

Southern 14 LWIB, Inc.
Oversight Committee

Meeting Date: October 10, 2018

ROLL CALL:			
		Present	Absent
Chris Howton, Chair	Hamilton County	X	
Bob Wolfe, Vice Chair	Johnson County	X	
Beth Wilson	Wayne County		X

Item(s) for discussion:

Motion: Motion to award the Adult & Dislocated Worker contract for PY18 (July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2020) to Wabash Area Development to serve the northern seven counties and to Shawnee Area Development to serve the southern seven counties in LWIA #26.

Motion made by: Bob Wolfe

Motion seconded by: Chris Howton

ROLL CALL:				
		Yes	No	Abstain
Chris Howton, Chair	Hamilton County	x		
Bob Wolfe, Vice Chair	Johnson County	x		
Beth Wilson	Wayne County			

Note: this committee has some concerns dealing with the level of service in the rural counties. Specifically, they want to ensure that those counties formerly covered by Mid 5 Employment and Training were still being served at the same level. Executive Direct will ask that in the future Service Providers report their efforts (both those served and those offered service) by county to monitor that all 14 Counties in the area are being served.

Motion carried by voice vote:

Evaluation Summary for PY18 Adult & Dislocated Worker Services

We received two proposals – Wabash Area Development, Inc. with a proposal to serve the northern counties of Edwards, Gallatin, Hamilton, Saline, Wabash, Wayne, and White as well as a proposal from Shawnee Development Council to serve the southern counties of Alexander, Harden, Johnson, Massac, Pope, Pulaski, and Union. Both were received prior to the deadline and contained all required elements.

All agencies responding are incumbent providers and are therefore allowed to utilize an alternative request method outlined in Section 1, L – Options (page 7). This option allows the responder to submit a less than full response to the RFP and negotiations are based on prior years performances, number of clients served, cost per client and amount of allocations available. The option further explains that agencies must respond with a complete RFP every three years. Both incumbent agencies submitted the complete RFP in PY16, so this is year three of the option. The Evaluation sheet for proposals being used includes alternate to full submission criteria as well as new submission criteria.

Respondent #1 – Shawnee Development Council

The available allocation for the southern seven counties is \$501,775, which is a decrease of \$55,611 from prior year's available allocation for Shawnee Development. The proposal presents a direct expenditure rate of 56% compared to last year's proposal for a direct expenditure rate of 60%.

Proposal plans to serve 101 participants, 51 currently enrolled and 50 new, at a cost per participant of \$4,968 as compared to last year's proposal at a cost of \$6,193 per participant. The overall proposal score is 86. A summary of deductions as follows:

- **Demonstrated Ability (24 of 30) - 0 points** were awarded for the criteria concerning new programmatic elements or innovation plans to increase performance and quality of service for this program year as nothing was addressing this issue was included in the proposal.
- **Proposed Services (14 of 15) –** With the turnover of key staff and the outcome of recent DCEO technical assistance, as well as State monitoring 1 point was deducted in the criteria concerning staffing plan.
- **Program Components (18 of 20) –** With the recent DCEO technical assistance, as well as State monitoring 2 point were deducted in the criteria for ability ensure Adults & Dislocated Workers remain engaged and committed to accomplishing goals – review revealed a lack of case notes to support contact with participants.
- **Fiscal Plan (9 of 10) –** The recent State monitoring revealed some minor fiscal issues and policies that needed reviewed. 1 point was deducted in the criteria for self-monitoring of financial compliance.
- **Budget (17 of 20) - 3 points** were awarded per the chart in the budget summary criteria and 0 points were awarded for matching resources as none were listed in the proposals.

Shawnee Development Council has a long history of meeting or exceeding performance standards and is on track to meet or exceed those measures in the current fiscal year.

Evaluation Summary for FY10 Adult & Dislocated Worker Services

We received two proposals - Wabash Area Development, Inc. with a proposal to serve the northern counties of Adams, Gallatin, Hamilton, Blaine, Wabash, Wayne, and White as well as a proposal from St. Lawrence Development Council to serve the southern counties of Alexander, Harlan, Johnson, Wayne, Boyd, Putnam, and Union. Both were received prior to the deadline and contained all required elements.

