

**AGENDA  
PROGRAMS COMMITTEE  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 2019  
9:30 AM**

**Workforce Connections  
Rosalie Boulware Conference Room  
6330 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 150  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146**

Voice stream link: <http://www.nvworkforceconnections.org/mis/listen.php>

This agenda has been properly noticed and posted in the following locations:

City of Las Vegas, 495 S. Main St., Las Vegas, NV  
City of North Las Vegas, 2250 N. Las Vegas Blvd., North Las Vegas, NV  
Clark County Clerk's Office, 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy., Las Vegas, NV  
Esmeralda County Courthouse, 233 Crook Street, Goldfield, NV  
Henderson City Hall, 240 Water St., Henderson, NV  
Boulder City (City Hall), 401 California Ave., Boulder City, NV  
Workforce Connections, 6330 W. Charleston Blvd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV  
Nevada JobConnect, 3405 S. Maryland Pkwy., Las Vegas, NV  
Lincoln County Courthouse, 181 Main St., Pioche, NV  
Nye County School District, 484 S. West St., Pahrump, NV  
Pahrump Chamber of Commerce, 1302 S. Highway 160, Pahrump, NV  
Nevada Public Notice Website, <https://notice.nv.gov>

This agenda is also available at [www.nvworkforceconnections.org](http://www.nvworkforceconnections.org)

**COMMENTARY BY THE PUBLIC**

The Programs Committee complies with Nevada's Open Meeting Law by taking public comment at the beginning of the meeting prior to approving the agenda, before any other action is taken, and again before the adjournment of the meeting.

As required by Nevada's Open Meeting Law, the Committee may only consider items posted on the agenda. Should you wish to speak on any agenda item or comment on any other matter during the public comment sessions of the agenda, we respectfully request that you observe the following:

1. Please state and spell your name for the record.
2. In fairness to others, groups or organizations are requested to designate one spokesperson.
3. In the interest of time, please limit your comments to three (3) minutes. You are encouraged to give brief, non-repetitive statements to ensure that all relevant information is presented.

It is the intent of the Committee to give all citizens an opportunity to be heard. Welcome to our meeting.

Copies of non-confidential supporting materials provided to the Committee are available upon request. Request for such supporting materials should be made to Kelly Ford at (702) 638-8750 or [kford@snavwc.org](mailto:kford@snavwc.org). Such supporting materials are available at the front desk of Workforce Connections, 6330 West Charleston Boulevard, Suite 150, Las Vegas, Nevada 89146, and are available online at [www.nvworkforceconnections.org](http://www.nvworkforceconnections.org).

Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities by notifying Dianne Tracy in writing at 6330 W. Charleston Blvd., Ste. 150, Las Vegas, NV 89146; or by calling (702) 638-8750; or by fax at (702) 638-8774. The TTY/TDD access number is (800) 326-6868 / Nevada Relay 711. A sign language interpreter may also be made available with twenty-four (24) hours advance notice. An Equal Opportunity Employer/Program.

**NOTE: MATTERS IN THIS AGENDA MAY BE TAKEN OUT OF ORDER.**

**Programs Committee Members:** Jack Martin, Chair; Peter Guzman, Vice Chair; Stavan Corbett, Lou DeSalvio, Cecil Fielder, Linda Gerstenberger, Jill Hersha, Sonja Holloway, Janice John, Liberty Leavitt, Louis Loupias, Cecilia Maldonado, Guy Martin, Valerie Murzl, Charles Perry, Mary Beth Sewald, Marcia Turner, and Ricardo Villalobos.

*All items listed on this agenda are for action by the Committee unless otherwise noted. Action may consist of any of the following: approve, deny, condition, hold or table. Public hearings may be declared open by the Chair, as required for any of the items on this agenda designated for discussion or possible action or to provide direction and recommendations to Workforce Connections.*

**AGENDA**

1. **CALL TO ORDER**, confirmation of posting, roll call and Pledge of Allegiance.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... 1
  
2. **FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION:** Members of the public may now comment on any matter posted on this agenda, which is before the Committee for consideration and action today. Please clearly state and spell your name for the record. Each comment will be limited to three (3) minutes.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... 2
  
3. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Approve the agenda with inclusions of any emergency items and deletions of any items.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... 3
  
4. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Approve the Programs Committee minutes of January 9, 2019.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... 4
  
5. **INFORMATION:** PY2018 Fiscal and Training Reports.
  - a. PY2018 WIOA Title I Awards and Expenditures Report July 1, 2018 through January 31, 2019.  
*Faith Cannella, Sr. Financial Analyst* ..... 12
  
