

Southern 14 LWIB, Inc.
Youth Committee

Meeting Date: _____

| ROLL CALL: | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|---------|--------|
| | | Present | Absent |
| Wayne Eichorn, Chair | Hardin County | x | |
| Penny Valentine, Vice Chair | IDES | x | |
| Dr. Beth Rister | Local Education | | x |
| Dr. Jay Edgren | College President | | x |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Item(s) for discussion:

1. PY18 Youth RFP Response from WADI
2. PY18 Youth RFP Response from SDC

Motion: No quorum present, but consensus of those attending and after polling those not in attendance, was to award the Youth 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. Wayne Eichorn will make a motion to the Executive Committee for the action.

Motion made by: None **Motion seconded by:** _____

| ROLL CALL: | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|-----|----|---------|
| | | Yes | No | Abstain |
| Wayne Eichorn, Chair | Hardin County | | | |
| Penny Valentine, Vice Chair | IDES | | | |
| Dr. Beth Rister | Local Education | | | |
| Dr. Jay Edgren | College President | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Motion carried by voice vote:

Evaluation Summary for PY17 Youth 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, J – Options (page 5). 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 \$216,235, which is a decrease of \$17,099 from prior year's available allocation for Shawnee Development. The proposal presents a direct expenditure rate of 57% compared to last year's proposal for a direct expenditure rate of 65%.

Proposal plans to serve 39 participants, 16 currently enrolled and 23 new, at a cost per participant of \$5,544 as compared to last year's proposal at a cost of \$7,778 per participant. The overall proposal score is 96, with explanation of deductions as follows:

- Program Design (37 of 40) – In the area of Individual Service Strategy one point was deducted, the measure asks that the applicant demonstrate the ability to provide a process ensuring that the Youth ISS is used. In the recent monitoring Shawnee Development had a few findings concerning the lack of incomplete ISS in participants' files. Additionally no points were awarded for the measure of Special Program activities, as the applicant did not outline any such activities.
- Prior Experience (19 of 20) — With turnover of key staff and the outcome of recent DCEO technical assistance, as well as State monitoring 1 point was deducted in the measure of adequate fiscal and program management capabilities.

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.

Respondent #2 – Wabash Area Development, Inc.

The available allocation for the northern seven counties is \$265,753, which is a decrease of \$33,679 from prior year's available allocation for Wabash Area Development. The proposal presents a direct expenditure rate of 50% compared to last year's proposal for a direct expenditure rate of 50%.

Proposal plans to serve 30 participants, 15 currently enrolled and 15 new, at a cost per participant of \$8,858 as compared to last year's proposal at a cost of \$11,977 per participant. The overall proposal score is 93, with explanation of deductions as follows:

- Program Design (38 of 40) - No points were awarded for the measure of Special Program activities, as the applicant did not outline any such activities.
- Budget and Cumulative Registrants (15 of 20) – No points were awarded in the measure of Offeror’s Budget provided a minimum of 20% of the budget allocated to paid work experience – The Budget submitted had an allocation of \$39,657 for work based learning which is only 15%. - Allocations for In School Youth were at 23%, but Allocations for Out of School Youth were only 12%.

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 three proposals awarded for PY17

The available allocation for our area was \$481,988 which is an overall decrease of \$50,778 from PY17 funding levels.

The State does not have a minimum of 40% direct expenditure rate for youth funds. However, the combined direct training expenditure rate, for PY18, is 53% compared to last year’s proposal for a direct expenditure rate of 56%. There is however a mandated minimum of 20% of youth funding to be expended of work-based learning. The proposals allocate \$94,658 (20%) to these activities.

Combined proposals plan to serve 69 participants, 31 currently enrolled and 38 new, at a cost per participant of \$6,985 as compared to last year’s proposal at a cost of \$9,687 per participant.

Performance Information from the IWDS Plan vs Actual Report as of June 30, 2018 – The area served 76 youth participants at a cost of \$325,534 which equates to a cost of \$4,283 per participant. \$64,186 was expended on work-based learning meeting our 20% benchmark.