were awarded based on the standard formula described in the RFP.

Here is a list of the scores:

1. Penquis C.A.P.: \$605,000.00—Score 25

## **VI. Conclusion**

This bidder received the highest score in experience due to operating in this region since 2017, being in operation for 58 years, described the history of collaborations with other agencies, and providing relevant projects. The bidder scored the highest in proposed services due to the thoroughness of each response to the identified sections, the review team did not identify missing measures.



**STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

**Janet T. Mills  
Governor**

**Randall Liberty  
Commissioner**

**AWARD NOTIFICATION LETTER**

04/30/2025

**Restorative Justice Institute of Maine  
PO BOX 2227  
South Portland ME 04116**

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP #202502018, Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative.

Dear Emma Goldbas,

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Corrections for Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- **Juvenile Region One:** Not Awarded. The Department will reissue the RFP for Region One at a later date.
- **Juvenile Region Two:** Restorative Justice Project Maine
- **Juvenile Region Three:** Penquis C.A.P.

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Signed by:

*Sonja Charest*

4/30/2025

**Sonja Charest**, M.A., PS-C, CADC, CEBL/CEBP

Manager of Juvenile Evidence-Based Programs & Grants

*She/Her/Hers*

Maine Department of Corrections | 111 State House Station | Augusta, ME 04333-0111

Cell: (207) 458-2076



## **STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS**

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

**Janet T. Mills  
Governor**

**Randall Liberty  
Commissioner**

**AWARD NOTIFICATION LETTER**

04/30/2025

**Youth Led Justice  
175 Lancaster Street, Suite 217A  
Portland, ME 04101**

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP #202502018, Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative.

Dear Brandon Brown,

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Corrections for Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- **Juvenile Region One:** Not Awarded. The Department will reissue the RFP for Region One at a later date.
- **Juvenile Region Two:** Restorative Justice Project Maine
- **Juvenile Region Three:** Penquis C.A.P.

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Signed by:

*Sonja Charest*

4/30/2025

**Sonja Charest**, M.A., PS-C, CADC, CEBL/CEBP

Manager of Juvenile Evidence-Based Programs & Grants

*She/Her/Hers*

Maine Department of Corrections | 111 State House Station | Augusta, ME 04333-0111

Cell: (207) 458-2076



## **STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS**

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

**Janet T. Mills  
Governor**

**Randall Liberty  
Commissioner**

**AWARD NOTIFICATION LETTER**

04/30/2025

**Youth Advocate Programs  
3899 North Front Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17110**

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP #202502018, Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative.

Dear Carla Powell,

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Corrections for Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- **Juvenile Region One:** Not Awarded. The Department will reissue the RFP for Region One at a later date.
- **Juvenile Region Two:** Restorative Justice Project Maine
- **Juvenile Region Three:** Penquis C.A.P.

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Signed by:

*Sonja Charest*

4/30/2025

**Sonja Charest**, M.A., PS-C, CADC, CEBL/CEBP

Manager of Juvenile Evidence-Based Programs & Grants

*She/Her/Hers*

Maine Department of Corrections | 111 State House Station | Augusta, ME 04333-0111

Cell: (207) 458-2076



## **STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS**

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

**Janet T. Mills  
Governor**

**Randall Liberty  
Commissioner**

**AWARD NOTIFICATION LETTER**

04/30/2025

**Sweetser  
50 Moody Street  
Saco, ME 04072**

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP #202502018, Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative.

Dear Kristie Worster,

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Corrections for Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- **Juvenile Region One:** Not Awarded. The Department will reissue the RFP for Region One at a later date.
- **Juvenile Region Two:** Restorative Justice Project Maine
- **Juvenile Region Three:** Penquis C.A.P.

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Signed by: ?

*Sonja Charest*

4/30/2025

**Sonja Charest**, M.A., PS-C, CADC, CEBL/CEBP

Manager of Juvenile Evidence-Based Programs & Grants

*She/Her/Hers*

Maine Department of Corrections | 111 State House Station | Augusta, ME 04333-0111

Cell: (207) 458-2076



## **STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS**

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

**Janet T. Mills  
Governor**

**Randall Liberty  
Commissioner**

**AWARD NOTIFICATION LETTER**

04/30/2025

**Restorative Justice Practice, LLC  
1525 Red Mountain Drive  
Longmont, CO 80504**

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP #202502018, Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative.

Dear Erica Lee,

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Corrections for Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- **Juvenile Region One:** Not Awarded. The Department will reissue the RFP for Region One at a later date.
- **Juvenile Region Two:** Restorative Justice Project Maine
- **Juvenile Region Three:** Penquis C.A.P.

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Signed by:

*Sonja Charest*

4/30/2025

**Sonja Charest**, M.A., PS-C, CADC, CEBL/CEBP

Manager of Juvenile Evidence-Based Programs & Grants

*She/Her/Hers*

Maine Department of Corrections | 111 State House Station | Augusta, ME 04333-0111

Cell: (207) 458-2076



## **STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS**

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

**Janet T. Mills  
Governor**

**Randall Liberty  
Commissioner**

**AWARD NOTIFICATION LETTER**

04/30/2025

**Restorative Justice Project Maine  
132 High Street  
Belfast, ME 04915**

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP #202502018, Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative.

Dear Kathy Durgin-Leighton,

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Corrections for Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- **Juvenile Region One:** Not Awarded. The Department will reissue the RFP for Region One at a later date.
- **Juvenile Region Two:** Restorative Justice Project Maine
- **Juvenile Region Three:** Penquis C.A.P.

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Signed by:

*Sonja Charest*

4/30/2025

**Sonja Charest**, M.A., PS-C, CADC, CEBL/CEBP

Manager of Juvenile Evidence-Based Programs & Grants

*She/Her/Hers*

Maine Department of Corrections | 111 State House Station | Augusta, ME 04333-0111

Cell: (207) 458-2076



## **STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS**

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).



**STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

**Janet T. Mills  
Governor**

**Randall Liberty  
Commissioner**

**AWARD NOTIFICATION LETTER**

04/30/2025

**Penquis C.A.P., Inc.  
262 Harlow Street  
Bangor, ME 04401**

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award(s) under RFP #202502018, Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative.

Dear Mindy Kane,

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFP), issued by the State of Maine Department of Corrections for Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award(s) to the following bidder(s):

- **Juvenile Region One:** Not Awarded. The Department will reissue the RFP for Region One at a later date.
- **Juvenile Region Two:** Restorative Justice Project Maine
- **Juvenile Region Three:** Penquis C.A.P.

The bidder(s) listed above received the evaluation team's highest ranking(s). The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder(s) soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFP, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFP, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFP are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

Signed by:

*Sonja Charest*

4/30/2025

**Sonja Charest**, M.A., PS-C, CADC, CEBl/CEBP

Manager of Juvenile Evidence-Based Programs & Grants

*She/Her/Hers*

Maine Department of Corrections | 111 State House Station | Augusta, ME 04333-0111

Cell: (207) 458-2076



## **STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS**

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Office of State Procurement Services [formerly the Division of Purchases], Chapter 120, § (2) (2).

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION ONE)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**SUMMARY PAGE**

**Department Name:** Maine Department of Corrections  
**Name of RFP Coordinator:** Sonja Charest  
**Names of Evaluators:** Christine Thibeault, Stephanie O'Reilly, Vic Viera

| <u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>  | <u>Pass</u>             | <u>Fail</u>           |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)   | <b>X</b>                |                       |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eligible to work in the state of Maine</li> </ul> | <b>X</b>                |                       |
| <u>Scoring Sections</u>  | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience                                     | <b>20</b>               | <b>11</b>             |
| Section III. Proposed Services   | <b>55</b>               | <b>22</b>             |
| Section IV. Cost Proposal  | <b>25</b>               | <b>25</b>             |
| <u>Total Points</u>  | <u>100</u>              | <u>58</u>             |

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION ONE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**OVERVIEW OF SECTION I  
Preliminary Information**

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
|                                    |
| Section I. Preliminary Information |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- The bidder signed and submitted the Bidder Certification.
- The bidder attached their non-profit certification for the state of Maine.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION ONE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Organization Qualifications and Experience**

|  | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>11</b>             |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience

A. Overview of Organization

- Working with MDOC since 2013.
- Delivery a variety of RJ practices and “hold relevant degrees and extensive training in RJ facilitation.”
- Use a data-driven approach and robust data collection and evaluation.
- The staffing table was provided but did not give details on specific FTE’s and per-diem staff.
- The provider gives examples of three relevant projects;
  1. The first project directly relevant as it pertains to existing contract with MDOC for RJ services.
  2. The second project is relevant because it describes a community healing and accountability process using RJ dialogue, including youth and older youth, BIPOC, and LGBTQIA+. It is unclear what the overall goal of this project was and the processes that lead to the successes. The project focused on residence, accountability, and systemic barriers. Not directly relevant but tangentially relevant.
  3. The third project was co-learning and action coalition, the description of the project is unclear. Power mapping is not defined, unclear. Terms in this project are not defined and unclear purposes and goals.
- The provider identified degrees, collection methods and trainings but did not elaborate on the details as it pertains to these sections.
- “Moving at the speed of trust” was a good quote.

B. Subcontractors

- None listed.

C. The provider included the organization chart in this section.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION ONE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Proposed Services**

|                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section III. Proposed Services | <b>55</b>               | <b>22</b>             |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

I. Proposed Services

A. Population Served

- Region One (York & Cumberland)
- 80 youth annually (40 each county)
- Multilingual, culturally aware staff and interpreter services.
- Distinguished between the needs of York and Cumberland County
- Immigrant and refugee communities, multilingual facilitation, trauma-informed practices.
- Target outreach to underrepresented communities

B. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- Describe workforce development programs in York for vulnerable youth.
- Virtual work has been identified, and RJ virtual in region one where there is a dense population is a concern.
- Many undefined terms
- Community Liaisons looks like it should be a subcontractor the way that it is written.
  1. This was not included on their organization chart.
  2. Partnerships with cultural community organizations were not listed on the subcontractor sections.
- RJ principle 1: not clearly identified
- RJ principle 2: in the trauma-informed section around choice of consent.
- RJ principle 3: not clearly identified and minimal details given outside of identified victim-centered approach. Not clear on the details on how they acknowledge the focus of the most impacted party.
- RJ principle 4: identified empowerment and resilience to support positive experience, case management collaboration, check-ins, encouragement and overcoming challenges. Follow through and access to resources.
- RJ principle 5: emotional and physical safety, choice and autonomy, divers population, family and youth voice with the youth advisory group.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION ONE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

- Victim-Centered Approach: yes, the provider was identified. Victims will engage in a way that feels good to them, but no identified commitment to the direct definition of it. No identification of use of surrogate victims. Identifies consent from JCCO's to access victims in the process.
- Type of services provided: pre-conferencing/pre-process preparation, monitoring and support, mentoring, initial meeting, repair agreement, dialogue, circles, mediation, and conferencing.
  1. Are they certified mediators? Not clear if trained in this specifically.
  2. Co-create agreements with the responsible party, which did not identify the victim's needs at the forefront.
  3. Did not see closing letters, was vague about closing details.

**C. Implementation – Work Plan**

- Provided a work plan.
- The plan was not formatted to understand the timeline easily.
- Plan identified starting to work with youth until November, which is 5 months post contract start date, but unclear on exact process.
- Ongoing task box was not clear that it would be ongoing working with youth.

**D. Training**

- Did not identify where RJ Facilitation was provided and by who
- Stated they would do culturally responsive training but did not identify who, where and requirements.
- In Qualification sections, not proposed services; they list that all staff are trained in facilitation, PYD, Trauma-informed care, but does not identify who, hours, training requirements, etc.
- Recruit and train volunteers, but does not identify plan.

**E. Data Collection**

- Outcomes did not seem realistic, feasible, and attainable.
  1. Reduced recidivism rate, did not identify baseline on how to identify. Recidivism not defined, many definitions for this.
- Admin coordinator compiles and analyzes KPI's monthly.
- Annual evaluations include, county specific outcome analysis.
- Victim outcomes pre/post assessment on fear and safety and avoidance behaviors, outcomes are questionable around ethical and if they are attainable through data collection.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION ONE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Cost Proposal**

| Lowest Submitted<br>Cost Proposal | , | Cost Proposal<br>Being Scored | x        | Score<br>Weight  | =        | Score     |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|-----------|
| <b>\$577,868.00</b>               | , | <b>\$577,868.00</b>           | <b>x</b> | <b>25 points</b> | <b>=</b> | <b>25</b> |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Cost Proposal
  - A. A formula was used to score the cost proposals.
  - B. This bidder was the lowest proposal for Region One and is awarded the full 25 point.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: YOUTH LED JUSTICE (REGION ONE)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**SUMMARY PAGE**

**Department Name:** Maine Department of Corrections  
**Name of RFP Coordinator:** Sonja Charest  
**Names of Evaluators:** Christine Thibeault, Stephanie O'Reilly, Vic Viera

| <u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>                              | <u>Pass</u>             | <u>Fail</u>           |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)       | <b>X</b>                |                       |
| • Eligible to work in the state of Maine               | <b>X</b>                |                       |
| <u>Scoring Sections</u>                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>6</b>              |
| Section III. Proposed Services                         | <b>55</b>               | <b>8</b>              |
| Section IV. Cost Proposal                              | <b>25</b>               | <b>17.95</b>          |
| <u>Total Points</u>                                    | <u>100</u>              | <u>31.95</u>          |

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: YOUTH LED JUSTICE (REGION ONE)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**OVERVIEW OF SECTION I  
Preliminary Information**

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
|                                    |
| Section I. Preliminary Information |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- The bidder signed and attached the bidder certification, insurance proof, and non-profit status.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: YOUTH LED JUSTICE (REGION ONE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Organization Qualifications and Experience**

|  | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>6</b>              |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience

A. Overview of Organization

- Agency has experience as Maine Youth Court, Youth LED Justice independent 501C3
- Identified capacity to do the work
- Identified that they are moving away from the Youth LED process
- Identified region two in this proposal rather than identifying region one specifically.
- Data identified in the qualifications does not align with internal data for youth served for this provider.
- Project One: minimal details, does not describe a project with relevant experiences.
- Project Two: minimal details, does not describe a project with relevant experiences. Does not elaborate on training identification.
- Project Three: minimal details, does not describe a project with relevant experiences. School-based (youth and adults) preventive community circles and responsive practices.
- Does not identify any management of funding in projects and nature of services.

B. Subcontractors

- None listed.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Proposed Services**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: YOUTH LED JUSTICE (REGION ONE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

|                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
|                                | <u>e</u>                | <u>d</u>              |
| Section III. Proposed Services | <b>55</b>               | <b>8</b>              |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

I. Proposed Services

A. Population Served

- Region 1 (York and Cumberland)
- 200 referrals per year, does not define specifics per county
- Referral numbers do not align with past number of referrals in that region (see Q & A summary posted)
- There is no identified staff capacity or increase to manage 200 referrals, does not identify staff currently working in that region.

B. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- The proposal was hard to follow and there is no specific process that they outline.
- There is assumption that the youth will take accountability rather than supporting the youth to get to accountability.
- Identify that they will work with you on a minimal of weekly basis.
- Type of services:
  1. They did not identify the types of services they will complete other than dialogue and circle, but did not elaborate on what this means or how they are implementing it.
  2. Mentioned mentorship but did not define or implementation plan. No mentor in the organization chart. Unclear who is going to provide the mentoring.
  3. Letters of completion identified to referral source, but encourage the youth to keep in contact with JCCO for support, which is not the role of the JCCO.
  4. Establishing presence in schools, but this was not identified as the scope of the services requested.
  5. Community building is beyond the scope of requested services.
- RJ principle 1: mentions but did not address clearly.
- RJ principle 2: mentions but did not address clearly.
- RJ principle 3: mentions but did not address clearly.
- RJ principle 4: mentions but did not address clearly.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: YOUTH LED JUSTICE (REGION ONE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

- RJ principle 5: mentions but did not address clearly.
  - Victim-Centered Approach: stated they would reach out to the harmed party, but did not explain what this meant for the agency, alternatives for direct contact. Did not address clearly.
- C. Implementation – Work Plan
- Provided but details or minimal. Implementation plan only goes until the second quarter, does not identify two-year plan as requested.
  - States they will do outreach to subcontractors, but does not list them. Plan does not have specific dates and timeframes.
- D. Training
- States that training is a priority, monthly supervision, and that all staff are trained in facilitation, but does not define who, where, hours, and skills.
  - Refresher training for all staff annually and motivational interviewing— does not define where they will get this training and how.
  - Unclear what an innovative circle practice is.
- E. Data Collection
- Stated they will continue to follow current contract, but does not specify what this is or how they have experience with it.
  - Stating they would identify a new survey for facilitation
  - Does not identify what the performance they will measure but identify they will measure them.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: YOUTH LED JUSTICE (REGION ONE)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Cost Proposal**

---

| Lowest Submitted Cost Proposal | , | Cost Proposal Being Scored | x        | Score Weight     | =        | Score        |
|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|--------------|
| <b>\$577,868.00</b>            | , | <b>\$804,734.00</b>        | <b>x</b> | <b>25 points</b> | <b>=</b> | <b>17.95</b> |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Cost Proposal
  - A. A formula was used to score the cost proposals.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Youth Advocate Programs (Region One)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**SUMMARY PAGE**

**Department Name:** Maine Department of Corrections  
**Name of RFP Coordinator:** Sonja Charest  
**Names of Evaluators:** Christine Thibeault, Stephanie O'Reilly, Vic Viera

| <b><u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u></b>                       | <b><u>Pass</u></b>             | <b><u>Fail</u></b>           |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)       | <b>X</b>                       |                              |
| • Eligible to work in the state of Maine               | <b>X</b>                       |                              |
| <b><u>Scoring Sections</u></b>                         | <b><u>Points Available</u></b> | <b><u>Points Awarded</u></b> |
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>                      | <b>11</b>                    |
| Section III. Proposed Services                         | <b>55</b>                      | <b>8</b>                     |
| Section IV. Cost Proposal                              | <b>25</b>                      | <b>22.78</b>                 |
| <b><u>Total Points</u></b>                             | <b><u>100</u></b>              | <b><u>41.78</u></b>          |

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Youth Advocate Programs (Region One)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**OVERVIEW OF SECTION I  
Preliminary Information**

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
|                                    |
| Section I. Preliminary Information |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- Cover page, bidder certification and certification to operate in the state were all present.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Youth Advocate Programs (Region One)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Organization Qualifications and Experience**

|  | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>11</b>             |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience

A. Overview of Organization

- Operates in 33 states, founded in 1975
- Currently delivering services in the state and in region one
- Accredited
- Experience with diversion opportunities for youth
- Project 1: Been in Maine since 2019 but not delivering RJ practices.
- Project 2: Ohio, contracted to support transitions for reentry not RJ practices.
- Project 3: New Jersey a variety of programs but no RJ specific.
- They do mention a restorative approach through community service to give back to the communities.