  - b. PY2018 WIOA Title I Adult and Youth Snapshots July 1, 2018 through January 31, 2019.  
*Brett Miller, Strategic Planning & Analysis Manager* ..... 15
  
6. **INFORMATION:** Provider Compliance – Status of Pink Papers and Corrective Action Plans.  
*Jaime Cruz, Executive Director* ..... 21
  
7. **INFORMATION:** Strategic Initiatives Update Report.  
*Irene Bustamante Adams, Deputy Director & Chief Strategy Officer* ..... 35
  
8. **INFORMATION:** Request for Proposals Evaluation (RFP) and Selection Process Overview.  
*Jaime Cruz, Executive Director* ..... 37

- 9. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to Lincoln County Grants Administration to provide WIOA Title I Adult and Dislocated Worker services in the Lincoln cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$170,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the Workforce Connections (WC) Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... **40**
- 10. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to Lincoln County Grants Administration to provide WIOA Title I Youth services in the Lincoln cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$250,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... **44**
- 11. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to Nye Communities Coalition to provide WIOA Title I Adult and Dislocated Worker services in the Nye and Esmeralda cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$630,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... **48**
- 12. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to Nye Communities Coalition to provide WIOA Title I Youth services in the Nye and Esmeralda cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$450,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... **52**
- 13. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to ResCare Workforce Services to provide WIOA Title I Adult and Dislocated Worker services in the North cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$2,200,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... **56**

- 14. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to HELP of Southern Nevada to provide WIOA Title I Youth services in the North cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$1,300,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... **66**
- 15. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to ResCare Workforce Services to provide WIOA Title I Adult and Dislocated Worker services in the South cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$2,200,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... **75**
- 16. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to ResCare Workforce Services to provide WIOA Title I Youth services in the South cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$1,300,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... **84**
- 17. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to ResCare Workforce Services to provide WIOA Title I Adult and Dislocated Worker services in the Central cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$3,400,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... **93**
- 18. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to ResCare Workforce Services to provide WIOA Title I Youth services in the Central cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$900,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... **100**

- 19. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award new contracts to Hope for Prisoners and Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow to provide WIOA Title I Adult and Dislocated Worker services in the ADW Re-entry cluster. The award amounts shall not exceed \$750,000 each. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.  
*Liberty Leavitt, Committee Member* ..... 107
- 20. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to Youth Advocate Programs to provide WIOA Title I Youth services in the Youth Re-entry cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$650,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... 118
- 21. INFORMATION:** Programs Committee members’ comments and updates  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... 125
- 22. SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION:** Members of the public may now comment on any matter or topic, which is relevant to or within the authority or jurisdiction of the Committee. You may comment now even if you commented earlier, however, please do not simply repeat the same comment you previously made. Please clearly state and spell your name for the record. Each comment will be limited to three (3) minutes.  
*Jack Martin, Chair* ..... 126
- 23. ADJOURNMENT**

1. **CALL TO ORDER, confirmation of posting, roll call, and Pledge of Allegiance.**  
*Jack Martin, Chair*

2. **FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION:** Members of the public may now comment on any matter posted on this agenda, which is before this Committee for consideration and action today. Please clearly state and spell your name for the record. Each public comment will be limited to three (3) minutes. *Jack Martin, Chair*

**3. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION:** Approve the agenda with inclusions of any emergency items and deletion of any items. *Jack Martin, Chair*

4. **DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION:** Approve the Programs Committee minutes of January 9, 2019. *Jack Martin, Chair*

## MINUTES

### WORKFORCE CONNECTIONS PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

January 9, 2019 | 9:30 a.m.

Rosalie Boulware Conference Room  
6330 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 150  
Las Vegas, NV 89146

#### Members Present

Jack Martin, Chair	Peter Guzman, Vice Chair	Stavan Corbett
Charles Perry	Cecil Fielder	Guy Martin
Jill Hersha	Janice John	Valerie Murzl
Liberty Leavitt (phone)	Lou DeSalvio	Louis Loupias
Sonja Holloway	Peter Guzman	Linda Gerstenberger

#### Members Absent

Mary Beth Sewald	Marcia Turner	Bart Patterson
------------------	---------------	----------------

#### Staff Present

Jaime Cruz	Alletha Muzorewa	Robyn Fields
Irene Bustamante Adams	Brett Miller	Tom Dang
Jeannie Kuennen	Jim Kostecki	