All agencies responding and incumbent provider had the financials shown to utilize an alternative request method outlined in Section 1.1 - Options (a-v). The option allows the responder to submit a list that fully responds to the RFP and negotiate on their own performance number of clients served, cost per client and amount of clients as available. The option further explains that agencies must respond with a complete RFP every three years - each incumbent agency submitted the complete RFP in FY10, so this is year three of the option. The evaluation sheet for proposals being used includes elements to full submission criteria as well as new submission criteria.

Attachment #1 - St. Lawrence Development Council

The available allocation for the southern seven counties is \$401,375, which is a decrease of \$55,811 from prior year's available allocation for St. Lawrence Development. The proposal provides a direct expenditure rate of 50% compared to last year's proposal for a direct expenditure rate of 40%.

Proposal plans to serve 301 participants, 50 currently enrolled and 25 new, at a cost per participant of \$4,988 as compared to last year's proposal at a cost of \$5,129 per participant. The overall proposal score is 88. A summary of deductions as follows:

- Generalized Ability (24 of 30) - 0 points were awarded for the criteria concerning new programmatic elements of innovation plans to increase both quantity and quality of services for this program year as nothing was addressing this issue was included in the proposal.
- Impaired Services (14 of 15) - With the turnover of staff and the outcome of recent DCEO technical assistance, as well as State monitoring 1 point was deducted in the criteria concerning staffing plan.
- Program Elements (18 of 20) - With the recent DCEO technical assistance, as well as State monitoring 2 points were deducted in the criteria for ability assess Adult & Dislocated Workers remain engaged and committed to accomplishing goals - review revealed a lack of case notes to support contact with participants.
- Fiscal Plan (9 of 10) - The recent State monitoring report some action fiscal issues and policies that needed reviewed. 1 point was deducted in the criteria for self-monitoring of financial compliance.
- Budget (10 of 30) - 3 points were awarded for the part in the budget monitoring criteria and 6 points were awarded for matching resources as none were noted in the proposals.

St. Lawrence Development Council has a long history of meeting or exceeding performance standards and on track to meet or exceed those measures in the current fiscal year.

Respondent #2 – Wabash Area Development, Inc.

The available allocation for the northern seven counties is \$595,480 which is a decrease of \$246,271 from prior year's available allocation for Wabash Area Development. The proposal presents a direct expenditure rate of 50% which is the same as last year's proposal for a direct expenditure rate.

Proposal plans to serve 75 participants, 31 currently enrolled and 44 new, at a cost per participant of \$7,940 as compared to last year's proposal at a cost of \$6,235 per participant. The overall proposal score is 91. A summary of deductions as follows:

- Demonstrated Ability (24 of 30) - 0 points were awarded for the criteria concerning new programmatic elements or innovation plans to increase performance and quality of service for this program year as nothing was addressing this issue was included in the proposal.
- Budget (17 of 20) - 3 points were awarded per the chart in the budget summary criteria and 0 points were awarded for matching resources as none were listed in the proposals.

Wabash Area Development has a long history of meeting or exceeding performance standards and is on track to meet or exceed those measures in the current fiscal year.

Comparing the two proposals submitted for PY18 to the proposals awarded for PY17

The available allocation for our area was \$1,097,255 which is an overall decrease of \$301,882 from PY17 funding.

The State requires a minimum of 40% direct expenditure rate. However, the combined direct training expenditure rate, for PY18, is 52.7% compared to last year's proposal for a direct expenditure rate of 54%.

Combined proposals plan to serve 176 participants, 82 currently enrolled and 94 new, at a cost per participant of \$6,234 as compared to last year's proposal at a cost of \$6,218 per participant.

Performance Information from the IWDS Plan vs Actual Report as of June 30, 2018 – The area served 224 adult and dislocated worker participants at a cost of \$912,014 which equates to a cost of \$4,071 per participant.