B. Subcontractors

- None listed.
- Org Chart is completed
- Job Descriptions but none listed as RJ
- State “advocates” as RJ facilitation which is not language best practices.
- Litigation documentation provided.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Youth Advocate Programs (Region One)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Proposed Services**

|                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section III. Proposed Services | <b>55</b>               | <b>8</b>              |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Proposed Services
  - A. Population Served
    - York and Cumberland (Region 1)
    - Justice-involved youth and those at-risk
    - 45 youth annually, but did not clarify how many in each county
  - B. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    - Description of services exceeds the scope of services listed in the RFP.
    - The proposed services are aligned with wraparound services not direct RJ services.
    - Tools identified are not relevant.
    - Will no eject no reject be a problem with voluntary?
    - RJ Principle 1: not clearly defined.
    - RJ Principle 2: not clearly defined.
    - RJ Principle 3: not clearly defined.
    - RJ Principle 4: not clearly defined.
    - RJ Principle 5: identifies they the show dignity and respect to clients
    - Victim-Centered Approach—states that both victim and offender are center of the process, which is not a victim-centered approach.
      - 1. No eject no reject policy may contradict the victim centered approach.
    - Types of services: identified COSA’s but define it as family support circles, which is incorrect and not what is requested in the RFP.
    - Services out of scope of what was requested in the RFP.
    - Mentoring services, and individual case planning
    - 4-month programming is not realistic based on current juvenile practices
  - C. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Provided.
    - Part 1 Rapid start up, that is 8 weeks.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Youth Advocate Programs (Region One)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

- Part 2 timeline/work plan for programs after 8 weeks, individual youth referred
- Timeline lists not accepting referrals until 9 weeks.

**D. Training**

- Program director is responsible for operating the program, staffing structure, but not specific training is listed.
- Basic “advocacy training” “Madnt training”
- 2 staff training and ongoing 20 hours of training per year

**E. Data Collection**

- Entry survey and Discharge Survey with youth enrolled, but nothing about victim satisfaction surveys
- CQI team will review reports and collect demographic data.
- Evolv database system
- 3, 6, 12 month data collection post-completion.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Youth Advocate Programs (Region One)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Cost Proposal**

| Lowest Submitted<br>Cost Proposal | , | Cost Proposal<br>Being Scored | x        | Score<br>Weight  | =        | Score        |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|--------------|
| <b>\$577,868.00</b>               | , | <b>\$634,136.00</b>           | <b>x</b> | <b>25 points</b> | <b>=</b> | <b>22.78</b> |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Cost Proposal
  - A. A formula was used to score the cost proposals.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: SWEETSER (REGION ONE)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**SUMMARY PAGE**

**Department Name:** Maine Department of Corrections  
**Name of RFP Coordinator:** Sonja Charest  
**Names of Evaluators:** Christine Thibeault, Stephanie O'Reilly, Vic Viera

| <u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>                              | <u>Pass</u>             | <u>Fail</u>           |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)       | <b>X</b>                |                       |
| • Eligible to work in the state of Maine               | <b>X</b>                |                       |
| <u>Scoring Sections</u>                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>4</b>              |
| Section III. Proposed Services                         | <b>55</b>               | <b>8</b>              |
| Section IV. Cost Proposal                              | <b>25</b>               | <b>21.00</b>          |
| <u>Total Points</u>                                    | <u>100</u>              | <u>33.00</u>          |

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: SWEETSER (REGION ONE)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**OVERVIEW OF SECTION I  
Preliminary Information**

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
|                                    |
| Section I. Preliminary Information |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- The provider submitted the cover page, bidder certification, certification documentation to work in the state of Maine, and attached their certificate of license.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: SWEETSER (REGION ONE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Organization Qualifications and Experience**

|  | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>4</b>              |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience
  - A. Overview of Organization
    - 60-year history in the state of Maine
    - Mental health and substance use services, residential services
    - No stated history of providing RJ services.
    - Experience in serving youth but not in RJ.
    - Project identified were not relevant to RJ practices.
    - The organization chart did not clearly state where RJ would fall under.
    - Litigation was identified and clearly defined.
  - Subcontractors
    - None listed.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Proposed Services**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: SWEETSER (REGION ONE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

|                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
|                                | <u>e</u>                | <u>d</u>              |
| Section III. Proposed Services | <b>55</b>               | <b>8</b>              |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

I. Proposed Services

A. Population Served

- York and Cumberland
- Did not state how many youth they would serve.
- Stated they would provide RJ in Saco, Sanford, Portland, and Brunswick offices.
- New program would need to hire and established.

B. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- Appears to implement RJ into current services rather than new programming.
- Stated they will provide COSA's but has no history of RJ, appears to copy and paste/minimally changed wording for doing COSA's. stated they would do sexual assault cases, but this is not allowable or requested under this RFP request.
- Many staff identified but roles not defined clearly.
- Types of services:
  1. "mistake maker" and "harmed person" is not the correct language or best practices for language.
  2. Does not appear to acknowledge the impact and harm to victims and how that will be navigated in the process.
  3. Does not appear to understand RJ best practices, principles, and application of understanding.
  4. Conferencing identified but does not identify the others that are in the process per best practices.
  5. States they will provide peer mentoring but does not identify how this will be completed. unclear if they are meeting in addition to the youth/case on mentoring in addition to RJ.
  6. No mention of services for the most impacted party
- RJ Principle 1: not clearly defined
- RJ Principle 2: not clearly defined
- RJ Principle 3: not clearly defined

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: SWEETSER (REGION ONE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

- RJ Principle 4: not clearly defined
  - RJ Principle 5: not clearly defined
  - Victim-Centered Approach: does not define or mention this.
- C. Implementation – Work Plan
- Provided.
  - The plan was organized and covers the complete period of work.
  - Creation of referral form and website, which is not requested per RFP.
- D. Training
- Working with external agencies to train staff. Who are the external agencies? What is the training?
  - Identified a 12-week timeline for all staff.
  - Some staff have been identified as having received RJ training
- E. Data Collection
- QR codes for survey collection
  - Victim-satisfaction survey
  - Internal database usage

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: SWEETSER (REGION ONE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Cost Proposal**

---

| Lowest Submitted<br>Cost Proposal | , | Cost Proposal<br>Being Scored | x        | Score<br>Weight  | =        | Score        |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|--------------|
| <b>\$577,868.00</b>               | , | <b>\$664,066.00</b>           | <b>x</b> | <b>25 points</b> | <b>=</b> | <b>21.00</b> |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Cost Proposal
  - A. A formula was used to score the cost proposals.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Practice LLC (Region One)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**SUMMARY PAGE**

**Department Name:** Maine Department of Corrections  
**Name of RFP Coordinator:** Sonja Charest  
**Names of Evaluators:** Christine Thibeault, Stephanie O'Reilly, Vic Viera

| <b><u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u></b>                       | <b><u>Pass</u></b>             | <b><u>Fail</u></b>           |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)       | <b>X</b>                       |                              |
| • Eligible to work in the state of Maine               | <b>X</b>                       |                              |
| <b><u>Scoring Sections</u></b>                         | <b><u>Points Available</u></b> | <b><u>Points Awarded</u></b> |
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>                      | <b>2</b>                     |
| Section III. Proposed Services                         | <b>55</b>                      | <b>3</b>                     |
| Section IV. Cost Proposal                              | <b>25</b>                      | <b>12.06</b>                 |
| <b><u>Total Points</u></b>                             | <b><u>100</u></b>              | <b><u>17.06</u></b>          |

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Practice LLC (Region One)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**OVERVIEW OF SECTION I  
Preliminary Information**

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
|                                    |
| Section I. Preliminary Information |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- Cover page and bidder certification was provided. A statement of foreign qualifications to conduct activities was provided as proof to work in the state.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Practice LLC (Region One)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Organization Qualifications and Experience**

|  | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>2</b>              |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience
  - A. Overview of Organization
    - Created in 2020 in Colorado
    - Worked on RJ initiatives in Colorado in Minnesota but did not clearly define what these were.
    - Brief description fails to provide specific examples of restorative justice services being delivered.
  - B. Subcontractors
    - 21 subcontractors

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Proposed Services**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Practice LLC (Region One)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

|                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section III. Proposed Services | <b>55</b>               | <b>3</b>              |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Proposed Services
  - A. Population Served
    - York and Cumberland (region 1)
    - Discuss implementing RJ agencies not youth, family or victims.
    - Appears to want to train RJ agencies, standards, not serving the youth specifically.
    - The organization chart is not clear, no relation to RJ work. Provided a staff list but unclear of what their roles are within restorative justice. Subcontractors are on org chart.
    - Services described were not requested in RFP.
  - B. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    - RJ Principle 1: did not mention.
    - RJ Principle 2: did not mention.
    - RJ Principle 3: did not mention.
    - RJ Principle 4: did not mention.
    - RJ Principle 5: did not mention.
    - Victim-Centered Approach: did not mention.
    - Type of Services: focus groups with RJ organizations, community round-up. Services described were not requested in RFP.
  - C. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Provided. Covers the period of the contract, but is difficult to understand. Does not list taking referrals for youth. Services described were not requested in RFP.
  - D. Training
    - Motivation interviewing, neurobiology, humor, internal family systems, non-violent communication. Services described were not requested in RFP.
  - E. Data Collection
    - Database system
    - Do their own surveys, but no mention of implementation.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Cost Proposal**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Practice LLC (Region One)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

| Lowest Submitted<br>Cost Proposal | ÷ | Cost Proposal<br>Being Scored | x        | Score<br>Weight  | =        | Score        |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|--------------|
| <b>\$577,868.00</b>               | ÷ | <b>\$1,197,000.00</b>         | <b>x</b> | <b>25 points</b> | <b>=</b> | <b>12.06</b> |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Cost Proposal
  - Formula was used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION TWO)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**SUMMARY PAGE**

**Department Name:** Maine Department of Corrections  
**Name of RFP Coordinator:** Sonja Charest  
**Names of Evaluators:** Christine Thibeault, Stephanie O’Rielly, Vic Viera

| <b><u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u></b>                       | <b><u>Pass</u></b>             | <b><u>Fail</u></b>           |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)       | <b>X</b>                       |                              |
| • Eligible to work in the state of Maine               | <b>X</b>                       |                              |
| <b><u>Scoring Sections</u></b>                         | <b><u>Points Available</u></b> | <b><u>Points Awarded</u></b> |
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>                      | <b>13</b>                    |
| Section III. Proposed Services                         | <b>55</b>                      | <b>21</b>                    |
| Section IV. Cost Proposal                              | <b>25</b>                      | <b>25</b>                    |
| <b><u>Total Points</u></b>                             | <b><u>100</u></b>              | <b><u>59.00</u></b>          |

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION TWO)**

**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**OVERVIEW OF SECTION I  
Preliminary Information**

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
|                                    |
| Section I. Preliminary Information |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- The bidder signed and submitted the Bidder Certification.
- The bidder attached their non-profit certification for the state of Maine.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION TWO)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Organization Qualifications and Experience**

|  | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>13</b>             |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience
  - A. Overview of Organization
    - Region Two
    - Working with MDOC since 2013.
    - Delivery a variety of RJ practices and “hold relevant degrees and extensive training in RJ facilitation.”
    - Use a data-driven approach and robust data collection and evaluation.
    - The staffing table was provided but did not give details on specific FTE’s and per-diem staff.
    - The provider gives examples of three relevant projects;
      1. The first project directly relevant as it pertains to existing contract with MDOC for RJ services.
      2. The second project is relevant because it describes a community healing and accountability process using RJ dialogue, including youth and older youth, BIPOC, and LGBTQIA+. It is unclear what the overall goal of this project was and the processes that lead to the successes. The project focused on residence, accountability, and systemic barriers. Not directly relevant but tangentially relevant.
      3. The third project was co-learning and action coalition, the description of the project is unclear. Power mapping is not defined, unclear. Terms in this project are not defined and unclear purposes and goals.
    - The provider identified degrees, collection methods and trainings but did not elaborate on the details as it pertains to these sections.
    - “Moving at the speed of trust” was a good quote.
    - Identified Oxford County which has not been served in the past.
  - B. Subcontractors
    - Mention, but not listed specifically.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION TWO)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Proposed Services**

|                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section III. Proposed Services | <b>55</b>               | <b>21</b>             |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Proposed Services
  - A. Population Served
    - Juvenile Region Two
    - 80 youth served identified
    - Franklin referrals expectation is 0-1, where the need is greater in this area.
    - Kennebec referral expectation is 4, where the need is greater in this area.
  - B. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    - Type of services: Restorative mediation (who is providing this specific training), does not explain how they will triage the types of services they will provide for specific cases. Dialogue, circles, mediation, and conferencing.
    - Case management support services—this scope is not requested in the RFP.
    - Completion and closure was within 12-16 weeks of open.
    - Identified specific needs for rural populations (i.e.. Transportation)
    - Virtual as “back-up” and seasonal planning
    - RJ Principle 1: not clearly defined if this is embedded in programming.
    - RJ Principle 2: not clearly defined if this is embedded in programming.
    - RJ Principle 3: not clearly defined if this is embedded in programming.
    - RJ Principle 4: not clearly defined if this is embedded in programming.
    - RJ Principle 5: not clearly defined if this is embedded in programming.
    - Victim-Centered Approach: victim outreach, initial outreach, small towns handled with care for privacy, flexible options, prep and follow through victims received support to feel safe, heard.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION TWO)**

**DATE: 04/11/2025**

- Staffing: one FTE in Oxford/Lewiston, one FTE Bath/Brunswick (Brunswick is technically Region 1), per-diem network listed but not the number of staff available
  - Regional advisory committee of 15-18 members—review of PM's/ community staff/ youth members. Appears to be unrealistic on administrative tasks to maintain and sustain an advisory group across a diverse and vast region.
  - Long-term financial sustainability, leveraging other funding resources— does not explain how they will do that.
  - Culturally responsive engagement and interpretation services, does not list as subcontractors.
- C. Implementation – Work Plan
- Provided a work plan.
  - The plan was not formatted to understand the timeline easily.
  - The ongoing task for serving youth was 7-12 months, unclear when they will start taking referrals or begin working with you.
- D. Training
- Who certified them as mediators?
  - Did not appear to have a specific training section, was listed in the quals section.
- E. Data Collection
- Quality assurance schedule, case file audits, staff performance reviews, process observations, stakeholder feedback, data analysis, PM tracking, budget review.
  - Regional learning exchanges—what does this mean?
  - Case level data, RJ dashboard, KPI's monthly, quarterly outcome reviews.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION TWO)**

**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Cost Proposal**

---

| Lowest Submitted<br>Cost Proposal | , | Cost Proposal<br>Being Scored | x        | Score<br>Weight  | =        | Score     |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|-----------|
| <b>\$568,440.00</b>               | , | <b>\$568,440.00</b>           | <b>x</b> | <b>25 points</b> | <b>=</b> | <b>25</b> |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Cost Proposal
  - A. A formula was used to score the cost proposals. The bidder was the lowest in this region and received the full 25 points.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: YOUTH LED JUSTICE (REGION TWO)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**SUMMARY PAGE**

**Department Name:** Maine Department of Corrections  
**Name of RFP Coordinator:** Sonja Charest  
**Names of Evaluators:** Christine Thibeault, Stephanie O'Reilly, Vic Viera

| <b><u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u></b>   | <b><u>Pass</u></b>             | <b><u>Fail</u></b>           |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)   | <b>X</b>                       |                              |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eligible to work in the state of Maine</li> </ul> | <b>X</b>                       |                              |
| <b><u>Scoring Sections</u></b>   | <b><u>Points Available</u></b> | <b><u>Points Awarded</u></b> |
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience                                     | <b>20</b>                      | <b>6</b>                     |
| Section III. Proposed Services   | <b>55</b>                      | <b>8</b>                     |
| Section IV. Cost Proposal  | <b>25</b>                      | <b>17.61</b>                 |
| <b><u>Total Points</u></b>   | <b><u>100</u></b>              | <b><u>31.61</u></b>          |

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: YOUTH LED JUSTICE (REGION TWO)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**OVERVIEW OF SECTION I  
Preliminary Information**

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
|                                    |
| Section I. Preliminary Information |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- The bidder signed and attached the bidder certification, insurance proof, and non-profit status.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: YOUTH LED JUSTICE (REGION TWO)**

**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Organization Qualifications and Experience**

|  | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>6</b>              |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience

A. Overview of Organization

- Agency has experience as Maine Youth Court, Youth LED Justice independent 501C3
- Identified capacity to do the work
- Identified that they are moving away from the Youth LED process
- Identified region two in this proposal rather than identifying region one specifically.
- Data identified in the qualifications does not align with internal data for youth served for this provider.
- Project One: minimal details, does not describe a project with relevant experiences.
- Project Two: minimal details, does not describe a project with relevant experiences. Does not elaborate on training identification.
- Project Three: minimal details, does not describe a project with relevant experiences. School-based (youth and adults) preventive community circles and responsive practices.
- Does not identify any management of funding in projects and nature of services.

B. Subcontractors

- None listed.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Proposed Services**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: YOUTH LED JUSTICE (REGION TWO)**

**DATE: 04/11/2025**

|                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
|                                | <u>e</u>                | <u>d</u>              |
| Section III. Proposed Services | <b>55</b>               | <b>8</b>              |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

I. Proposed Services

A. Population Served

- Juvenile Region two
- Stated historical referrals of 200 youth per year
- Identified 180 that they would serve per year as the sole provider

B. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- Type of services: repair agreement phase, possible circle process. Did not explain how the program will be implemented throughout the process.
- Identified school-based programming which is outside the scope of the RFP.
- RJ Principle 1: Does not mention.
- RJ Principle 2: Does not mention.
- RJ Principle 3: Does not mention.
- RJ Principle 4: Does not mention.
- RJ Principle 5: Does not mention.
- Victim-Centered Approach: stated they would reach out to the harmed party, but did not explain what this meant for the agency, alternatives for direct contact. Did not address clearly.