#### Others Present

Charles Navarro, Hope for Prisoners	Brittani Gray, NPI
Michael D. Hollis, FIT	Kaylee Harker, NYECC
Janice Rael, NPI	Jennifer Casey, FIT
Amy Licht, Olive Crest	Tammi Odegard, NYECC
Gina Garcia, ResCare	Bruce Harris, SNFITT
Christina Sewell HELP of Southern Nevada	Joe Sharpe, ResCare
Denise Gee, HELP of Southern Nevada	Vanessa Castro, SNRHA
Brittani Gray, Nevada Partners, Inc.	Shawn Schwiesow, Goodwill Southern NV
Angela Brookins, Hope for Prisoners	Neosha Smith, YAP, Inc.
Nina Ridgeway, Goodwill	Linda Montgomery, TLC
Princette Bowling, KRA	Nield Montgomery, TLC

(It should be noted that not all attendees may be listed above)

**1. Call to order, confirmation of posting, roll call, and Pledge of Allegiance**

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Jack Martin at 9:38 a.m. Staff confirmed the meeting had been properly noticed and posted in accordance with the Nevada Open Meeting Law; roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

**2. FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION**

Justin Robinson, a HOPE for Prisoners participant thanked the Committee and shared appreciation for the program.

Priscilla Muniz, a HELP of SNV DropOut Recovery participant, shared how the program helped her finish school, obtain employment, and alleviate homelessness. She is now pursuing her goal of becoming a dental hygienist.

Timothy Pattelo, a HELP of SNV DropOut Recovery participant, shared how the program helped him finish school, obtain employment and alleviate homelessness. He is now a licensed HVAC technician.

Elena Castellano, a HELP of SNV DropOut Recovery participant, was present with her career coach who translated for her. She was grateful to HELP of SNV for all of the assistance, she has completed phlebotomy training and is currently job searching.

**3. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: Approve the agenda with inclusions of any emergency items and deletion of any items**

Jaime Cruz, Executive Director, confirmed there were no changes to the agenda.

*A motion was made by Charles Perry and seconded by Peter Guzman to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.*

**4. INFORMATION: Welcoming of new Committee members**

Chair Martin welcomed the new Programs Committee members Linda Gerstenberger, Guy Martin and Mary Beth Sewald and invited them to speak. New Committee member Mary Beth Sewald was not present at this meeting.

**5. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: Approve minutes of August 8, 2018, Programs Committee**

Chair Martin presented the minutes provided on page 6-12 of the agenda packet.

*A motion was made by Charles Perry and seconded by Lou DeSalvio to approve the minutes of August 8, 2018, as presented. Motion carried.*

**6. INFORMATION: Strategic Initiatives Update Report**

- a. Status Update on WIOA Compliance Assurance Initiatives
- b. Status Update on Workforce Development System Continual Improvement Initiatives

Irene Bustamante Adams, Deputy Director and Chief Strategy Officer, presented the Strategic Initiatives Report offered on page 14-15 of the agenda packet and provided information on the process and progress of the current RFP cycle. Ms. Bustamante Adams highlighted initiatives such

as the upcoming Workforce Summit on January 31<sup>st</sup> that was born of a listening session for the service providers spearheaded by Jack Martin, and a collaboration between College of Southern Nevada, Nevada State College and University of Nevada, Las Vegas to enroll WIOA eligible youth after they graduate high school, but before they enter college. Lastly, Ms. Bustamante Adams thanked Chair, Jack Martin and Committee member, Jill Hersha for making introductions to other entities to enable Workforce Connections (WC) to broaden its collaborative horizons.

Jack Martin stated that Ms. Bustamante Adams' report represented the culmination of work that WC has been doing for the last year and a half to integrate with system partners to find better and more creative solutions to assist populations who are more difficult to serve. Mr. Martin opined that the employment rate is such that, "everyone who is working is working". The attention is now focused on alternative labor pools in the youth population and adult populations with barriers to employment. These groups include high school dropouts and incarcerated youth, as well as underemployed individuals, veterans, and reentry adult population.

Mr. Martin, with the aid of Executive Director Cruz, led the Committee in a discussion on the best ways to serve these varied populations. Some of the methods discussed were increasing the quality and level of training, the use of apprenticeship activities for those who are not college bound, the use of pre-apprenticeship activities to upskill those who have difficulty passing the entrance exams for apprenticeship, drug testing, and literacy activities.

