From: Shaw, Barbara
To: Irving, Toni
Subject: RE: Governor"s Neighborhood Recovery Initiative
Date: Wednesday, February 23, 2011 6:51:01 PM

Hi, Toni. All I can add is that his proposal in no way stacked up against the proposals that were selected. He essentially provide one sentence responses to each section of the application as compared to the others who provided much more thorough and thoughtful responses. It's really something that he feels so entitled to these dollars when he put so little effort into applying for them. He can't seem to accept that his application didn't measure up and appears to be looking for any possible way he can discredit the process.

Would you like to see his proposal and the proposals from the selected groups?

From: Irving, Toni
Sent: Wednesday, February 23, 2011 1:26 PM
To: Shaw, Barbara
Subject: RE: Governor's Neighborhood Recovery Initiative

Other than the poorly written application are there any other specific details we can provide? Greg Gaither is repeatedly calling to complain and if you can add anything before I return his call I would appreciate it.

Toni Irving, Ph.D
Senior Advisor
Deputy Chief of Staff to Governor Pat Quinn
James R. Thompson Center
100 W. Randolph, Suite 16-100
Chicago, IL 60601
312.814.3967 (o)
312.814.5512 (f)

From: Shaw, Barbara
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2011 9:04 AM
To: Gregory Gaither
Subject: RE: Governor's Neighborhood Recovery Initiative

Mr. Gaither:

The basic reason is that we support GADC's finding that Project City's application was not as strong as the recommended applications.

Thanks,
Barbara Shaw

From: Gregory Gaither [mailto[redacted]
Sent: Sunday, February 13, 2011 12:31 PM
To: Shaw, Barbara
Subject: Re: Governor's Neighborhood Recovery Initiative

Dear Mrs. Shaw:
Thanks for your response. But you don't provide a rationale for the decision to deny funding for proposal submitted by Project City Inc. Please provide reasons for your decision?
Thanks,
ggaither

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 13, 2011, at 12:18 PM, "Shaw, Barbara" <Barbara.Shaw@Illinois.gov> wrote:

> Mr. Gaither,
>
> Thank you for your email regarding denial of Project City, Inc.'s NRI Reentry component application. We have reviewed supporting documents from Project City, Inc. and Greater Auburn-Gresham Development Corporation (GADC) and are in support of GADC's decision not to select Project City, Inc for the Reentry component.
>
> We appreciate your interest in the Neighborhood Recovery Initiative and regret that Project City, Inc. was not funded . We wish you and your organization well.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Barbara Shaw
> Director, IVPA

From: Gregory Gaither [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, January 27, 2011 7:04 PM
To: Shaw, Barbara
Subject: RE: Governor's Neighborhood Recovery Initiative

Mrs. Shaw:

Thanks for your response. However, we have already contacted GADC regarding denial of our juvenile reentry proposal. Please see attached e-mail messages.

As indicated in e-mail messages, our inquiry specifically referred to criteria used by GADC in selection of juvenile reentry partners.

The following is the response provided by GADC Project Manager:
"A variety of criteria was used, such as;
history / track record, letters of support/references, responsiveness, location, etc."

We find the GADC response somewhat vague and arbitrary for the following reasons;

- The GADC response fails to provide any set of objective measures of accountability across the board that is applicable to the community partner selection process

- Our organization has a long history/track record of delivering juvenile justice services

  (20-yrs)

- There was no request for letters of support/references in the application.

- The term "responsiveness" is rather vague and not clearly delineated by GADC as a selection criteria

- On the issue of "location" GADC seems somewhat confused; our organization is actually located in the target (Greater Grand Crossing) community. GADC is located in the Auburn Gresham community.

- The use of Etcetera (etc.) an adverb meaning "and so on" is again vague and arbitrary

The GADC response to our inquiry regarding criteria used in the selection of juvenile reentry partners is at best a rough-and-ready answer to what was obviously an unanticipated question. Clearly, the response GADC provides is not representative of objective criteria to be applied across the board in selection of community partners.

The obvious lack of objective criteria by GADC in selection of community partners renders this entire process as suspect. The underlying suspicion is whether GADC selected partners based solely upon who they knew as opposed to skill set and ability to deliver juvenile justice services.