C. Implementation – Work Plan

- Provided but details or minimal. Implementation plan only goes until the second quarter, does not identify two-year plan as requested.

D. Training

- Stated the director when out of state and brought back knowledge.
- Identified annual training is motivational interviewing, PYD, mandated reporting.
- Specialized training for 5 organizations but not in the subcontractor section or explain what this is.

E. Data Collection

- Stated they will continue to follow the current contract but does not specify what this is or how they have experience with it.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: YOUTH LED JUSTICE (REGION TWO)**

**DATE: 04/11/2025**

- Developing staff satisfaction survey

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: YOUTH LED JUSTICE (REGION TWO)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Cost Proposal**

| Lowest Submitted<br>Cost Proposal | , | Cost Proposal<br>Being Scored | x        | Score<br>Weight  | =        | Score        |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|--------------|
| <b>\$568,440.00</b>               | , | <b>\$806,600.00</b>           | <b>x</b> | <b>25 points</b> | <b>=</b> | <b>17.61</b> |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Cost Proposal
  - A. A formula was used to score the cost proposals.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Project Maine (REGION TWO)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**SUMMARY PAGE**

**Department Name:** Maine Department of Corrections  
**Name of RFP Coordinator:** Sonja Charest  
**Names of Evaluators:** Christine Thibeault, Stephanie O'Reilly, Vic Viera

| <u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>                              | <u>Pass</u>             | <u>Fail</u>           |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)       | <b>X</b>                |                       |
| • Eligible to work in the state of Maine               | <b>X</b>                |                       |
| <u>Scoring Sections</u>                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>14</b>             |
| Section III. Proposed Services                         | <b>55</b>               | <b>45</b>             |
| Section IV. Cost Proposal                              | <b>25</b>               | <b>19.24</b>          |
| <u>Total Points</u>                                    | <u>100</u>              | <u>78.24</u>          |

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Project Maine (REGION TWO)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**OVERVIEW OF SECTION I  
Preliminary Information**

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
|                                    |
| Section I. Preliminary Information |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- The bidder provided the cover page, certification, insurance and documentation that they work in the state.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Project Maine (REGION TWO)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Organization Qualifications and Experience**

|  | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>14</b>             |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience
  - A. Overview of Organization
    - Providing RJ services for 4 of the 7 counties since 2005
    - Provides reentry services in Belfast Maine
    - Provides full array of RJ processes (pre-conferencing, dialogue, conferences, circles, support circles, reintegration circles (unclear what this means))
    - Identified the most impacted party in the forefront/ services tailored to individual needs.
    - Describe volunteer and staff skills and experience, mentoring training (18 hour) foundations course.
    - Project 1: working with MEIRS to deliver culturally relevant and linguistically accessible services, meeting needs of immigrant youth and working with people with lived experience to inform practices. Did not describe the trainings that the 6 youth completed.
    - Project 2: working with JJAG to expand on project one and circles of care (not defined), which appears to be school directed.
    - Project 3: identified current work with MDOC, 92% did not have a record following completion and 100% victim survey—was not clear where this data came through.
  - B. Subcontractors
    - 1 named—MEIRS
    - Potentially subcontract with YLJ and RJIM based on the results of the RFP. Would subcontract with existing organizations or hire another staff to cover those areas.
    - Unclear of which areas the subcontractors will cover

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Project Maine (REGION TWO)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Proposed Services**

|                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section III. Proposed Services | <b>55</b>               | <b>45</b>             |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Proposed Services
  - A. Population Served
    - Region two
  - B. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    - Types of services: restorative reflections, dialogue, conferences, circles, support services and circles, mentoring, closing circles and wrap up work. Each category is described effectively and how it will be implemented.
    - Harm repair agreement is under 16 weeks for completion
    - RJ Principle 1: defined and explained thoroughly.
    - RJ Principle 2: defined and explained thoroughly
    - RJ Principle 3: defined and explained thoroughly
    - RJ Principle 4: defined and explained thoroughly
    - RJ Principle 5: defined and explained thoroughly
    - Victim-Centered Approach: acknowledge victim-centered but appears to describe the responsible party focus.
  - C. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Provided.
    - Identified 4 phases and monthly/quarterly/yearly outline.
    - Easy to understand and follow.
    - Hire up to 2 RJ managers if needed
  - D. Training
    - State training subcontractors, outline ongoing case reviews with new staff.
    - Training identified in qualifications section NOT this section
      1. Mentors complete 18 hours of training
      2. Training modules

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Project Maine (REGION TWO)**

**DATE: 04/11/2025**

3. Baseline staff training (42 hours) in RJ, trauma-informed care, PYD, and cultural competencies
4. 18 hours of addressing harm through RJ process
5. Ongoing staff meetings

**E. Data Collection**

- Survey and youth outcome survey
- Quote a youth
- No victim satisfaction survey identified
- Use a database Vela for tracking
- Minimal information on what is being tracked
- Goals are that 90% completed with good outcomes by the court

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Project Maine (REGION TWO)**

**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Cost Proposal**

---

| Lowest Submitted<br>Cost Proposal | , | Cost Proposal<br>Being Scored | x        | Score<br>Weight  | =        | Score        |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|--------------|
| <b>\$568,440.00</b>               | , | <b>\$738,300.00</b>           | <b>x</b> | <b>25 points</b> | <b>=</b> | <b>19.24</b> |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Cost Proposal
  - A. A formula was used to score the cost proposals.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Practice LLC (REGION TWO)**  
**DATE: 04/09/2025**

**SUMMARY PAGE**

**Department Name:** Maine Department of Corrections  
**Name of RFP Coordinator:** Sonja Charest  
**Names of Evaluators:** Christine Thibeault, Stephanie O'Reilly, Vic Viera

| <b><u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u></b>                       | <b><u>Pass</u></b>             | <b><u>Fail</u></b>           |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)       | <b>X</b>                       |                              |
| • Eligible to work in the state of Maine               | <b>X</b>                       |                              |
| <b><u>Scoring Sections</u></b>                         | <b><u>Points Available</u></b> | <b><u>Points Awarded</u></b> |
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>                      | <b>2</b>                     |
| Section III. Proposed Services                         | <b>55</b>                      | <b>3</b>                     |
| Section IV. Cost Proposal                              | <b>25</b>                      | <b>0</b>                     |
| <b><u>Total Points</u></b>                             | <b><u>100</u></b>              | <b><u>5</u></b>              |

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Practice LLC (REGION TWO)**  
**DATE: 04/09/2025**

**OVERVIEW OF SECTION I  
Preliminary Information**

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
|                                    |
| Section I. Preliminary Information |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- Cover page and bidder certification was provided. A statement of foreign qualifications to conduct activities was provided as proof to work in the state.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Practice LLC (REGION TWO)**

**DATE: 04/09/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Organization Qualifications and Experience**

|  | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>2</b>              |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience
  - A. Overview of Organization
    - Created in 2020 in Colorado
    - Worked on RJ initiatives in Colorado in Minnesota but did not clearly define what these were.
    - Brief description fails to provide specific examples of restorative justice services being delivered.
  - B. Subcontractors
    - 21 subcontractors

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Proposed Services**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Practice LLC (REGION TWO)**

**DATE: 04/09/2025**

|                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section III. Proposed Services | <b>55</b>               | <b>3</b>              |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

I. Proposed Services

NOTE: It appears that the bidder copy and pasted from the previous proposal and the headers of regions were incorrectly labeled and the evaluators were unsure of which region the proposals belonged to.

A. Population Served

- States York and Cumberland in on area but Juvenile region 2 in another on the same form, unclear.
- Discuss implementing RJ agencies not youth, family or victims.
- Appears to want to train RJ agencies, standards, not serving the youth specifically.
- The organization chart is not clear, no relation to RJ work. Provided a staff list but unclear of what their roles are within restorative justice. Subcontractors are on org chart.
- Services described were not requested in RFP.

B. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- RJ Principle 1: did not mention.
- RJ Principle 2: did not mention.
- RJ Principle 3: did not mention.
- RJ Principle 4: did not mention.
- RJ Principle 5: did not mention.
- Victim-Centered Approach: did not mention.
- Type of Services: focus groups with RJ organizations, community round-up. Services described were not requested in RFP.

C. Implementation – Work Plan

- Provided. Covers the period of the contract, but is difficult to understand. Does not list taking referrals for youth. Services described were not requested in RFP.

D. Training

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Practice LLC (REGION TWO)**

**DATE: 04/09/2025**

- Motivation interviewing, neurobiology, humor, internal family systems, non-violent communication. Services described were not requested in RFP.

E. Data Collection

- Database system
- Do their own surveys, but no mention of implementation.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Practice LLC (REGION TWO)**

**DATE: 04/09/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Cost Proposal**

| Lowest Submitted<br>Cost Proposal | , | Cost Proposal<br>Being Scored | x        | Score<br>Weight  | =        | Score    |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|----------|
| <b>N/A</b>                        | , | <b>N/A</b>                    | <b>x</b> | <b>25 points</b> | <b>=</b> | <b>0</b> |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

I. Cost Proposal

- A. The bidder appeared to have copy and pasted from another application and the budget listed York and Cumberland. The budget table provided did not have consistent totals and it was unclear the amount being asked for and for which region. The bidder was asked to provide a two year budget and they provided a budget for the renewal periods. For these reason, the bidder receives a score of 0.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION THREE)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**SUMMARY PAGE**

**Department Name:** Maine Department of Corrections  
**Name of RFP Coordinator:** Sonja Charest  
**Names of Evaluators:** Christine Thibeault, Stephanie O’Rielly, Vic Viera

| <b><u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u></b>                       | <b><u>Pass</u></b>             | <b><u>Fail</u></b>           |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)       | <b>X</b>                       |                              |
| • Eligible to work in the state of Maine               | <b>X</b>                       |                              |
| <b><u>Scoring Sections</u></b>                         | <b><u>Points Available</u></b> | <b><u>Points Awarded</u></b> |
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>                      | <b>11</b>                    |
| Section III. Proposed Services                         | <b>55</b>                      | <b>26</b>                    |
| Section IV. Cost Proposal                              | <b>25</b>                      | <b>24.91</b>                 |
| <b><u>Total Points</u></b>                             | <b><u>100</u></b>              | <b><u>61.91</u></b>          |

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION THREE)**

**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**OVERVIEW OF SECTION I  
Preliminary Information**

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
|                                    |
| Section I. Preliminary Information |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- The bidder signed and submitted the Bidder Certification.
- The bidder attached their non-profit certification for the state of Maine.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION THREE)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Organization Qualifications and Experience**

|  | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>11</b>             |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience

A. Overview of Organization

- Region three
- Working with MDOC since 2013.
- Delivery a variety of RJ practices and “hold relevant degrees and extensive training in RJ facilitation.”
- Use a data-driven approach and robust data collection and evaluation.
- The staffing table was provided but did not give details on specific FTE’s and per-diem staff.
- The provider gives examples of three relevant projects;
  1. The first project directly relevant as it pertains to existing contract with MDOC for RJ services.
  2. The second project is relevant because it describes a community healing and accountability process using RJ dialogue, including youth and older youth, BIPOC, and LGBTQIA+. It is unclear what the overall goal of this project was and the processes that lead to the successes. The project focused on residence, accountability, and systemic barriers. Not directly relevant but tangentially relevant.
  3. The third project was co-learning and action coalition, the description of the project is unclear. Power mapping is not defined, unclear. Terms in this project are not defined and unclear purposes and goals.
- The provider identified degrees, collection methods and trainings but did not elaborate on the details as it pertains to these sections.
- “Moving at the speed of trust” was a good quote.

B. Subcontractors

- Mention, but not listed specifically.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION THREE)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Proposed Services**

|                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section III. Proposed Services | <b>55</b>               | <b>26</b>             |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Proposed Services
  - A. Population Served
    - 70 youth per year
    - Ensure fair access to rural access (transportation), tailoring services to the specific needs of the region.
    - Geographical accessibility strategy
    - Seasonal considerations—travel and virtual
    - Condensed service delivery during good weather times. Will they wait to serve youth for favorable weather?
    - Two staff and a per-diem network for all of the regions.
    - Two staff is not realistic to cover all of region three based off of geographical expanse.
  - B. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    - Gas card assistance for families (transportation barrier)
    - Identified limited formal support network.
    - 20-week process
    - Victim-Cetnered Approach—understood small town culture and privacy needs.
    - RJ Principle 1: yes, through recognizing the differences in small communities.
    - RJ Principle 2: yes, identified victim centered approach, outcome communication.
    - RJ Principle 3: yes, identified support before, during, and after the process. identified 4 elements of the victim-centered approach.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION THREE)**

**DATE: 04/11/2025**

- RJ Principle 4: yes, agreement implementation and acknowledge the difference in communities.
- RJ Principle 5: yes, culturally sensitivity and rural subcultural identities.
- Servies: creation of county advisory groups
- Connection to LEO, ED, and other relevant agencies.

**C. Implementation – Work Plan**

- Provided.
- Currently do not have a presence or current staff, hiring in the first month is unrealistic.
- Identifies the full scope of the contract.
- The plan is not clear and concise and hard to follow.
- Identifies connection to community providers but does not list .

**D. Training**

- Did not mention specific training. Who are they getting trained by? Subcontracts? Unclear of how, who, where they are getting trained and in what they are being trained.
- “Comprehensive” training program, specialized training in PYD, cultural (in Quals section)

**E. Data Collection**

- Admin Coordinator compiles and analyzes KPI's
- Quarterly outcome reviews with MDOC
- Says USM will be an evaluator but does not list them as a subcontractor.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION THREE)**

**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Cost Proposal**

---

| Lowest Submitted<br>Cost Proposal | , | Cost Proposal<br>Being Scored | x        | Score<br>Weight  | =        | Score        |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|--------------|
| <b>\$605,000.00</b>               | , | <b>\$607,000.00</b>           | <b>x</b> | <b>25 points</b> | <b>=</b> | <b>24.91</b> |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Cost Proposal
  - A. A formula was used to score the cost proposals.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Penquis CAP (REGION THREE)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**SUMMARY PAGE**

**Department Name:** Maine Department of Corrections  
**Name of RFP Coordinator:** Sonja Charest  
**Names of Evaluators:** Christine Thibeault, Stephanie O'Reilly, Vic Viera

| <u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u>                              | <u>Pass</u>             | <u>Fail</u>           |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)       | <b>X</b>                |                       |
| • Eligible to work in the state of Maine               | <b>X</b>                |                       |
| <u>Scoring Sections</u>                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>18</b>             |
| Section III. Proposed Services                         | <b>55</b>               | <b>54</b>             |
| Section IV. Cost Proposal                              | <b>25</b>               | <b>25</b>             |
| <u>Total Points</u>                                    | <u>100</u>              | <u>97</u>             |

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Penquis CAP (REGION THREE)**

**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**OVERVIEW OF SECTION I  
Preliminary Information**

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
|                                    |
| Section I. Preliminary Information |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- The bidder provided the cover page, certification, insurance, and documentation to work in the state.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Penquis CAP (REGION THREE)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Organization Qualifications and Experience**

|  | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>18</b>             |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience
  - A. Overview of Organization
    - 58 Years of experience
    - Licensed mental health agency
    - Several Community-based services available
    - History of collaborating with other organizations
    - Have provided RJ services for youth in Maine since 2017
    - One Youth Services Director (FTE)
    - 100% of surveys returned and 100% of victims reported satisfaction
    - 100% of youth (responsible party) understand how their actions affect others.
    - Project 1: RJ program currently providing (serving 28 MDOC/non-MDOC) 24 successfully completed.
    - Project 2: Breakthrough Youth—partnership with other providers where they provide financial literacy, healthy decision-making and safe sex programming/social-emotional learning.
    - Project 3: Host Homes (HUD funds) 10 host homes, 10 youth annually, to provide housing for youth that are homeless or at-risk, age 12-24. 5 youth were served in the most recent reporting year.
    - Quote from the youth was favorable
  - B. Subcontractors
    - Yes, subcontract with ACAP (Aroostook & Washington), RJP (Waldo), DRJ (Hancock), and the bidder will cover the remaining counties
    - Described the subcontracts in detail
    - Identified staff profiles for RJP not ACAP or DRJ.

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Proposed Services**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Penquis CAP (REGION THREE)**

**DATE: 04/11/2025**

|                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section III. Proposed Services | <b>55</b>               | <b>54</b>             |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

I. Proposed Services

A. Population Served

- Juvenile Region Three
- Identify cases that they would not work with (civil, violent, sexual harm)
- Did not identify the number of youth served.

B. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- Type of Services: dialogue, circles, COSA's, harm repair, closing circles, formal letters to JCCO, conferencing—described in detail how they process works. Describe the start to finish process and the details. Wide net of those involved in the circle (community, LEO's, JCCO's).
- Mentoring once per week for 1 hour up to 12 weeks.
- RJ Principle 1: yes, described and outlined in detail how they apply the principle to the work.
- RJ Principle 2: yes, described and outlined in detail how they apply the principle to the work.
- RJ Principle 3: yes, described and outlined in detail how they apply the principle to the work.
- RJ Principle 4: yes, described and outlined in detail how they apply the principle to the work.
- RJ Principle 5: yes, described and outlined in detail how they apply the principle to the work.
- Victim-Centered Approach: yes, described and outlined in detail how they apply this approach, alternative options of victim involvement.

C. Implementation – Work Plan

- Organizational chart was provided (Penquis & subcontractor for all of region 3) “JR3 Restorative Justice Collaborative”
- Identified the need to hire a FT facilitator and add hours to per-diem facilitator in addition to subcontractor
- Staff time, roles, and how they will facilitate programming.
- Prepared to start work immediately
- Merge meetings monthly for 2-years.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Penquis CAP (REGION THREE)**

**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**D. Training**

- All staff will be trained within 3 months of hire to include: RJ/ trauma-informed care, PYD and other relevant. Fundamental RJ training, new staff members will shadow circles and be co-facilitators and receive feedback then move into independent facilitation.
- 10 hours of CEU's each year.
- Internal case reviews and volunteer meetings/training.