**7. INFORMATION: Provider Compliance Status – Status of pink papers and technical assistance**

- a. Nye Communities Coalition (NyeCC) Youth Pink Paper and Corrective Action Plan.
- b. Nye Communities Coalition (NyeCC) ADW Pink Paper and Corrective Action Plan.
- c. Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow (FIT) Adult Re-Entry Pink Paper and Corrective Action Plan.
- d. ResCare Workforce Services (RWS) One-Stop Career Center (OSCC) Youth Pink Paper and Corrective Action Plan.
- e. ResCare Workforce Services (RWS) Boulder City/Laughlin Youth Pink Paper and Corrective Action Plan.
- f. ResCare Workforce Services (RWS) Boulder City/Laughlin ADW Pink Paper and Corrective Action Plan.
- g. ResCare Workforce Services (RWS) Mesquite Youth Pink Paper and Corrective Action Plan.
- h. ResCare Workforce Services (RWS) Mesquite ADW Pink Paper and Corrective Action Plan.
- i. Olive Crest Youth Pink Paper and Corrective Action Plan.
- j. Goodwill Southern Nevada Youth Pink Paper and Corrective Action Plan.
- k. HELP of Southern Nevada ADW Pink Paper and Corrective Action Plan.

Ricardo Villalobos suggested that for this agenda item, instead of reviewing each program, staff should provide an overview and highlight any areas of concern to which, Peter Guzman and Jack Martin concurred.

- **Alletha Muzorewa is the contract administrator for:**

a/b. Nye Communities Coalition said there were no concerns for the agency; they have added a large number of OJT's since the issuance of the pink paper.

- **Jeannie Kuennen is the contract administrator for:**

c. FIT. Ms. Kuennen stated that she has an extremely low level of concern for this agency as they have ramped up and obligated approximately \$36,000 in training costs.

d. ResCare Workforce Services (RWS) One-Stop Career Center (OSCC) Youth work-based learning. RWS revamped their program and focused more on job readiness classes before they put youth into a work experience. Ms. Kuennen has no concerns about this project.

e. ResCare Workforce Services (RWS) Boulder City/Laughlin Youth work-based learning were a little bit slow starting but are now at 27% which is within 3% of their goal, Ms. Kuennen has no concerns.

f. ResCare Workforce Services (RWS) Boulder City/Laughlin ADW. RWS has had challenges with participants having to come to Las Vegas for training. They are now exploring training opportunities with Mojave in Bullhead AZ, as we have reciprocity to use Arizona's ETPL. Ms. Kuennen has no concerns.

g/h. ResCare Workforce Services (RWS) Mesquite Youth. RWS took over this contract from Salvation Army when they did not receive funding. It took some time to train the staff, which caused them to have a slow start. They have since that time increased their enrollments and Ms. Kuennen has no concerns for either the work-based learning for the Youth or the ADW training expenditures.

- **Robyn Fields is the contract administrator for:**

i. Olive Crest. In the first quarter, they were working through some changes in the foster care program. Ms. Fields has no concerns.

j. Goodwill has begun to increase its work-based learning numbers, no concerns.

k. HELP has already seen a 90% increase in their training expenditures for this year if that trend continues we anticipate no problems in this contract.

**8. INFORMATION: PY2018 Fiscal and Training Reports**

a. Awards and Expenditures Report

b. Adult Snapshot – Programs

c. Youth Snapshot – Programs

d. WIOA Expenditure Tracking Report

Faith Cannella, Senior Financial Analyst, reviewed the Awards and Expenditures Report on pages 31-33 of the agenda packet. Ms. Cannella noted that while there was a lot of pink on the report, WC had no real concerns about the safety of the agencies at this time.

Brett Miller, Manager Strategic Planning and Analysis, delivered the snapshot reports on pages 34-36 the agenda packet.

**Adult Snapshot – Programs**

Enrollments goal:	1,627
Enrollments actual:	822
Trainings:	231
Placements:	98
Average wage:	14.08

**Youth Snapshot – Programs**

Enrollments goal:	873
Enrollments actual:	387
Work-Based Learning:	103
Occupational Skills Training:	15
Placements:	39
Average wage:	\$11.79

Mr. Miller next addressed the WIOA Title I Expenditure Tracking report on pg. 40 of the packet.

**WIOA Title I Expenditure Tracking YTD PY18 – July 1, 2018, - November 30, 2018**

On the Adult side – is off plan at approximately 260,448

On the Youth side – is on plan at approximately 110,016

Jaime Cruz informed the new Committee members that if assistance is ever needed to interpret the reports, the staff is always available to help. Mr. Cruz further stated that since it takes some time for information to get into the system, the data in the reports will always be lagging and not in real time.

**9. INFORMATION: Programs Committee member comments**

Charles Perry complemented the staff of WC on their work and responsiveness. Mr. Perry opined that if Committee members have media connections they should use them to help get the word out about WC and its mission.