The larger question it seems is the role of the State Agency (IVPA) in addressing these issues? Dollars supporting Governor's Neighborhood Recovery Initiative are derived from tax-payers, and therefore, should be closely monitored and supervised by the designated State agency. To direct community based service provider applicants back to lead agencies suspected of improper and inequitable practices is just another way of "passing the buck" and smacks of fiscal irresponsibility on behalf of tax- paying citizens.

We strongly urge IVPA to intervene in and take corrective action to resolve unfair practices of GADC in selection of community partners for Governor's Neighborhood Recovery Initiative grant.

<-----Original Message----->

From: Shaw, Barbara [Barbara.Shaw@Illinois.gov]
Sent: 1/25/2011 9:36:45 AM
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Governor's Neighborhood Recovery Initiative

Mr. Gaither: Thank you for your email. In response, I would like to point out the following:

1) In our phone conversation I could not tell you who the Lead Agency was because it had not yet been finalized. A few of the Lead Agency

selections took a little longer than others. We did rely on the local community by asking local elected officials to help identify Lead Agencies to submit an application.

2) The Lead Agencies had the responsibility of convening an Advisory Committee and, given the tight time frame, many of the nominated Lead Agencies started identifying their Advisory Committee members before their Lead Agency status was completely finalized.

3) We relied on the Lead Agency in each community, with input from their Advisory Committee, to make decisions on provider partners based on the quality of the applications they received and the criteria for each component. If you disagree with GAGDC's decision, I encourage you to communicate directly with them and request the reason for their decision..

Again, I encourage you to contact the Lead Agency and request information about why your application was not accepted.

Sincerely,

Barbara Shaw

Barbara Shaw
Illinois Violence Prevention Authority
100 W. Randolph, Ste. 4-750
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 814-1514
(312) 814-8259 fax

From: Gregory Gaither [mailto[redacted]
Sent: Thursday, January 20, 2011 8:11 PM
To: Shaw, Barbara
Subject: Governor's Neighborhood Recovery Initiative

Mrs. Shaw:

I attempted reaching you via your office telephone and left messages several weeks ago regarding denial of our organization's juvenile reentry proposal by Lead Agency - Auburn Gresham CDC.

We have several concerns/criticisms over the process in which community partners were selected by this Lead Agency.

First, this Leaf Agency organization was among the last selected by your office. As a matter of fact, in discussions with you (via cell phone) during your flight layover to D.C. you indicated there had been no selection of a Lead

Agency for the Greater Grand-Crossing Community. About one week later we learned of Auburn Gresham's CDC selection as Lead Agency. As you and your staff will recall we questioned the selection of this organization because it is located in Auburn Gresham and not Greater Grand Crossing. More importantly, this selection flies in the face of community self-determination which as we understood was to be a core consideration of the Governor's Neighborhood Recovery Initiative.

Second, we realize this isn't a perfect world so we were willing to work with the selection of this lead agency. However, upon contacting Auburn Gresham CDC to request participation on the advisory board we were told that membership had already been established and no additional members were needed.
We again questioned how advisory board members could have been already selected given the very short window of time leading up to Auburn Gresham's selection as Lead Agency.

Third, although we submitted our application for consideration as a juvenile reentry community partner provider it was clear by now that the entire selection process appeared tainted. This was of course confirmed when we received notice that our proposal was denied.

Fourth, when I attended initial IVPA - Governor's Neighborhood Recovery meetings with faith-based leaders at State of Illinois-Thompson Center there were many concerns voiced over selection of Lead Agency organizations and fairness in their selection of community partner providers. Almost all participants in this meeting felt selection of providers by Lead Agencies should be based upon skills/abilities to deliver services. Additionally, questions arose regarding the role of IVPA in monitoring and overseeing execution of fairness/equity in the selection process.

Finally, It doesn't appear that happened in this particular instance. Our organization has an exemplary record of delivering juvenile justice services for more than twenty years. We have roots in the target community including a long history of work with youth in Greater Grand Crossing.

If necessary, we are prepared to advocate at the highest levels of state government over the obvious disregard for community self-determination, as well as, our record of delivering high quality juvenile
justice services. services.

Gregg Gaither, M.S.W., M.Ed.