**E. Data Collection**

- Track demographics, completions, training, PM's, outcomes, survey's, database.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Penquis CAP (REGION THREE)**  
**DATE: 04/11/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Cost Proposal**

---

| Lowest Submitted<br>Cost Proposal | , | Cost Proposal<br>Being Scored | x        | Score<br>Weight  | =        | Score     |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|-----------|
| <b>\$605,000.00</b>               | , | <b>\$605,000.00</b>           | <b>x</b> | <b>25 points</b> | <b>=</b> | <b>25</b> |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Cost Proposal
  - A. A formula was used to score the cost proposals. The bidder was the lowest; therefore, they received the full points at 25.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Practice LLC (REGION THREE)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**SUMMARY PAGE**

**Department Name:** Maine Department of Corrections  
**Name of RFP Coordinator:** Sonja Charest  
**Names of Evaluators:** Christine Thibeault, Stephanie O'Reilly, Vic Viera

| <b><u>Pass/Fail Criteria</u></b>                       | <b><u>Pass</u></b>             | <b><u>Fail</u></b>           |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)       | <b>X</b>                       |                              |
| • Eligible to work in the state of Maine               | <b>X</b>                       |                              |
| <b><u>Scoring Sections</u></b>                         | <b><u>Points Available</u></b> | <b><u>Points Awarded</u></b> |
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>                      | <b>2</b>                     |
| Section III. Proposed Services                         | <b>55</b>                      | <b>3</b>                     |
| Section IV. Cost Proposal                              | <b>25</b>                      | <b>0</b>                     |
| <b><u>Total Points</u></b>                             | <b><u>100</u></b>              | <b><u>5</u></b>              |

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Practice LLC (REGION THREE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**OVERVIEW OF SECTION I  
Preliminary Information**

|                                    |
|------------------------------------|
|                                    |
| Section I. Preliminary Information |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- Cover page and bidder certification was provided. A statement of foreign qualifications to conduct activities was provided as proof to work in the state.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Practice LLC (REGION THREE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION II  
Organization Qualifications and Experience**

|  | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Section II. Organization Qualifications and Experience | <b>20</b>               | <b>2</b>              |

---

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience
  - A. Overview of Organization
    - Created in 2020 in Colorado
    - Worked on RJ initiatives in Colorado in Minnesota but did not clearly define what these were.
    - Brief description fails to provide specific examples of restorative justice services being delivered.
  - B. Subcontractors
    - 21 subcontractors
    -

**EVALUATION OF SECTION III  
Proposed Services**

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**  
**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**  
**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Practice LLC (REGION THREE)**  
**DATE: 04/10/2025**

|                                | <u>Points Available</u> | <u>Points Awarded</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
|                                | <u>e</u>                | <u>d</u>              |
| Section III. Proposed Services | <b>55</b>               | <b>3</b>              |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

I. Proposed Services

NOTE: It appears that the bidder copy and pasted from the previous proposal and the headers of regions were incorrectly labeled and the evaluators were unsure of which region the proposals belonged to.

A. Population Served

- States York and Cumberland in on area but Juvenile region 2 in another on the same form, unclear.
- Discuss implementing RJ agencies not youth, family or victims.
- Appears to want to train RJ agencies, standards, not serving the youth specifically.
- The organization chart is not clear, no relation to RJ work. Provided a staff list but unclear of what their roles are within restorative justice. Subcontractors are on org chart.
- Services described were not requested in RFP.

B. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- RJ Principle 1: did not mention.
- RJ Principle 2: did not mention.
- RJ Principle 3: did not mention.
- RJ Principle 4: did not mention.
- RJ Principle 5: did not mention.
- Victim-Centered Approach: did not mention.
- Type of Services: focus groups with RJ organizations, community round-up. Services described were not requested in RFP.

C. Implementation – Work Plan

- Provided. Covers the period of the contract, but is difficult to understand. Does not list taking referrals for youth. Services described were not requested in RFP.

D. Training

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Practice LLC (REGION THREE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

- Motivation interviewing, neurobiology, humor, internal family systems, non-violent communication. Services described were not requested in RFP.

E. Data Collection

- Database system
- Do their own surveys, but no mention of implementation.

**STATE OF MAINE  
TEAM CONSENSUS EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE**

**BIDDER: Restorative Justice Practice LLC (REGION THREE)**

**DATE: 04/10/2025**

**EVALUATION OF SECTION IV  
Cost Proposal**

| Lowest Submitted<br>Cost Proposal | , | Cost Proposal<br>Being Scored | x        | Score<br>Weight  | =        | Score    |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------|------------------|----------|----------|
| <b>N/A</b>                        | , | <b>N/A</b>                    | <b>x</b> | <b>25 points</b> | <b>=</b> | <b>0</b> |

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- I. Cost Proposal
  - A. The bidder appeared to have copy and pasted from another application and the budget listed York and Cumberland. The budget table provided did not have consistent totals and it was unclear the amount being asked for and for which region. The bidder was asked to provide a two year budget and they provided a budget for the renewal periods. For these reason, the bidder receives a score of 0.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**I. Organization Qualifications and Experience**

The Bidder has experience delivering restorative justice services to youth in Region 1 and has had a contract with MDOC to deliver restorative justice services since 2013. They have existing staff currently delivering a variety of restorative practices and assert that their direct service state “hold relevant degrees and complete extensive training in restorative justice facilitation with ongoing professional development.” The agency description states that they utilize a “data-driven approach” with robust data collection and evaluation on a regular basis. The agency also states they provide all facilitators training in adolescent development, trauma-informed practices, cultural competency, and effective agreement monitoring.

Three relevant examples of projects performed by the agency include:

1. A description of the existing contract with MDOC and the “key achievements” as well as the agency’s ability to manage public funds responsibly and provide all new staff training in trauma-informed care, adolescent development, and cultural responsiveness.
2. A 5-7 month project funded by Maine Health Access Foundation to deliver restorative dialogue sessions to three distinct age cohorts. Youth and older (60+) adults engaged in structured conversations about justice, healing, and community building.
3. A project with USM to implement “co-learning and action coalitions” and described as “ a transformative approach to building restorative culture within community and organizations.” Weekly 2 hours sessions over a 4 month period for groups of 10-20 participants involved assigned readings and reflective tasks, “tailored intervention based on community-specific needs,” and “power mapping.”

An organizational chart for the agency reveals there is a Board of Directors, a Director (Emma Goldbas), 2 Youth Justice Coordinators (none now?) an Administrative Coordinator (none now?) and Per Diem Facilitator Network for York and Cumberland Counties.

**II. Proposed Services**

1. Population Served

The proposal states that 80 youth will be served in Region 1.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

The proposal articulates several types of restorative justice processes that the agency will deliver. These are in line with the suggested services outlined in the RFP and include “restorative mediation” which was not referenced in the RFP.

The proposal does indicate that services will be delivered from a “victim-centered approach” and outlines several of methods to engage victims. There is no reference, however, to the 5 restorative justice principles as articulated in the RFP.

Trauma-informed approach is described well.

Methodology is clearly stated and clearly explains the time line for referrals with a 12-16 week period of completion for referrals.

The proposal identifies “culturally responsive practices” to engage youth and families from “varied cultural backgrounds,” though there are no specific practices explained nor is there a description of the range of cultural backgrounds to be served in Region 1.

Service for York and Cumberland Counties differ, though it’s not clear why there is a need for “multilingual, culturally aligned facilitators and community liaisons in Cumberland County but not in York County. The agency proposes it will “adapt processes” for suburban and rural contexts with mobile facilitators (not defined) in York County, yet Cumberland County contains suburban and rural areas as well. Nor is it clear why workforce development services would be provided in York County, but not Cumberland.

The agency states they work with “certified interpreters” to ensure cultural fluency, accuracy and trust, and that “regular use of state-certified professionals ensures every restorative process... is fully accessible. Presumably this would be a subcontracted provider yet the agency does not specify so.

The Expected Outcomes and Performance Metrics for Region 1 are not realistic, or are described in a manner that make reliable measurement challenging. For example, one of the defined youth outcomes is “80% demonstrate gains in conflict resolution” and that this outcome would be measured by pre/post assessments using validated tools.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

Some of the outcomes are unrealistic in that they would require victims to participate in more activity/feedback than can reasonably be expected. For example, “75% report lower anxiety related to the youth or incident and 70% feel safer in their community.” These factors would be measured by pre/post assessments on fear and safety and fewer “avoidance behaviors.” (Is this an ethical/appropriate tool to use in restorative practices?)

Community Outcomes are similarly unrealistic in that they require more data than is possible within the context of this award. For example, “a 10% reduction in juvenile offenses in participating communities over three years,” requires an baseline measure that does not exist and the ability to demonstrate a causal relationship between the services delivered and the number of juvenile offenses in a community.

Assertions are made that are not supported regarding costs, e.g., “10% cost savings vs. traditional juvenile processing.” There is no reliable data on the cost associated with “traditional juvenile processing, which ranges from diversion through re-entry, and the average cost per case outlined in the agency’s budget proposal.

The assertion that efficiency measures will generate and estimated annual savings of \$22,400 compared to traditional service delivery models is another example of unsupported proposed outcome that lacks validation or any citation to an authority.

Diversified funding is mentioned as one means of developing long-term financial sustainability. This is an excellent factor to include in the proposal, but it would have been helpful if there had also been an explanation of they types of funding the agency currently receives that reflect “diversified funding.”

**3. Implementation – Work Plan**

The work plan provided is somewhat in a timeline chart, though it is several pages making it difficult to follow. The work plan clearly describes the tasks to be completed monthly and the person/role responsible for ensuring completion.

**4. Training**

The statement of qualifications contains the following language: Comprehensive Training Program: All facilitators received specialized training in adolescent development, trauma-informed practices, cultural competency and effective agreement monitoring. The proposal does not specify the number of hours of initial training or any ongoing training requirement.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

5. Data Collection

Data Collection and Analysis is described as “Admin Coordinator complies and analyzes KPIs monthly (no definition of KPI). The second bulleted point is “Annual evaluations include county-specific outcome analysis.” It is unclear what is being evaluated.

Monthly statistical reports to DOC provide “detailed outcomes and county comparisons” and monthly team review of performance metrics are conducted. These are vague explanations without clearly defining what data will be collected, maintained, and provided to MDOC.

**III. Cost Proposal**

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION ONE)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience

1. Overview of Organization

- Director (.4 FTE) and Restorative Justice Learning & Development Specialist (Time not noted). What are their qualifications?
- Direct Service staff. One FT in York County, one FT in Cumberland County, Per Diem facilitator network, .4 Admin Coordinator
- Direct Service Staff hold relevant degrees. What are the degrees and what is the raining in RJ facilitation?
- What standards of experience and expertise will the Per Diem Staff hold/adhere to?
- Has worked with the system
- Data driven approach, monthly case review. Who is included in the case review? What are they reviewing for?

2. Subcontractors

- None

II. Proposed Services

1. Population Served

- 80 Justice Involved youth in York (40) and Cumberland (40)

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- Restorative Dialogue, Circles, Mediation, Conferencing,
- Case Management and Support Pre-Process Preparation, Agreement Development, Monitoring and Support, Mentoring – Is the case management under a MH license and billable to Mainecare?
- Victim Centered Approach.
- Regional based advisory structure with 12-15 members
- 

3. Implementation – Work Plan

- Case plan under 16 weeks
- No start date for accepting referrals and starting with with youth and families.

4. Training

- Per Diem Training starts in Month 3

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION ONE)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

5. Data Collection

- Willing to use DOC Dashboard – real time case level data
- Monthly performance indicators
- Quarterly outcome reviews with DOC
- Annual Evaluation
- Director audits at least 15% of case files each quarter
- Participant satisfaction survey after every process
- Quarterly facilitation observations
- Outcomes already designed

III. Cost Proposal

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** RJIM\_R1

**DATE:** 4/7/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Vic Viera

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience – RJIM has been active with the department of corrections since 2013

1. Overview of Organization
  - 2 directors + per diem network
  - Still need to hire for 2 full time coordinators
  - How many per diem staff are available through network?
2. Subcontractors
  - None mentioned
    - Use of state approved interpreters

II. Proposed Services

1. Population Served
  - 80 youth annually across York and Cumberland Counties
    - “Offer virtual sessions where geographic isolation limits access”??
2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
  - Restorative Mediation? – Where are the certifications coming from?
3. Implementation – Work Plan
  - “School liaison role within each youth justice coordinator position”??
4. Training
  - Where are staff receiving cultural competency, trauma informed care and ongoing practitioner training??
5. Data Collection
  - Utilizes RJ Dashboard

III. Cost Proposal

- Formula scoring

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Youth Led Justice – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**I. Organization Qualifications and Experience**

Youth Led Justice began as Maine Youth Court in 2012 (utilizing a Youth Court model) but has evolved to a staff directed model and in 2021 transitioned to its current form as an independent 501(c)(3) organization. The statement of qualifications include many assertions of the qualifications and experience of staff members. Although the agency and staff are certainly qualified to provide the services requested in the RFP, many of the assertions made regarding qualifications lack specificity. For example, “The staff at Youth Led Justice are highly trained facilitators from diverse backgrounds with a wealth of lived experience – including multiple staff with direct experience in our state’s criminal legal system as youth and adults” The training portfolio of the staff is more specific but still contains information that is unclear or fails to establish expertise in restorative justice. For example, staff are described as “certified Narcan Trainer,” “waiting for lince approval from the state as a Certified Alcohol and Drug Counselor,” another working to finish their degree in that same field” and “an ordained minister.” The assertion of holding a “MS from the world’s top ranked conflict and resolution graduate program” fails to state the degree conferred or the institution that issued the degree.

Three relevant examples of projects performed by the agency include:

1. Department of Corrections Youth Diversion with Tara Chiasson listed as the contact. The description of the project fails to explain that Tara Chiasson is merely a referral source rather than a project administrator. The description of the project does state that the agency provides direct services and mentoring to youth that “often culminates in restorative dialogues, circles, accountability letters, and repair agreements.
2. Tree Street Youth Center implementing restorative practices including dialogues, conducting trainings (not specified what type of training) and creating safe, productive environments for youth people. During the 2022-2023 period (no specific date) Tree Street gave YLJ a community partnership award for supporting youth facing suspension or expulsion and providing restorative school reintegration services.
3. Portland Public Schools – YLJ has provided trainings and workshops on RP for youth and adults in various school settings focusing on preventive community building circles and responsive restorative circle practices.

An organizational chart identifying the positions of executive director, Regional Program Director, Restorative Specialist #1/Administrative Assistant, Restorative Specialist #2,

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Youth Led Justice – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

and Restorative Specialist #3 is provided. The chart lacks the names of individuals in those positions and fails to identify whether any of the positions are vacant.

**II. Proposed Services**

1. Population Served – Serve “upwards of 200 referrals per year” throughout Region 1.

No subcontractors will be utilized but there is no articulated plan for how the agency will expand to serve 200 youth. (YLJ received 32 referrals in 2024) There is no explanation of what additional staff will need to be hired to serve 200 rather than 32 youth in a given year.

The proposal states that the primary goal is to take referrals from all possible sources “to work directly with young people who are at risk of becoming involved with the criminal legal system.” The “diversion strategy” falls into three categories:

- A. Direct support and RJ processes for referrals (processes not defined but later references a “restorative circle”) The process for addressing direct referrals is described in paragraph form without headings but the information is included,
- B. Establishing a presence in schools and offering opportunities for training and education around restorative practices – YLJ is working with Lewiston schools to “grow our presence in this district.” It’s not known what type of presence they have or wish to expand to other schools. No clear explanation of what service would be provided. Quarterly trainings for youth and school faculty around restorative practices is beyond the scope of service requested in the RFP. No support that this strategy improves outcomes for justice-involved youth or addresses harm caused to individuals or communities.
- C. Community Building – focused on “holding space for groups of youth to come together in restorative environments to discuss conflicts in their communities in real time and collectively envision how to respond to those conflicts and the structural barriers they face in community.” Similar to the strategy listed above, this strategy, while admirable, is beyond the scope of work sought in the RFP and does not address harm to individuals or communities or propose measurable outcomes.

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

Only a passing reference to the 5 restorative justice principles was offered without any explanation of the principles. The proposal is rather dismissive of the 5 principles in stating “We understand that along with the five RJ principals [sic], normalizing

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Youth Led Justice – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

restorative responses to conflict requires much more than a circle, a dialogue, and/or a repair agreement – ....”

Methodology of processing referrals is provided but does not contain estimated times of completion for each of the steps identified.

3. Implementation – Work Plan

The work plan provided does not cover the performance period of the contract and makes reference only to tasks to be performed by September 1 and October 1, 2025. There are only five tasks identified with the second to last task being outreach to youth-serving organizations about collaboration, training, and opportunities for youth to “begin in Q1” and “have monthly meetings in Q2 about youth in need of additional services and supports.” The final task to be completed for the Region 1 Work Plan is to “identify parts of the region that are furthest away, create a list and outreach to potential subcontractors in those areas.” Earlier in the proposal, it was stated that no subcontractors would be utilized. Although not clearly stated, it appears that this final task is to be completed by August 2025 (no year indicated on work plan).

4. Training

YLJ staff are all trained restorative facilitators with skills in circle practice, restorative dialogue, harm repair agreements and “the full spectrum of restorative processes” (not defined). Although continued education is stated as “always a priority,” there is no explanation of training expectations. “Refresher trainings around the full spectrum of restorative processes used by YLJ’ are not defined. The Executive Director has been in discussion with five different organizations (not identified) about offering specialized training in topics such as violence interruption, community building, restorative responses to harm, innovative circle practices, trauma-informed RJ, etc., over the next year for YLJ staff and “other interested parties in our network and community.” It’s unclear whether these organizations would constitute sub-contractors for the purpose of effectuating the services contracted.

5. Data Collection

Data collection will “follow the data collection protocols that have been maintained in the current contract” and surveys, comprehensive qualitative (confidential), demographic, and outcome-based case notes. It’s unclear what, if any, information/data would be provided to MDOC. The agency is also in the process of creating a performance measure and staff satisfaction survey to identify strengths and weaknesses of staff practices.

**III. Cost Proposal**

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Youth Led Justice (REGION ONE)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience
  1. Overview of Organization
    - Started as Maine Youth Court in 2012. Youth Led Justice in 2021 as a 501-c3.
    - Where is the data on 280 youth coming from?
    - Training portfolio of staff: MI, Narcan, RP for Edu, Ordained minister, CADC
    - Trains RJ to schools in Portland Elementary to High School
  2. Subcontractors
    - None mentioned
- II. Proposed Services
  1. Population Served
    - Youth at risk of or involved with juveniles justice
  2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    - Repair Harm services, agreement
    - Presence within school
    - Community Building
  3. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Continue the work that they are currently contracted to do
    - Increase connection to Region Probation
    - Outreach to schools
  4. Training
    - Restorative facilitators trained in Circle Practice, Restorative Dialogue, harm repair agreements
    - Continued education through monthly supervision
    - Yearly refresher trainings
  5. Data Collection
    - Unless otherwise requested, will maintain the data collection protocols that have been used in the current contract
    - Qualitative, demographic, outcome based,
    - Creating performance measure survey for youth satisfaction
    -
- III. Cost Proposal
  1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative**

**BIDDER NAME: YLJ\_R1\_Vic**

**DATE: 4-7-2025**

**EVALUATOR NAME: Vic Viera**

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Maine Department of Corrections**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience – YLJ has been around since 2012
    - 1. Overview of Organization
      - How many staff does YLJ have now?
    - 2. Subcontractors
      - No mention of subcontractors at this time
  - II. Proposed Services - No specific mention of changing or adding anything to current services
    - 1. Population Served
      - York and Cumberland Counties – no specific number of youth mentioned.
    - 2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
      - Train and support schools?
    - 3. Implementation – Work Plan
      - Nothing new added
    - 4. Training
      - What RJ training are staff receiving?
    - 5. Data Collection
      - Utilizes DOC's database and surveys
  - III. Cost Proposal
    - 1. Received, formula used for scoring.
- Other:
- Emphasis on greater Portland Area
  - Over 200 referrals a year?
  - More details on projects vs. testimonials
  - More details on youth programs and youth-led processes
  
  - No breakdown on cost proposal

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Youth Advocate Program (YAP) – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**I. Organization Qualifications and Experience**

The Youth Advocate Program (YAP), Inc. is a nationally recognized and accredited nonprofit organization. The agency operates in 33 states and Washington DC and began serving youth in Maine in 2019. YAP programs facilitate dialogue among victims, justice-involved youth, community members, and stakeholders. YAP also facilitates restorative circles

Three relevant examples of projects performed by the agency include:

1. Maine DOC – Since 2019, YAP has provided individualized, intensive wraparound advocacy services using the “YAPWrap” model with a “no reject, no eject” policy. This includes 24/7 crisis support for youth and families.
2. Hamilton County (Ohio) Juvenile Courts – YAP provides Intensive Youth Services to youth referred by the juvenile probation department with the goal of keeping youth in their homes and communities, transitioning youth home after detention, building developmental assets and resilience, and strengthening family functioning.
3. Middlesex County (NJ) – YAP provides a variety of programs that address all levels of juvenile justice including diversion, disposition alternatives, alternatives to detention and re-entry. The services incorporate groups with a restorative approach to rebuild participant relationships with the community.

An organizational chart is provided, and in addition, more detailed information than required in the documents labeled “job description” for each of the positions.

**Proposed Services**

1. Population Served – Juveniles justice involved youth and those at risk of becoming justice-involved in York and Cumberland Counties.
2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

The YAPWrap model will provide a strength-based service approach to providing comprehensive individualized services and support networks “around” delinquent or dependent youth. YAPWrap is a trauma-informed, holistic model utilizing best practices and core principles of wraparound, mentoring, restorative justice and PYD.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Youth Advocate Program (YAP) – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

Although the proposal states that “restorative justice principles and practices are central to our juvenile justice services,” there is no identification of the 5 restorative justice principles stated in the RFP.

YAP will utilize a “most impacted party-centered approach” in the restorative process. It is unclear whether this is the same as a victim-centered approach.

YAP is proposing to serve up to 15 youth at any given time, and up to 45 youth annually. Programming periods average four months and will include Restorative Circles, community service projects, and mentoring for 1 hour per week.

Several assessment tools will be utilized including a Life Domain Tool, Strengths Tool, Interest Survey, and Family Values and Vision Tool. Increasing protective factors and reducing risk factors is a core strategy of youth, but utilizing a formal process of assessment and individualized service plans (ISP) are likely beyond the scope of the services being sought by this RFP.

The focus of Restorative Circles is on repairing relationships that have been injured, and restorative circles will bring together the most impacted party, youth, and family team members as support for all.

There are services described in the Services to be Provided section that exceed the scope of services being sought by the RFP:

~YAP Services include “Purpose Transition” or discharge services, but these are not within the definition of the services being sought in the RFP.

Crisis Support services available 24/7, safety assessments and plans on risk issues,

~Individualized Service Plans with Family Team meetings/Family Group Conferencing

~Intentional weekly activities for youth and their family

~One-on-one individual services that improve academic engagement and performance, build employment prospects, and connect to pro-social people, places, and activities.

~ Supervised group services

Staffing model:

One full-time program director, one full-time Assistant Program Director, one full-time Program Coordinator, part-time Advocates based on case load and one full-time Administrative Manager.

The Expected Outcomes and Performance Metrics:

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Youth Advocate Program (YAP) – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

Projected Outcomes include completion of the repair agreement, not being rearrested while in the program, 10 increase in participation toward academic achievement as indicated by school attendance or pursuing their GED (not sure how this would be measured as there would need to be a baseline) and 100% of participating youth and families will receive wraparound support and appropriate referrals (this service is beyond the scope of the services sought and it's unclear of where the funding would come from to support this additional service)

3. Implementation – Work Plan

A work plan is included with the proposal but it is confusing as it conflates timelines for implementing the services throughout the contract period and the timeline for individual cases. The Work Plan describes the activities to occur during the “rapid start-up” period of performance, but extends for only 8 weeks.

4. Training

“YAP has a Leadership Team of national and regional experts who bring decades of experience and assist with rapid start-up of the program and hiring, training, technical assistance and ongoing case management consultations as part of the agency’s commitment to quality assurance.” The following training will be provided:

Orientation

Basic Advocacy Training

Mandt System

Program Specific and Ongoing Training for specific interventions and curricula, i.e., the YAP Program Coordinator and one additional staff will receive training in Restorative Circles.

Ongoing training requirement (unspecified) is 20 hours per year.

5. Data Collection

Entry and discharge surveys will be collected and YAP will develop an evaluation survey to administer to the most impacted party at the Restorative Circle. The result of the survey will be a satisfaction rate and results will be provided to the referring authority. Demographic data will be collected on participants. Outcomes (unspecified) will be collected at discharge, 3, 6, and 12 months post discharge. YAP national leadership reviews quarterly agency-wide outcomes reports and the board of directors reviews annual outcomes.

**II. Cost Proposal**

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Youth Advocate Programs (YAP) (REGION ONE)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience

1. Overview of Organization

- Non-profit, COA Accredited, 33 states for 50 years
- YapWrap Service model
- Prevention, diversion, reentry, violence reduction, gang involved youth, youth involved in human trafficking
- Maine start in 2019
- YAPWrap recieved accolades from 14 external studies
- Will hire regional and state for administration, leadership and advocates.

2. Subcontractors

- None proposed

II. Proposed Services

1. Population Served

- Juvenile justice involved youth in York and Cumberland Counties

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- YAPWrap Program
- Many resources outside of RJ
- Repair Harm work as well as other RJ Processes are blended with other services. This dilutes the RJ Process and philosophy

3. Implementation – Work Plan

- Services do not start until after week 9
- Completion of repair harm within a month, discharge by month 4

4. Training

- Mandt Trained
- Basic Advocacy Training
- 20 hours of on-going training
- Unknown amount of Restorative Justice Training.

5. Data Collection

- Utilizes currently administered surveys

III. Cost Proposal

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** YAP\_R1\_Vic

**DATE:** 4-7-2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Vic Viera

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience – started in 1975, recognized nationwide for their youth advocacy and diversion work.

1. Overview of Organization

- Added job descriptions?
- No assistant program director
- No program coordinator or advocates

2. Subcontractors

- No subcontractors mentioned at this time.

II. Proposed Services - WRAP YAP? – sounds like WRAP case management.

1. Population Served

- 45 youth a year is this per county? (Cumberland and York)

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- 24/7 crisis support
  - Connect youth and families to additional services
  - First month of services is helping family connect to other resources and make referrals (Case Management?)

3. Implementation – Work Plan

- Will take 9 weeks to get up and running at minimum

4. Training

- Mandt Training
- RJ Training?

5. Data Collection

- Uses different data collection database and their own survey

III. Cost Proposal

- Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Sweetser – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**I. Organization Qualifications and Experience**

Sweetser has a 60-year history of providing services to children and young people in Maine. Services they provide include mental health and substance use disorder treatment, mobile crisis services, Child Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) residential treatment, and education services. The agency has also established Certified Community Behavioral Health Clinics in Brunswick and Sanford. Despite providing many highly valued services to youth and families, the agency does not state any history providing restorative justice services to youth in Maine.

Three relevant examples of projects performed by the agency include:

1. Sweetser Children’s Residential Treatment Program/Winterport. This project does not demonstrate any experience providing restorative justice services to youth.
2. Sweetser’s Child Mobile Crisis and Child Assertive Community Treatment. The purpose of this program is to “identify treatment goals and implement strategies that will help improve the client’s functioning while remaining at home in the community. Clinical services are provided to the child/youth and family but there is no description of any restorative practices.
3. Child Crisis Stabilization Unit/Saco and Rockport – a short-term therapeutic residential placement for youth ages 7-17 experiencing mental health crisis. Crisis planning, clinical services, and family support are provided, but there is no indication in the proposal that restorative practices are utilized.

An extensive organizational chart for the agency is provided but there are no names included, there are no positions that appear directly relevant to or experienced in restorative practices, and it is unclear how many, if any, of these positions are currently vacant.

List of litigations is provided.

**II. Proposed Services**

1. Population Served – “Juvenile Region A” Restorative circles, support circles, conferences and meetings will be provided in Saco, Sanford, Portland, and Brunswick offices.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Sweetser – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

Restorative Justice services to be provided include:

- a. Restorative Dialogue between “participants, families, and harmed persons” where the facilitator asks questions of the “mistake maker” and the “harmed person.” Which may result in a “repair opportunity.”
- b. Restorative Circles –
- c. Circles of Support and Accountability (CoSA) – to support individuals, especially those with problem sexual behaviors, to assist reintegration into the community. Also may be used for participants involved in violent crimes.
- d. Support Circles –
- e. Restorative Conferences – including a Repair Agreement
- f. Mentoring/Peer Phase – participants will meet with youth ages 18-28 with lived experience in the juvenile justice system to support the repair work. Family peers support specialists will provide support to family/natural supports working with participants. (Does this include supports for victims as well?)
- g. Closing/Wrap Up includes a referral to behavioral health services such as case management/care coordination, MST, ACT, etc.

Methodology for delivering restorative justice services includes accepting referrals from LEAs, courts, schools, community organizations, and families electronically through the program’s website.

Staffing model includes recruiting a Program Coordinator to oversee all aspects of training and referrals for Restorative Practices from MDOC and external agencies. Two restorative Support Specialists will lead and facilitate spaces where “transformative conversations” can take place. Youth Peer Support and Family Support Specialists will provide support from their lived experience. Sweetser currently employs both Youth and Family Peers.

The Expected Outcomes and Performance Metrics are not identified or described in the proposal.

3. Implementation – Work Plan

A very detailed and structured work plan is provided describing tasks that will be completed during the performance period of the contract.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Sweetser – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

4. Training

The "Peer Training Network contract" involves collaboration with RJP Maine to coordinate Restorative Practices training to peer supporters across Maine. Restorative Justice Training will be obtained from "external agencies" in facilitating Restorative Dialogues and Restorative Circles. Staff will complete training within 12 weeks of hire. Sweetser will train up to 75 staff working in other Sweetser program to ensure that youth benefit from restorative practices in those programs. Several members of Sweetser leadership have attended "Restorative Practices Training" (not specified who provided the training).

Sweetser utilizes several methods of youth development training including a behavioral health module. The proposal outlines training in Positive Youth Development in detail. Also included is a commitment to utilizing a trauma-informed approach.

Although training to understand youth needs is clearly articulated, there is no mention of training to understand victim impact nor is there any training specific to addressing the unique and complex needs of individuals who have experienced sexual harm or violence within close relationships.

5. Data Collection

Data collection activities proposed include surveys that can be answered via QR codes to ensure anonymity and encourage participation. Additionally, the proposal states that "Sweetser is very comfortable with outcome measures and currently identifies key performance measures for all monthly program reviews." Additional data collected will include demographics (not specified), completion of the restorative justice program, training, funding, performance measures (unspecified) and outcomes (unspecified).

Lacking from the proposal is a description of the outcomes expected and how outcomes will be recorded, analyzed and reported back to MDOC.

**III. Cost Proposal**

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Sweetser (REGION ONE)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience
  1. Overview of Organization
    - One of largest independent Health Organizations in Maine
    - MH, SUD, Children, Adults, Families, crisis, Education, Psych Treatment facility, residential treatment, BH Clinics
  2. Subcontractors
    - None Shown
- II. Proposed Services
  1. Population Served
    - York and Cumberland Counties, maine office in Saco , with offices in Sanford, Portland, and Brunswick
  2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    - Two Restorative Support Specialists, Youth Peer support and family support specialists
    - Restorative Dialogue, Circles, COSA, Support, COferences, Repair Process, Mentoring Peer Phase, Referral and Care Coordination
  3. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Plan provided taking into account need for onboarding and training.
  4. Training
    - Collaborate with external agencies to train 5 dedicated RJ team, within 12 weeks of hire and no facilitation will occur until training is complete
    - Positive Youth Development is trained at Sweetser for the ACT team
  5. Data Collection
    - Surveys, providing tablets and QR codes for anonymity. Youth Justice and Prevention satisfaction survey, Restorative Justice Victim Satisfaction Survey (New Zealand)
- III. Cost Proposal
  1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Sweetser\_R1\_Vic

**DATE:** 4-7-2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Vic Viera

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience – Sweetser has been around for over 60 years in Maine

1. Overview of Organization
  - Organizations has various departments – where would RJ fall?
2. Subcontractors
  - No mention of collaboration with other RJ orgs for this
    - Mentions receiving training from RJP to get their staff trained in restorative practices

II. Proposed Services - no breakdown of timelines on services, referral process or closing out process

1. Population Served
  - Offer services in Saco, Sanford, Portland and Brunswick
2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
  - Peer Support Network of people who have been through similar processes, confidentiality with juveniles??
3. Implementation – Work Plan
  - Mentions repair process as a separate process.
    - Support Circles and CoSA's?
4. Training
  - CoSA circles – who were they trained by to do this? Mentions these as a way to support individuals with Problem Sexual behaviors.
    - Will train up to 75 staff? How many staff will actually be involved in this program?
5. Data Collection
  - Has their own survey they would like to use – utilizing QR codes and providing tablets to participants. Want to use separate survey for victims?

III. Cost Proposal

1. Received, formula used for scoring.
  - Cost proposal – media buys? Repair cost? Training/Ed?

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Practices, LLC – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

The Bidder submitted three proposals, one for each DOC Region, as required by the RFP. However, the labels are all confusing to the point that it's impossible to tell which region each of the three proposals is for. On the cover sheets for Appendix C the documents are labeled as follows:

Document #1: "File 2 [Restorative Justice Practices, LLC] – Juvenile Region 2  
(Androscoggin, Franklin, Kennebec, Knox, Lincoln, Oxford and  
Sagadahoc Counties)  
Juvenile Region 1 (York & Cumberland Counties)

Document #2: "File 2 [Restorative Justice Practices, LLC] – Juvenile Region 2  
(Androscoggin, Franklin, Kennebec, Knox, Lincoln, Oxford and  
Sagadahoc Counties)  
Juvenile Region 1 (York & Cumberland Counties) (identical to above)

Document #3: "File 2 [Restorative Justice Practices, LLC] – Juvenile Region 3  
(Aroostook, Hancock, Penobscot, Piscataquis, Somerset, Waldo and  
Washington Counties)  
Juvenile Region 1 (York & Cumberland Counties)

**I. Organization Qualifications and Experience**

**1. Overview of Organization**

Although submitted on Appendix C, the description of the organization is confusing as the Bidder is "Restorative Justice Practices, LLC," however, the narrative references "I" as though an individual is submitting the proposal.

No history of providing restorative practices in Maine, nor does it provide any indication of having provided restorative justice programming directly to youth.

The three examples of projects that demonstrate experience and expertise in performing services requested in the RFP are not responsive. The first example provides no explanation of the project at all. The second example describes hosting a "restorative practice training, coaching and facilitation for a community group conference." The third example references work being done by a County without reference to how RJP, LLC is contributing to the project other than to state that one of the named subcontractors "is leading innovative efforts to support district-wide implementation" of restorative practices through a partnership with schools and a municipality.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Practices, LLC – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

2. Subcontractors

There are 21 individuals listed under the category of “Subcontractors (Further Contact Information Provided Upon Interview) & Organizational Chart. It is unclear who is an employee/agent of RJP, LLC and who is a subcontractor. Labels on the purported organizational chart are not helpful for distinguishing employees vs. subcontractors, e.g., “Common Comrades,” “Behind the Scenes,” and “Support Team.”

**II. Proposed Services**

1. Population Served

The narrative of the “Services to be provided” fails to clearly state what the Bidder will provide, and to the extent that activities are identified, they fail to meet the requirements of the services requested in the RFP. For example, the narrative indicates that “what’s really needed is a unified body to administer restorative justice and restorative practices consistently across the state” and that a “helpful approach” would be “structure all involved organizations around a few key program areas...” This sentence reflects a misunderstanding of the requested service and the existing resources in Maine.

The narrative fails to describe services that would be delivered to youth in Region 1, the method of delivering those services, the resources to be utilized, or how each task will be accomplished.

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

There was no mention of the 5 restorative justice principles or victim-centered approach to restorative practices in the narrative.

3. Implementation – Work Plan

The work plan provided does not describe activities that meet the purpose of the award, i.e., to establish restorative justice programming within Region 1 communities. Several of the tasks described are confusing such as “Administer baseline survey to assess starting point,” however, “starting point is not defined or explained. There are also tasks that indicate the agency does not currently have the capacity to deliver services, e.g., “Finalize Org Chart & Roles,” when there should already be a clearly defined org chart and roles. There are two potential RJ models referenced, “Challenge Day,” and “Upshift Programs” yet no explanation of what those services entail. The dates of task completion make it difficult, if not impossible, to determine when certain tasks will be completed.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Practices, LLC – Region 1

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

4. Training

The proposal does not clearly identify who will be responsible for providing restorative justice services, and consequently, there is no description of the training that will be provided to those individuals.

5. Data Collection

The proposal does reference using platforms such as “Arrows” and “HubSpot” to “manage and track the progress of restorative justice cases in real time,” however there is no description of the outcome measures to be sought or how data will be collected or analyzed to determine whether the outcome measures have been met. There is also reference of a “survey tool” without explaining who will be surveyed or what information will be sought.

**III. Cost Proposal**

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** RJ LLC (Region one)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience
  1. Overview of Organization
    - 2020 out of Colorado
    - Lived experience, training, and education (Variety)
  2. Subcontractors
    - 20+ subcontractors ranging from direct service to tech support.
- II. Proposed Services
  1. Population Served
    - Communities
  2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    -
  3. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Standards building with communities/state
  4. Training
    - None identified
  5. Data Collection
    - Surveys
- III. Cost Proposal
  1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** RJLLC\_R1\_Vic

**DATE:** 4-7-2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Vic Viera

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience – created in 2020 history working with Colorado Public Health Department. Worked with Colorado and Minnesota on various initiatives regarding Restorative Justice
  - Overview of Organization
  - 21 staff listed various roles for each person
- II. Subcontractors
  - Staff are also listed as subcontractors
  - Mentions working alongside current RJ orgs in Maine but does not mention them by name – have they already started reaching out to local orgs?
- III. Proposed Services - Sounds more like a create/implementation team to figure out what needs to be done or can be supported in Maine
  1. Population Served
    - Does not mention working with families, youth or victims.
    - Does not give a number for amount of youth per county they will serve.
  2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    - Implement – looking to organize the organizations into various categories for services they provide?
  3. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Focus groups?
    - Community days? – Is anyone in this group local to Maine?
  4. Training
    - “Motivational Interviewing, Internal Family Systems, Neurobiology, non-violent communication, mindfulness-based stress reduction, humor and other trauma informed tools”
      - RJ Training through what organizations?
  5. Data Collection
    - Offers new database for data collection and online survey for participants and trainees.
- IV. Cost Proposal
  - Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine – Region 2

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**I. Organization Qualifications and Experience**

The Bidder has experience delivering restorative justice services to youth in Region 2 – Androscoggin and Oxford Counties. They have existing staff currently delivering a variety of restorative practices and assert that their direct service state “hold relevant degrees and complete extensive training in restorative justice facilitation with ongoing professional development.” The agency description states that they utilize a “data-driven approach” with robust data collection and evaluation on a regular basis. The agency also states they provide all facilitators training in adolescent development, trauma-informed practices, cultural competency, and effective agreement monitoring.

Three relevant examples of projects performed by the agency include:

1. A description of the existing contract with MDOC and the “key achievements” as well as the agency’s ability to manage public funds responsibly and provide all new staff training in trauma-informed care, adolescent development, and cultural responsiveness.
2. A 5-7 month project funded by Maine Health Access Foundation to deliver restorative dialogue sessions to three distinct age cohorts. Youth and older (60+) adults engaged in structured conversations about justice, healing, and community building.
3. A project with USM to implement “co-learning and action coalitions” and described as “ a transformative approach to building restorative culture within community and organizations.” Weekly 2 hours sessions over a 4 month period for groups of 10-20 participants involved assigned readings and reflective tasks, “tailored intervention based on community-specific needs,” and “power mapping.”

An organizational chart for the agency reveals there is a Board of Directors, a Director (Emma Goldbas), 2 Youth Justice Coordinators (none now?) an Administrative Coordinator (none now?) and Per Diem Facilitator Network for Region 2.

**II. Proposed Services**

1. Population Served

The proposal states that 80 youth will be served in Region 2 with the numbers of youth to be served in each of the seven counties specified.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine – Region 2

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

The proposal articulates several types of restorative justice processes that the agency will deliver. These are in line with the suggested services outlined in the RFP and include “restorative mediation” which was not referenced in the RFP.

The proposal does indicate that services will be delivered from a “victim-centered approach” and outlines several of methods to engage victims. There is no reference, however, to the 5 restorative justice principles as articulated in the RFP.

Trauma-informed approach is described well.

Methodology is clearly stated and clearly explains the time line for referrals with a 12-16 week period of completion for referrals.

The proposal includes “Rural Service Delivery Adaptations,” including Resource Navigation to provide enhanced support for identifying and accessing limited community resources by maintaining resource county-specific resource guides, developing creative agreement options that leverage informal community supports, and building opportunities with businesses and organizations that can serve youth. While these are admirable efforts to serve youth, they exceed the scope of the RFP.

Communication adaptations are outlined such as utilizing multiple methods of contact, yet there is no mention of language barriers that exist in some parts of Region 2.

There are two full time youth justice coordinator positions proposed – one for the Western portion of the Region (Androscoggin, Oxford and Franklin Counties) and one for the Midcoast portion of the Region (Knox, Lincoln, Sagadahoc, and Kennebec Counties)

The Expected Outcomes and Performance Metrics for Region 2 are not realistic, or are described in a manner that make reliable measurement challenging. For example, one of the defined youth outcomes is “80% demonstrate gains in conflict resolution” and that this outcome would be measured by pre/post assessments using validated tools.

Some of the outcomes are unrealistic in that they would require victims to participate in more activity/feedback than can reasonably be expected. For example, “75% report lower anxiety related to the youth or incident and 70% feel safer in their community.”

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine – Region 2

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

These factors would be measured by pre/post assessments on fear and safety and fewer “avoidance behaviors.” (Is this an ethical/appropriate tool to use in restorative practices?)

Community Outcomes are similarly unrealistic in that they require more data than is possible within the context of this award. For example, “a 10% reduction in juvenile offenses in participating communities over three years,” requires an baseline measure that does not exist and the ability to demonstrate a causal relationship between the services delivered and the number of juvenile offenses in a community.

Assertions are made that are not supported regarding costs, e.g., “10% cost savings vs. traditional juvenile processing.” There is no reliable data on the cost associated with “traditional juvenile processing, which ranges from diversion through re-entry, and the average cost per case outlined in the agency’s budget proposal.

The assertion that efficiency measures will generate and estimated annual savings of \$22,400 compared to traditional service delivery models is another example of unsupported proposed outcome that lacks validation or any citation to an authority.

Diversified funding is mentioned as one means of developing long-term financial sustainability. This is an excellent factor to include in the proposal, but it would have been helpful if there had also been an explanation of they types of funding the agency currently receives that reflect “diversified funding.”

**3. Implementation – Work Plan**

The work plan provided is somewhat in a timeline chart, though it is several pages making it difficult to follow. The work plan clearly describes the tasks to be completed monthly and the person/role responsible for ensuring completion.

**4. Training**

The statement of qualifications contains the following language: Comprehensive Training Program: All facilitators received specialized training in adolescent development, trauma-informed practices, cultural competency and effective agreement monitoring. The proposal does not specify the number of hours of initial training or any ongoing training requirement.

**5. Data Collection**

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine – Region 2

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

Data Collection and Analysis is described as “Admin Coordinator complies and analyzes KPIs monthly (no definition of KPI). The second bulleted point is “Annual evaluations include county-specific outcome analysis.” It is unclear what is being evaluated.

Monthly statistical reports to DOC provide “detailed outcomes and county comparisons” and monthly team review of performance metrics are conducted. These are vague explanations without clearly defining what data will be collected, maintained, and provided to MDOC.

**III. Cost Proposal**

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION TWO)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience

1. Overview of Organization

- Director (.3 FTE) and Restorative Justice Learning & Development Specialist (Time not noted). What are their qualifications?
- Direct Service staff. One FT in Oxford/Lewiston, one FT in Bath/Brunswick, Per Diem facilitator network, .3 Admin Coordinator
- Direct Service Staff hold relevant degrees. What are the degrees and what is the raining in RJ facilitation?
- What standards of experience and expertise will the Per Diem Staff hold/adhere to?
- Has worked with the system
- Data driven approach, monthly case review. Who is included in the case review? What are they reviewing for?

2. Subcontractors

- None

II. Proposed Services

1. Population Served

- 80 Justice Involved youth in Oxford (7), Franklin (0-1), Kennebec (4), Knox (15), Lincoln (14), Sagadahoc (10) and Androscoggin (30)

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- Restorative Dialogue, Circles, Mediation, Conferencing,
- Case Management and Support Pre-Process Preparation, Agreement Development, Monitoring and Support, Mentoring – Is the case management under a MH license and billable to Mainecare?
- Victim Centered Approach.
- Regional based advisory structure with 15-18 members
- 

3. Implementation – Work Plan

- Case plan under 16 weeks
- No start date for accepting referrals and starting with youth and families.

4. Training

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (REGION TWO)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

- Per Diem Training starts in Month 3

5. Data Collection

- Willing to use DOC Dashboard – real time case level data
- Monthly performance indicators
- Quarterly outcome reviews with DOC
- Annual Evaluation
- Director audits at least 15% of case files each quarter
- Participant satisfaction survey after every process
- Quarterly facilitation observations
- Outcomes already designed

III. Cost Proposal

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** RJIM\_R2\_Vic

**DATE:** 4-7-2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Vic Viera

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience – RJIM has been working with MDOC since 2013.

1. Overview of Organization
  - 1 youth justice coordinator Oxford/Androscoggin Counties
  - 1 youth justice coordinator for Bath/Brunswick
  - Per diem network – how many?
2. Subcontractors
  - Mentions collaborating with other organizations but no specific names

II. Proposed Services

1. Population Served
    - 80 youth a year across region 2 across 7 counties
      - Breakdown of youth served per county concern with emphasis on Lewiston/Auburn area instead of rest of Androscoggin County
      - 0-1 youth Franklin County??
      - Franklin, Oxford, Kennebec counties are all “resource deserts”
  2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    - Restorative Mediation? – Who has trained their staff to do this?
  3. Implementation – Work Plan
    - School liaisons??
      - Identify and train cultural community liaisons – who? What organizations?
  4. Training
    - No mention of specific trainings.
  5. Data Collection
    - Utilizes DOC database for data collection.
- III. Cost Proposal
1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Youth Led Justice – Region 2

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**I. Organization Qualifications and Experience**

Youth Led Justice began as Maine Youth Court in 2012 (utilizing a Youth Court model) but has evolved to a staff directed model and in 2021 transitioned to its current form as an independent 501(c)(3) organization. The statement of qualifications include many assertions of the qualifications and experience of staff members. Although the agency and staff are certainly qualified to provide the services requested in the RFP, many of the assertions made regarding qualifications lack specificity. For example, “The staff at Youth Led Justice are highly trained facilitators from diverse backgrounds with a wealth of lived experience – including multiple staff with direct experience in our state’s criminal legal system as youth and adults” The training portfolio of the staff is more specific but still contains information that is unclear or fails to establish expertise in restorative justice. For example, staff are described as “certified Narcan Trainer,” “waiting for lince approval from the state as a Certified Alcohol and Drug Counselor,” another working to finish their degree in that same field” and “an ordained minister.” The assertion of holding a “MS from the world’s top ranked conflict and resolution graduate program” fails to state the degree conferred or the institution that issued the degree.

Three relevant examples of projects performed by the agency include:

1. Department of Corrections Youth Diversion with Tara Chiasson listed as the contact. The description of the project fails to explain that Tara Chiasson is merely a referral source rather than a project administrator. The description of the project does state that the agency provides direct services and mentoring to youth that “often culminates in restorative dialogues, circles, accountability letters, and repair agreements.
2. Tree Street Youth Center implementing restorative practices including dialogues, conducting trainings (not specified what type of training) and creating safe, productive environments for youth people. During the 2022-2023 period (no specific date) Tree Street gave YLJ a community partnership award for supporting youth facing suspension or expulsion and providing restorative school reintegration services.
3. Portland Public Schools – YLJ has provided trainings and workshops on RP for youth and adults in various school settings focusing on preventive community building circles and responsive restorative circle practices.

An organizational chart identifying the positions of executive director, Regional Program Director, Restorative Specialist #1/Administrative Assistant, Restorative Specialist #2,

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Youth Led Justice – Region 2

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

and Restorative Specialist #3 is provided. The chart lacks the names of individuals in those positions and fails to identify whether any of the positions are vacant.

**II. Proposed Services**

1. Population Served – Serve “a minimum of 180 referrals per year” throughout Region 2.

No subcontractors will be utilized but there is no articulated plan for how the agency will expand beyond its current capacity serving youth in the greater L/A community.

Although the proposal states that the agency has a “long history of serving communities in this region...” there is no support for serving any areas outside of Lewiston, Auburn, and the “surrounding communities.”

The proposal states that the primary goal is to take referrals from all possible sources “to work directly with young people who are at risk of becoming involved with the criminal legal system.” The “diversion strategy” falls into three categories:

- A. Direct support and RJ processes for referrals (processes not defined but later references a “restorative circle”) The process for addressing direct referrals is described in paragraph form without headings but the information is included,
- B. Establishing a presence in schools and offering opportunities for training and education around restorative practices – YLJ is working with Lewiston schools to “grow our presence in this district.” It’s not known what type of presence they have or wish to expand to other schools. No clear explanation of what service would be provided. Quarterly trainings for youth and school faculty around restorative practices is beyond the scope of service requested in the RFP. No support that this strategy improves outcomes for justice-involved youth or addresses harm caused to individuals or communities.
- C. Community Building – focused on “holding space for groups of youth to come together in restorative environments to discuss conflicts in their communities in real time and collectively envision how to respond to those conflicts and the structural barriers they face in community.” Similar to the strategy listed above, this strategy, while admirable, is beyond the scope of work sought in the RFP and does not address harm to individuals or communities or propose measurable outcomes.

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

Only a passing reference to the 5 restorative justice principles was offered without any explanation of the principles. The proposal is rather dismissive of the 5 principles in

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Youth Led Justice – Region 2

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

stating "We understand that along with the five RJ principals [sic], normalizing restorative responses to conflict requires much more than a circle, a dialogue, and/or a repair agreement – ...."

Methodology of processing referrals is provided but does not contain estimated times of completion for each of the steps identified.

3. Implementation – Work Plan

The work plan provided does not cover the performance period of the contract and makes reference only to tasks to be performed by September 1 and October 1, 2025. There are only five tasks identified with the latest being outreach to youth-serving organizations about collaboration, training, and opportunities for youth to "begin in Q1" and "have monthly meetings in Q2 about youth in need of additional services and supports."

4. Training

YLJ staff are all trained restorative facilitators with skills in circle practice, restorative dialogue, harm repair agreements and "the full spectrum of restorative processes" (not defined). Although continued education is stated as "always a priority," there is no explanation of training expectations. "Refresher trainings around the full spectrum of restorative processes used by YLJ" are not defined. The Executive Director has been in discussion with five different organizations (not identified) about offering specialized training in topics such as violence interruption, community building, restorative responses to harm, innovative circle practices, trauma-informed RJ, etc., over the next year for YLJ staff and "other interested parties in our network and community." It's unclear whether these organizations would constitute sub-contractors for the purpose of effectuating the services contracted.

5. Data Collection

Data collection will "follow the data collection protocols that have been maintained in the current contract" and surveys, comprehensive qualitative (confidential), demographic, and outcome-based case notes. It's unclear what, if any, information/data would be provided to MDOC. The agency is also in the process of creating a performance measure and staff satisfaction survey to identify strengths and weaknesses of staff practices.

**III. Cost Proposal**

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Youth Led Justice (REGION TWO)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience
  1. Overview of Organization
    - Started as Maine Youth Court in 2012. Youth Led Justice in 2021 as a 501-c3.
    - Where is the data on 280 youth coming from?
    - Training portfolio of staff: MI, Narcan, RP for Edu, Ordained minister, CADC
    - Trains RJ to schools in Portland Elementary to High School
    - Two FT RJ SPecialists, .5 RJ Specialist combined with .5 Ad Assistant, Regional Program Director that also facilitates
  2. Subcontractors
    - No subcontractors
- II. Proposed Services
  1. Population Served
    - Youth at risk of or involved with juveniles justice
  2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    - Repair Harm services, agreement
    - Presence within school
    - Community Building
  3. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Continue the work that they are currently contracted to do
    - Increase connection to Region Probation
    - Outreach to schools
  4. Training
    - Restorative facilitators trained in Circle Practice, Restorative Dialogue, harm repair agreements
    - Continued education through monthly supervision
    - Yearly refresher trainings
  5. Data Collection
    - Unless otherwise requested, will maintain the data collection protocols that have been used in the current contract
    - Qualitative, demographic, outcome based,
    - Creating performance measure survey for youth satisfaction
- III. Cost Proposal
  1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** YLJ\_R2\_Vic

**DATE:** 4-7-2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Vic Viera

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience – YLJ has been around since 2012 as Maine Youth Court.

1. Overview of Organization  
• How many staff do they have on now?

2. Subcontractors  
• No mention of subcontractors

II. Proposed Services – no change of services to address other counties.

1. Population Served  
• How many additional youth do they plan to serve in the other counties?

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)  
• Where do the staff receive their RJ training?

3. Implementation – Work Plan  
• No new specifics added to address issues with other counties such as transportation.

4. Training  
• Staff have training in various fields.

5. Data Collection  
• Utilize DOC database for data collection.

III. Cost Proposal

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

Other:

- 200 referrals a year?
- More details on specific projects vs. testimonials
- No details on plans to expand into other counties
- Staffing? How many do they currently have and how many do they still need?
- Lots of mention of working with schools and providing trainings at schools.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Project Maine – Region 2

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**I. Organization Qualifications and Experience**

RJP Maine is a community-based organization with 20 year history of providing restorative justice services in Maine. The work with the District Attorney in Prosecutorial District 6, LEAs, JCCOs, court staff, schools another to provide restorative justice services for youth involved in or at risk of becoming involved in the justice system in Sagadahoc, Lincoln, Knox and Waldo Counties. They also provide restorative re-entry services for adults in Belfast. Their training team has been recognized by UMaine and Colby College for excellence, and they are working with Prosecutorial District 6 to provide restorative practices within its Treatment Court.

Core harm repair processes are tailored to the needs of the impacted person and nature of the situation including:

- Pre-conferencing,
- Restorative dialogues,
- Restorative Conferences,
- Restorative Circles,
- Restorative Support Circles, and
- Restorative Reintegration Circles

Secure data collection system called Advocate Advantage and victim services case management system known as Vela.

RJP Maine has a cohort of trained volunteers that serve as co-facilitators, surrogates, mentors, and community participants. Trained adult mentors complete an 18 hour training course.

The organizational chart includes a board of directors, full time paid staff, and an executive director. The training requirements are well-defined to include a 42 hours Foundations of Restorative Justice training module which includes trauma-informed practices and an 18 hour Addressing Harm through Restorative Processes module. Ongoing peer review occurs weekly as quality assurance.

Subcontractors:

MEIRS will be a subcontractor to adopt all of RJP Maine's current process in a project currently funded by JJAG. The section regarding subcontractors also states that RJP contacted RJIM and YLJ and they are waiting to learn of the awards for this RFP before

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Project Maine – Region 2

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

entering into a subcontractor relationship with RJP. Nevertheless, both agencies are listed as subcontractors for this proposal.

The qualifications of this agency to deliver services requested in the RFP are well-articulated and detailed. It is uncertain whether the listed subcontractors are willing to subcontract with RJP Maine, and whether that agency will be able to meet the requirements of the RFP to serve youth throughout Region 2 in the event that one or both of the listed agencies does not subcontract.

Three relevant examples of projects performed by the agency include:

1. MEIRS was provided training to give impacted youth the tools needed to process and respond to punitive responses in the school system. Three 6 hour trainings were consisted of 6-10 youth each and included MSP resident Abdi Awad in developing the curriculum.
2. JJAG funding a project to translate RJ materials into graphics and language appropriate for Maay Maay and Somali speakers. In November 2024, RJP Maine hired and trained a Maay Maay-speaking person to train staff and deliver multilingual, culturally responsive restorative services and Circle of Care facilitation.
3. Current contract with MDOC to provide restorative justice services to youth in Waldo, Knox, Lincoln, and Sagadahoc Counties. Such services include pre-conferencing, restorative circles and restorative support circles.

The agency's work is grounded in the five restorative justice principles which are clearly articulated and emphasize a victim-centered approach.

An organizational chart is attached and identifies the Executive Director, Harm Repair Team, Office manager, training team and intern. The role of the subcontractors and how they fit into the organizational chart is unclear.

**II. Proposed Services**

1. Population Served: The proposal is to expand the services currently available to justice-involved and at-risk youth in Sagadahoc, Lincoln, and Knox Counties to the four other counties in Region 2.
2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

The work of the agency is grounded in the five restorative justice principles and will include:

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Project Maine – Region 2

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

Restorative Reflections (Pre-Conferencing)  
Restorative Dialogues  
Restorative Conferences  
Restorative Circles,  
Restorative Reintegration Circles  
Support through the Repair Agreement Completion/Mentoring  
Closing Circles and Wrap Up

Process averages 2-6 months from referral to closing and the agency utilizes the Social Discipline Window with high expectations for accountability with high support.

The Region will be divided into 3 districts:

1. Knox, Lincoln, and Sagadahoc – continue to be served by RJP Maine
2. Oxford and Androscoggin – the agency prefers to subcontract with existing RJ organizations but are prepared to hire a new RJ manager for that area. The agency believes an immigrant-led organization is best positioned to meet the culturally specific needs of its youth and has already trained youth and adults in Lewiston’s immigrant community.
3. Kennebec and Franklin – the agency is prepared to expand into these counties that are not currently served by an RJ providers and states a plan for outreach to LEAs, schools, and community organizations.

3. Implementation – Work Plan

The work plan on the first page is concise and specifies dates and responsible person/role. The time line on the second page is too small to read.

4. Training

5. Data Collection

In addition to the DOC required survey, RJP utilizes a Youth Outcome Survey consisting of 15 questions to track outcomes. Data collection appears limited to surveys that collect subjective experiences of participants. No objective data collection activities are described in the proposal other than 90% of the cases are successfully completed (not defined) with a “good outcome” offered by the courts. This measure, however, only applies to offenses petitioned to court.

**III. Cost Proposal**

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Project Maine (region two)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience
  1. Overview of Organization
    - CBO started in 2005
    - RJ Training recognized by UMaine and Colby
    - RJ Services for education, reentry for Belfast
    - Three RJ Managers for Harm Repair Team, case managers with Master's Degrees in SW or RJ – take 42 hour Foundations in Restorative Justice and 18 hour Addressing harm through Restorative Processes (CEU's offered by UMaine)
    - Weekly 90 minute peer review sessions
    - Two training and capacity builders deliver training. UMaine, USD, Williams
    - Adult Volunteer Mentors take 18-hour Foundations training course
  2. Subcontractors
    - MEIRS, if chosen they will adopt RJP Maine's current processes
      1. Includes interpretation of 10 languages
    - YLJ waiting for results of RFP
    - RJIM waiting for results of RFP
- II. Proposed Services
  1. Population Served
    - Justice involved and at-risk youth Sagadahoc, Lincoln, Knox, Androscoggin, Oxford, Kennebec, and Franklin
  2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    - Restorative Reflections (pre-conferencing), Dialogues, Conferences, Circles, Repair Agreement and mentoring, closing circles
  3. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Processes average two to six months
    - Divide Region into Districts
      1. D1 – Sagadahoc, Lincoln, and Knox – 3 Offices
      2. D2 – Androscoggin and Oxford – Either subcontract or hire RJ Manager, use contractor space or Bates College
      3. D3 – Kennebec and Franklin – Either subcontract or hire RJ Manager, partner with Colby College
      4. Referrals immediately and build outward.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Project Maine (region two)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

4. Training
    - See qualifications.
  5. Data Collection
    - Survey for youth
- III. Cost Proposal
1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** RJP\_R2\_Vic

**DATE:** 4-7-2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Vic Viera

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience – RJP has been around since 2005.
  1. Overview of Organization
    - Large volunteer network
    - 3 current full time facilitators
  2. Subcontractors
    - MEIRS – culturally sensitive restorative processes
    - RJIM
      - YLJ
- II. Proposed Services
  1. Population Served
    - Offer culturally sensitive RJ processes focuses efforts in Androscoggin County, Oxford County and Kennebec.
      - No specific number of youth to be served
  2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    - Culturally Sensitive RJ – Who is setting this framework??
      - Tap into community for volunteers (Bates College)
  3. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Work with sub-contractors if not, will hire 2 full time coordinators
  4. Training
    - No mention of what specific trainings they have taken.
  5. Data Collection
    - Use DOC survey or their own?
- III. Cost Proposal
  1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Practices, LLC – Region 2

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

The Bidder submitted three proposals, one for each DOC Region, as required by the RFP. However, the labels are all confusing to the point that it's impossible to tell which region each of the three proposals is for. On the cover sheets for Appendix C the documents are labeled as follows:

Document #1: "File 2 [Restorative Justice Practices, LLC] – Juvenile Region 2  
(Androscoggin, Franklin, Kennebec, Knox, Lincoln, Oxford and  
Sagadahoc Counties)  
Juvenile Region 1 (York & Cumberland Counties)

Document #2: "File 2 [Restorative Justice Practices, LLC] – Juvenile Region 2  
(Androscoggin, Franklin, Kennebec, Knox, Lincoln, Oxford and  
Sagadahoc Counties)  
Juvenile Region 1 (York & Cumberland Counties) (identical to above)

Document #3: "File 2 [Restorative Justice Practices, LLC] – Juvenile Region 3  
(Aroostook, Hancock, Penobscot, Piscataquis, Somerset, Waldo and  
Washington Counties)  
Juvenile Region 1 (York & Cumberland Counties)

**I. Organization Qualifications and Experience**

**1. Overview of Organization**

Although submitted on Appendix C, the description of the organization is confusing as the Bidder is "Restorative Justice Practices, LLC," however, the narrative references "I" as though an individual is submitting the proposal.

No history of providing restorative practices in Maine, nor does it provide any indication of having provided restorative justice programming directly to youth.

The three examples of projects that demonstrate experience and expertise in performing services requested in the RFP are not responsive. The first example provides no explanation of the project at all. The second example describes hosting a "restorative practice training, coaching and facilitation for a community group conference." The third example references work being done by a County without reference to how RJP, LLC is contributing to the project other than to state that one of the named subcontractors "is leading innovative efforts to support district-wide implementation" of restorative practices through a partnership with schools and a municipality.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Practices, LLC – Region 2

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

2. Subcontractors

There are 21 individuals listed under the category of “Subcontractors (Further Contact Information Provided Upon Interview) & Organizational Chart. It is unclear who is an employee/agent of RJP, LLC and who is a subcontractor. Labels on the purported organizational chart are not helpful for distinguishing employees vs. subcontractors, e.g., “Common Comrades,” “Behind the Scenes,” and “Support Team.”

**II. Proposed Services**

1. Population Served

The narrative of the “Services to be provided” fails to clearly state what the Bidder will provide, and to the extent that activities are identified, they fail to meet the requirements of the services requested in the RFP. For example, the narrative indicates that “what’s really needed is a unified body to administer restorative justice and restorative practices consistently across the state” and that a “helpful approach” would be “structure all involved organizations around a few key program areas...” This sentence reflects a misunderstanding of the requested service and the existing resources in Maine.

The narrative fails to describe services that would be delivered to youth in Region 1, the method of delivering those services, the resources to be utilized, or how each task will be accomplished.

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

There was no mention of the 5 restorative justice principles or victim-centered approach to restorative practices in the narrative.

3. Implementation – Work Plan

The work plan provided does not describe activities that meet the purpose of the award, i.e., to establish restorative justice programming within Region 1 communities. Several of the tasks described are confusing such as “Administer baseline survey to assess starting point,” however, “starting point is not defined or explained. There are also tasks that indicate the agency does not currently have the capacity to deliver services, e.g., “Finalize Org Chart & Roles,” when there should already be a clearly defined org chart and roles. There are two potential RJ models referenced, “Challenge Day,” and “Upshift Programs” yet no explanation of what those services entail. The dates of task completion make it difficult, if not impossible, to determine when certain tasks will be completed.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Practices, LLC – Region 2

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

4. Training

The proposal does not clearly identify who will be responsible for providing restorative justice services, and consequently, there is no description of the training that will be provided to those individuals.

5. Data Collection

The proposal does reference using platforms such as “Arrows” and “HubSpot” to “manage and track the progress of restorative justice cases in real time,” however there is no description of the outcome measures to be sought or how data will be collected or analyzed to determine whether the outcome measures have been met. There is also reference of a “survey tool” without explaining who will be surveyed or what information will be sought.

**III. Cost Proposal**

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Practice LLC (REGION TWO)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience
  1. Overview of Organization
    - 2020 out of Colorado
    - Lived experience, training, and education (Variety)
  2. Subcontractors
    - 20+ subcontractors ranging from direct service to tech support.
- II. Proposed Services
  1. Population Served
    - Communities
  2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    -
  3. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Standards building with communities/state
  4. Training
    - None identified
  5. Data Collection
    - Surveys
- III. Cost Proposal
  1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** RJLLC\_R2\_Vic

**DATE:** 4-7-2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Vic Viera

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience – created in 2020 history working with Colorado Public Health Department. Worked with Colorado and Minnesota on various initiatives regarding Restorative Justice

1. **Overview of Organization**

- 21 staff listed various roles for each person

2. Subcontractors

- Staff are also listed as subcontractors
- Mentions working alongside current RJ orgs in Maine but does not mention them by name – have they already started reaching out to local orgs?

II. **Proposed Services** - Sounds more like a create/implementation team to figure out what needs to be done or can be supported in Maine

1. Population Served

- Does not mention working with families, youth or victims.
- Does not give a number for amount of youth per county they will serve.

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- Implement – looking to organize the organizations into various categories for services they provide?
- No acknowledgment of changes throughout regions (Rural vs Urban)

3. Implementation – Work Plan

- Focus groups?
- Community days? – Is anyone in this group local to Maine?

4. **Training**

- “Motivational Interviewing, Internal Family Systems, Neurobiology, non-violent communication, mindfulness-based stress reduction, humor and other trauma informed tools”
- RJ Training through what organizations?

5. **Data Collection**

- Offers new database for data collection and online survey for participants and trainees.

III. **Cost Proposal**

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine – Region 3

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**I. Organization Qualifications and Experience**

The Bidder has experience delivering restorative justice services to youth in Maine. They have existing staff currently delivering a variety of restorative practices and assert that their direct service state “hold relevant degrees and complete extensive training in restorative justice facilitation with ongoing professional development.” The agency description states that they utilize a “data-driven approach” with robust data collection and evaluation on a regular basis. The agency also states they provide all facilitators training in adolescent development, trauma-informed practices, cultural competency, and effective agreement monitoring. Although Hally Phillips is mentioned in the statement of qualifications as the “Restorative Justice Learning and Development Specialist,” neither her name nor position appear on the organizational chart.

Three relevant examples of projects performed by the agency include:

1. A description of the existing contract with MDOC and the “key achievements” as well as the agency’s ability to manage public funds responsibly and provide all new staff training in trauma-informed care, adolescent development, and cultural responsiveness.
2. A 5-7 month project funded by Maine Health Access Foundation to deliver restorative dialogue sessions to three distinct age cohorts. Youth and older (60+) adults engaged in structured conversations about justice, healing, and community building.
3. A project with USM to implement “co-learning and action coalitions” and described as “ a transformative approach to building restorative culture within community and organizations.” Weekly 2 hours sessions over a 4 month period for groups of 10-20 participants involved assigned readings and reflective tasks, “tailored intervention based on community-specific needs,” and “power mapping.”

An organizational chart for the agency reveals there is a Board of Directors, a Director (Emma Goldbas), 2 Youth Justice Coordinators (none now?) an Administrative Coordinator (none now?) and Per Diem Facilitator Network for Region 3.

**II. Proposed Services**

1. Population Served

The proposal states that 70 youth will be served in Region 3.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine – Region 3

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

The proposal articulates several types of restorative justice processes that the agency will deliver. These are in line with the suggested services outlined in the RFP and include “restorative mediation” which was not referenced in the RFP.

The proposal does indicate that services will be delivered from a “victim-centered approach” and outlines several of methods to engage victims. There is no reference, however, to the 5 restorative justice principles as articulated in the RFP.

The proposal outlines a “Region 3 – Specific Service Delivery Method.” This includes a “geographic accessibility strategy to address the large geographic area covered in Region 3.

Youth Justice Coordinators will be stationed in Bangor and in Presque Isle with development of a “hub” location in each of the seven counties in Region 3. A “circuit rider” scheduling model will be implemented and community engagement approaches will be tailored specifically for rural communities, though it’s unclear what that means.

The youth justice coordinator in Aroostook County will be expected to have or develop specialized knowledge of agricultural communities as well as Wabanaki and Franco-American cultures.

Resource Navigation (not defined) is one of the proposed services to offer a “specialized approach to addressing the limited formal support services in rural areas.” This will also require partnerships with schools, faith communities, and civic organizations to create meaningful reparative agreement opportunities.

The proposal acknowledges the challenges that may exist in Region 3, e.g., transportation, more so than in other parts of the state and proposes virtual participation options and providing gas cards to families to defray the cost of travel.

The Case Flow and Process Timeline describes a 16-20 week time between referral and completion of the closing circle.

A “Trauma-Informed Rural Approach” is described as an “approach that addresses both the universal impacts of trauma and the unique experiences common in rural communities” to include: safety, trustworthiness, choice, collaboration, empowerment,

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine – Region 3

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

and cultural sensitivity to “Franco-American, Wabanaki, and rural subcultural identities” though these “unique” features are not explained.

The agency proposes that a “Region 3 Rural Justice Symposium” will be developed to share promising practices, identify common challenges and collaborative solutions, “build regional identity and commitment” (overly vague) and inform strategic planning for the upcoming year. Such an event may be beyond the scope of services requested in the RFP.

The Expected Outcomes and Performance Metrics for Region 3 are not realistic, or are described in a manner that make reliable measurement challenging. For example, one of the defined youth outcomes is “80% demonstrate gains in conflict resolution” and that this outcome would be measured by pre/post assessments using validated tools.

Some of the outcomes are unrealistic in that they would require victims to participate in more activity/feedback than can reasonably be expected. For example, “75% report lower anxiety related to the youth or incident and 70% feel safer in their community.” These factors would be measured by pre/post assessments on fear and safety and fewer “avoidance behaviors.” (Is this an ethical/appropriate tool to use in restorative practices?)

Community Outcomes are similarly unrealistic in that they require more data than is possible within the context of this award. For example, “a 10% reduction in juvenile offenses in participating communities over three years,” requires an baseline measure that does not exist and the ability to demonstrate a causal relationship between the services delivered and the number of juvenile offenses in a community.

Assertions are made that are not supported regarding costs, e.g., “10% cost savings vs. traditional juvenile processing.” There is no reliable data on the cost associated with “traditional juvenile processing, which ranges from diversion through re-entry, and the average cost per case outlined in the agency’s budget proposal.

The assertion that efficiency measures will generate and estimated annual savings of \$21,600 compared to traditional service delivery models is another example of unsupported proposed outcome that lacks validation or any citation to an authority.

Diversified funding is mentioned as one means of developing long-term financial sustainability. This is an excellent factor to include in the proposal, but it would have

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine – Region 3

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

been helpful if there had also been an explanation of they types of funding the agency currently receives that reflect “diversified funding.”

3. Implementation – Work Plan

The work plan provided is somewhat in a timeline chart, though it is several pages making it difficult to follow. The work plan clearly describes the tasks to be completed monthly and the person/role responsible for ensuring completion.

4. Training

The statement of qualifications contains the following language: Comprehensive Training Program: All facilitators received specialized training in adolescent development, trauma-informed practices, cultural competency and effective agreement monitoring. The proposal does not specify the number of hours of initial training or any ongoing training requirement.

5. Data Collection

Data Collection and Analysis is described as “Admin Coordinator complies and analyzes key performance indicators monthly without specifying what the performance indicators are. One of the Quality Assurance Mechanisms listed is “University of Maine’s Rural Health and Wellbeing Initiative” provides external evaluation. There is no explanation of what would be evaluated, nor is there any indication that this would be a subcontracted service.

Monthly statistical reports to DOC provide “detailed outcomes and county comparisons” and monthly team review of performance metrics are conducted. These are vague explanations without clearly defining what data will be collected, maintained, and provided to MDOC.

**III. Cost Proposal**

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (region 3)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience

1. Overview of Organization

- Director (.3 FTE) and Restorative Justice Learning & Development Specialist (Time not noted). What are their qualifications?
- Direct Service staff. One FT in Presque Isle, one FT in Bangor, Per Diem facilitator network, .3 Admin Coordinator
- Direct Service Staff hold relevant degrees. What are the degrees and what is the raining in RJ facilitation?
- What standards of experience and expertise will the Per Diem Staff hold/adhere to?
- Has worked with the system
- Data driven approach, monthly case review. Who is included in the case review? What are they reviewing for?

2. Subcontractors

- None listed

II. Proposed Services

1. Population Served

- 70 youth annually from Aroostook, Hancock, Penobscot, Piscataquis, Somerset, Waldo, Washington
- Rural counties approach. Hub locations with community partners.
- Emphasis on building relationships with key community influencers with attention to privacy concerns
- Acknowledges cultural differences from County to Coastal

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- Restorative Dialogue, Circles, Mediation, Conferencing,
- Case Management and Support Pre-Process Preparation, Agreement Development, Monitoring and Support, Mentoring – Is the case management under a MH license and billable to Mainecare?
- Victim Centered Approach.
- County based advisory structure with 5-8 members
- Regional RJ Symposium for Region 3

3. Implementation – Work Plan

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Institute of Maine (region 3)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

- Case plan under 20 weeks with time differential for rural locations
  - No start date for accepting referrals and starting with youth and families.
4. Training
    - Per Diem Training starts in Month 3
  5. Data Collection
    - Willing to use DOC Dashboard – real time case level data
    - Monthly performance indicators
    - Quarterly outcome reviews with DOC
    - Annual Evaluation
    - Director audits at least 15% of case files each quarter
    - Participant satisfaction survey after every process
    - Quarterly facilitation observations
    - External evaluation by UMaine Rural Health and Wellbeing Initiative
    - Outcomes already designed
- III. Cost Proposal
1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** RJIM\_R3\_Vic

**DATE:** 4-8-2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Vic Viera

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience – RJIM has been around since 2013.
  1. Overview of Organization
    - Need 2 full time youth justice coordinators
    - Will utilize per diem network (anyone in the region 3 area already or will need to find some?)
  2. Subcontractors
    - None mentioned at this time.
- II. Proposed Services – 70 youth annually across region 3
  1. Population Served
    - 2 full time coordinators to cover all of region 3? Travel time? Cost?
  2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    - Same services provided already less resources in community.
      - Restorative Mediation (Who are they trained by to do this?)
  3. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Need to hire for 2 full time positions, need to develop and find network of per diems.
      - How will the org address issues pertaining to rural, and remote locations of region 3 and the lack of additional resources.
  4. Training
    - No specific trainings mentioned.
  5. Data Collection
    - Utilizes MDOC Data base for data collection.
- III. Cost Proposal
  1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Penquis C.A.P. – Region 3

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

**I. Organization Qualifications and Experience**

The agency is a nonprofit community action agency and licensed mental health agency serving individuals and families. Penquis has 58 years of experience helping more than 30,000 Maine people of all ages every year. Their services are described as “client-centered,” “culturally competent,” “strengths based,” “performance-based,” “collaborative,” and “holistic.” They have a staff of 505 and nearly 500 volunteers supporting the organization. The description of the skills and qualifications of staff within the agency to deliver services requested in the RFP is impressive leaving no doubt that the agency is well-qualified to deliver restorative justice services to youth in Region 3. Penquis CAP currently has a contract with MDOC and the agency provides additional programs such as the Youth Engagement Program, Host Homes, Substance Affected Youth Program, and many others that serve the target population of this RFP.

Three relevant examples of projects performed by the agency include:

1. The Restorative Justice Program – a MDOC funded restorative justice program for youth that utilizes trained facilitators to deliver a variety of restorative justice services, e.g., circle conferences. The program is described as “victim-centered.”
2. Breakthrough Youth – Through a partnership with Aroostook County Action Partners and Down East Community Partners, important life skills are provided to youth ages 10-24 in Aroostook, Penobscot, Piscataquis, Hancock, and Washington Counties. Penquis serves Penobscot and Piscataquis Counties as a subcontractee.
3. Host Homes Program – provides housing and supportive services to youth ages 12-24 in greater Piscataquis County experiencing homelessness, are at imminent risk of homelessness, or fleeing/attempting to flee domestic violence.

Subcontractors:

Aroostook County Action Program  
The Restorative Justice Project of Maine  
Downeast Restorative Justice

An organizational chart for the agency

A very thorough and well-organized chart illustrates the organizational structure of the agency and identifies individuals in leadership positions by name.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Penquis C.A.P. – Region 3

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

Litigation in the past 5 years is explained.

**II. Proposed Services**

1. Population Served: Region 3 – Aroostook, Hancock, Penobscot, Piscataquis, Somerset, Waldo, and Washington Counties

Youth at risk for juvenile justice involvement or may not have had past involvement with MDOC. Referrals from JCCOs, case workers, public safety officials, school administrators, SROs. Both DOC and non-DOC involved youth will be served, but a priority will be given to MDOC youth.

The agency will NOT serve:

Youth with civil violations

Youth who have not admitted their conduct

Youth who do not voluntarily agree to participate in a restorative practice

Youth alleged to have committed serious violent crimes

Cases involving sexual harm, intimate partner violence or domestic violence

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

The agency clearly articulated an understanding of the 5 restorative justice principles and identified a primary focus on assisting the most impacted party and addressing needs with a secondary focus on community restoration and competency development.

The proposal clearly outlines a victim-centered approach that “puts the rights and dignity, including well-being and safety, of all victims in the forefront.” The proposal further includes a list of the factors that must be included and benefits of a victim-centered restorative justice approach.

The scope of work to be performed by each of the agencies that will fulfill the obligations of the award are as follows:

Penquis CAP is the lead agency

ACAP will serve Aroostook and Washington Counties

DRJ will serve Hancock County

Penquis CAP will serve Penobscot, Piscataquis, and Somerset Counties

RJP will serve Waldo County

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Penquis C.A.P. – Region 3

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

All of these agencies, collectively referred to as the “JR3 Restorative Justice Collaborative” have existing contracts with MDOC to provide restorative justice services to justice-involved youth and those at risk of becoming justice-involved.

The roles of staff are clearly defined, as are program activities to include outreach, referrals, restorative services. Each of the types of restorative event to be provided is clearly defined, and a comprehensive list of restorative questions is provided.

3. Implementation – Work Plan

The work plan is concisely illustrated on a single page and includes the task and the person/role responsible for task completion.

4. Training

“All current restorative staff members with RJC partners meet training requirements, and all new restorative staff will receive restorative practice and restorative justice facilitator training in addition to training in “trauma-informed care, PYD, and other relevant training within three months of hire. All staff are required to have 10 hours of annual continued development in RP, facilitation, or youth development.

5. Data Collection

Demographic data to be collected is listed, as well as data regarding:  
Successful completion of the restorative program  
Percentage of youth who complete within 40 hours  
Staff training – initial and annual thereafter  
Percentage of non-DOC youth referred  
Percentage of youth who have the first meeting scheduling attempt w/in one week  
And several other well-defined factors including satisfaction surveys

**III. Cost Proposal**

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Penquis CAP Inc. (Region 3)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience

1. Overview of Organization

- NonProfit agency with 58 years experience
- Organization covers RJ services with RJP, youth, HUD, school based RJ with MeCasa for bullying and sexual harrassment, WIOA and RJ in the workplace, DHHS, Section 28, Counseling for youth and adults, Substance affected youth, Rape response and sexual abuse

•

2. Subcontractors

- ACAP – Avg. Of 11 referrals over 3 years with 27 hours spent on cases. No information on number of facilitators, qualifications
- RJP – Three RJ Managers for RJ CM, provided qualifications with no names of facilitators.
- Downeast RJ
- Not clear re: RJ Facilitators under Penquis, 1 vacancy, 1 per diem, and 1 vacant per diem?

II. Proposed Services

1. Population Served

- Juvenile Region 3 Aroostook, Hancock, Penobscot, Piscataquis, Somerset, Waldo, Washington Counties
- Youth at risk for JJ involvement.
- NOT served list is extensive. How will service be determined? RJ work includes preparing, teaching, and mentoring responsible party for understanding the impact. This is part of the work. Service doesn't mean that the responsible party and impacted party have to meet.
- What training and qualifications will prepare facilitators to work with youth and families with offense v. sibling or parents?

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- ACAP will cover Aroostook and Washington
- DRJ will cover Hancock
- Penquis will cover Penobscot, Piscataquis, and Somerset
- RJPMaine will cover Waldo

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Penquis CAP Inc. (Region 3)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

3. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Restorative Dialogues
    - Restorative Circles
    - Circles of Support and Accountability
    - Restorative COncference/Harm Repair Circles
    - Repair Agreement Completion/Mentoring
    - All participants are included in MERJ?
  4. Training
    - Restorative Practice and facilitator training,
    - Shadowing to co-facilitating
    - 10 hours of continued development
  5. Data Collection
    - Demographics
    - Successful COmpletions
    - Training
    - Funding
    - Performance measures
    - Program Outcomes (based on DOC Process Survey)
- III. Cost Proposal
1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** PENQUIS\_R3\_Vic

**DATE:** 4-8-2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Vic Viera

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

I. Organization Qualifications and Experience – 58 years of working in the Penobscot and Piscataquis County area.

1. Overview of Organization

- Offers various programs to support clients outside of RJ
- Collaborates with various stakeholders in community.
  - RJ is one out of 6 of their youth programs

2. Subcontractors

- RJP (Waldo County)
- DRJ (Hancock County)
- ACAP (Aroostook and Washington County)

II. Proposed Services – Expand to all of region three using current RJ orgs but no number for amount of youth that can be served.

1. Population Served

- Specific offenses or conditions that would make the org NOT accept the referral

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

- Circles of Support and Accountability (CoSA's – who did they get trained by?)
  - Can offer additional resources for families (Can this happen outside of PENQUIS CAP's geographical coverage?)

3. Implementation – Work Plan

- Need to hire 1 full time and add another per diem spot

4. Training

- What training is offered for new staff to certify them as a practitioner?
  - Trainings + Collaboration with MECASA

5. Data Collection

- Utilizes DOC database for data collection.

III. Cost Proposal

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Practices, LLC – Region 3

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

The Bidder submitted three proposals, one for each DOC Region, as required by the RFP. However, the labels are all confusing to the point that it's impossible to tell which region each of the three proposals is for. On the cover sheets for Appendix C the documents are labeled as follows:

Document #1: "File 2 [Restorative Justice Practices, LLC] – Juvenile Region 2  
(Androscoggin, Franklin, Kennebec, Knox, Lincoln, Oxford and  
Sagadahoc Counties)  
Juvenile Region 1 (York & Cumberland Counties)

Document #2: "File 2 [Restorative Justice Practices, LLC] – Juvenile Region 2  
(Androscoggin, Franklin, Kennebec, Knox, Lincoln, Oxford and  
Sagadahoc Counties)  
Juvenile Region 1 (York & Cumberland Counties) (identical to above)

Document #3: "File 2 [Restorative Justice Practices, LLC] – Juvenile Region 3  
(Aroostook, Hancock, Penobscot, Piscataquis, Somerset, Waldo and  
Washington Counties)  
Juvenile Region 1 (York & Cumberland Counties)

**I. Organization Qualifications and Experience**

**1. Overview of Organization**

Although submitted on Appendix C, the description of the organization is confusing as the Bidder is "Restorative Justice Practices, LLC," however, the narrative references "I" as though an individual is submitting the proposal.

No history of providing restorative practices in Maine, nor does it provide any indication of having provided restorative justice programming directly to youth.

The three examples of projects that demonstrate experience and expertise in performing services requested in the RFP are not responsive. The first example provides no explanation of the project at all. The second example describes hosting a "restorative practice training, coaching and facilitation for a community group conference." The third example references work being done by a County without reference to how RJP, LLC is contributing to the project other than to state that one of the named subcontractors "is leading innovative efforts to support district-wide implementation" of restorative practices through a partnership with schools and a municipality.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Practices, LLC – Region 3

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

2. Subcontractors

There are 21 individuals listed under the category of “Subcontractors (Further Contact Information Provided Upon Interview) & Organizational Chart. It is unclear who is an employee/agent of RJP, LLC and who is a subcontractor. Labels on the purported organizational chart are not helpful for distinguishing employees vs. subcontractors, e.g., “Common Comrades,” “Behind the Scenes,” and “Support Team.”

**II. Proposed Services**

1. Population Served

The narrative of the “Services to be provided” fails to clearly state what the Bidder will provide, and to the extent that activities are identified, they fail to meet the requirements of the services requested in the RFP. For example, the narrative indicates that “what’s really needed is a unified body to administer restorative justice and restorative practices consistently across the state” and that a “helpful approach” would be “structure all involved organizations around a few key program areas...” This sentence reflects a misunderstanding of the requested service and the existing resources in Maine.

The narrative fails to describe services that would be delivered to youth in Region 1, the method of delivering those services, the resources to be utilized, or how each task will be accomplished.

2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)

There was no mention of the 5 restorative justice principles or victim-centered approach to restorative practices in the narrative.

3. Implementation – Work Plan

The work plan provided does not describe activities that meet the purpose of the award, i.e., to establish restorative justice programming within Region 1 communities. Several of the tasks described are confusing such as “Administer baseline survey to assess starting point,” however, “starting point is not defined or explained. There are also tasks that indicate the agency does not currently have the capacity to deliver services, e.g., “Finalize Org Chart & Roles,” when there should already be a clearly defined org chart and roles. There are two potential RJ models referenced, “Challenge Day,” and “Upshift Programs” yet no explanation of what those services entail. The dates of task completion make it difficult, if not impossible, to determine when certain tasks will be completed.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Practices, LLC – Region 3

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Christine Thibeault

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

4. Training

The proposal does not clearly identify who will be responsible for providing restorative justice services, and consequently, there is no description of the training that will be provided to those individuals.

5. Data Collection

The proposal does reference using platforms such as “Arrows” and “HubSpot” to “manage and track the progress of restorative justice cases in real time,” however there is no description of the outcome measures to be sought or how data will be collected or analyzed to determine whether the outcome measures have been met. There is also reference of a “survey tool” without explaining who will be surveyed or what information will be sought.

**III. Cost Proposal**

1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #:** 202502018

**RFP TITLE:** Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative

**BIDDER NAME:** Restorative Justice Practice LLC (region 3)

**DATE:** 4/8/2025

**EVALUATOR NAME:** Stephanie O'Reilly

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT:** Maine Department of Corrections

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

- I. Organization Qualifications and Experience
  1. Overview of Organization
    - 2020 out of Colorado
    - Lived experience, training, and education (Variety)
  2. Subcontractors
    - 20+ subcontractors ranging from direct service to tech support.
- II. Proposed Services
  1. Population Served
    - Communities
  2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    -
  3. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Standards building with communities/state
  4. Training
    - None identified
  5. Data Collection
    - Surveys
- III. Cost Proposal
  1. Received, formula used for scoring.

**STATE OF MAINE  
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES**

**RFP #: 202502018**

**RFP TITLE: Juvenile Justice Restorative Practices Initiative**

**BIDDER NAME: RJLLC\_R3\_Vic**

**DATE: 4-8-2025**

**EVALUATOR NAME: Vic Viera**

**EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Maine Department of Corrections**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

Organization Qualifications and Experience – created in 2020 history working with Colorado Public Health Department. Worked with Colorado and Minnesota on various initiatives regarding Restorative Justice

1. Overview of Organization
  - 21 staff listed various roles for each person
2. Subcontractors
  - Staff are also listed as subcontractors
  - Mentions working alongside current RJ orgs in Maine but does not mention them by name – have they already started reaching out to local orgs?
- II. Proposed Services - Sounds more like a create/implementation team to figure out what needs to be done or can be supported in Maine
  1. Population Served
    - Does not mention working with families, youth or victims.
    - Does not give a number for amount of youth per county they will serve.
  2. Description of Services (5 restorative Justice principles, victim-centered approach & type of services)
    - Implement – looking to organize the organizations into various categories for services they provide?
      - No acknowledgment of the rural and isolated areas of region 3.
  3. Implementation – Work Plan
    - Focus groups?
    - Community days? – Is anyone in this group local to Maine?
  4. Training
    - “Motivational Interviewing, Internal Family Systems, Neurobiology, non-violent communication, mindfulness-based stress reduction, humor and other trauma informed tools”
      - RJ Training through what organizations?
  5. Data Collection
    - Offers new database for data collection and online survey for participants and trainees.
- III. Cost Proposal
  1. Received, formula used for scoring.



STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Janet T. Mills  
Governor

Randall Liberty  
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT  
RFP #: 202502018  
RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE

I, Christine Thibeault accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Corrections. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

**I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.**

DocuSigned by:  
*Christine Thibeault*  
1EE8D720BD7E495  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

4/15/2025  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Janet T. Mills  
Governor

Randall Liberty  
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT  
RFP #: 202502018  
RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE

I, Stephanie O'Reilly accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Corrections. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

**I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.**

DocuSigned by:  
*Stephanie O'Reilly*  
70AF3509667C443...

4/15/2025

Signature

Date



STATE OF MAINE  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Janet T. Mills  
Governor

Randall Liberty  
Commissioner

AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT  
RFP #: 202502018  
RFP TITLE: JUVENILE JUSTICE RESTORATIVE PRACTICES INITIATIVE

I, vic viera accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Corrections. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. "Interest" may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder's company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder's official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

**I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.**

DocuSigned by:

*Vic Viera*

60526BE5C021434

Signature

4/15/2025

Date