Liberty Leavitt stated that she would like to bring in more Committee members to speak to youth in JAG and CTE to help expose them to what is available. Ms. Leavitt also stated that JAG is having a vocational workforce fair in the spring at Legacy High School to assist in bringing awareness of lucrative trade vocations to the youth.

Louis Loupias agreed with Ms. Leavitt. Mr. Loupias stated that for his part, he had had meetings with JAG to implement inspection programs in some of the high schools as a means to assist in bringing awareness of trade vocations to youth.

**10. SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION**

Bruce Harris, Seek and Find Inspection Testing and Training. Mr. Harris provided information about the services his business offers that focus on providing pre-apprenticeship skills to untrained individuals.

**11. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:46 a.m.

**5. INFORMATION:** PY2018 Fiscal and Training Reports.

- a. PY2018 WIOA Title I Awards and Expenditures Report July 1, 2018 through January 31, 2019. *Faith Cannella, Sr. Financial Analyst*
- b. PY2018 WIOA Title I Adult and Youth Snapshots July 1, 2018 through January 31, 2019. *Brett Miller, Strategic Planning & Analysis Manager*

**Workforce Connections  
Awards and Expenditures  
Program Year 18 Adult/Dislocated Worker Programs  
January 31, 2019**

Amounts for Providers reflect allowable expenditures through January 2019. Providers marked with an asterisk reflect allowable expenditures through December 2018

<b>WIOA PY18 One-Stop Operator</b>								
Provider	Contract Dates	Contract Award	Adult Expenditures	DW Expenditures	Total Invoiced	% Spent	Remaining Balance	
KRA Corporation	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 543,053	\$ 215,456	\$ 34,667	\$ 250,123	46.06%	\$ 292,930	
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 543,053</b>	<b>\$ 215,456</b>	<b>\$ 34,667</b>	<b>\$ 250,123</b>	<b>46.06%</b>	<b>\$ 292,930</b>	

<b>WIOA PY18 One-Stop Career Centers and Affiliate Sites</b>								
Provider	Contract Dates	Contract Award	Adult Expenditures	DW Expenditures	Total Invoiced	% Spent	Remaining Balance	
Goodwill of Southern Nevada - East	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 420,530	\$ 126,441	\$ 546,970	45.58%	\$ 653,030	
HELP of Southern Nevada - South	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 1,300,000	\$ 529,720	\$ 106,587	\$ 636,307	48.95%	\$ 663,693	
Nevada Partners, Inc. - North	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 1,360,000	\$ 730,022	\$ 108,567	\$ 838,590	61.66%	\$ 521,410	
ResCare Workforce Services - West	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 2,700,000	\$ 1,194,059	\$ 315,418	\$ 1,509,478	55.91%	\$ 1,190,522	
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 6,560,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,874,332</b>	<b>\$ 657,013</b>	<b>\$ 3,531,345</b>	<b>53.83%</b>	<b>\$ 3,028,655</b>	

<b>WIOA PY18 Special Populations</b>								
Provider	Contract Dates	Contract Award	Adult Expenditures	DW Expenditures	Total Invoiced	% Spent	Remaining Balance	
Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow - Re-Entry	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 700,000	\$ 355,516		\$ 355,516	50.79%	\$ 344,484	
HOPE for Prisoners - Pre & Post Entry	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 700,000	\$ 346,343		\$ 346,343	49.48%	\$ 353,657	
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 1,400,000</b>	<b>\$ 701,859</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 701,859</b>	<b>50.13%</b>	<b>\$ 698,141</b>	

<b>WIOA PY18 Rural</b>								
Provider	Contract Dates	Contract Award	Adult Expenditures	DW Expenditures	Total Invoiced	% Spent	Remaining Balance	
Lincoln County - Rural	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 150,000	\$ 57,972	\$ 4,286	\$ 62,257	41.50%	\$ 87,743	
Nye Communities Coalition - Rural	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 575,000	\$ 240,850	\$ 73,598	\$ 314,448	54.69%	\$ 260,552	
ResCare Workforce Services - Laughlin/Boulder City	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 200,000	\$ 74,925	\$ 2,700	\$ 77,625	38.81%	\$ 122,375	
ResCare Workforce Services - Mesquite	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 200,000	\$ 74,916	\$ 8,368	\$ 83,284	41.64%	\$ 116,716	
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 1,125,000</b>	<b>\$ 448,662</b>	<b>\$ 88,952</b>	<b>\$ 537,614</b>	<b>47.79%</b>	<b>\$ 587,386</b>	

<b>Total PY18 Adult/DW</b>		<b>\$ 9,628,053</b>	<b>\$ 4,240,309</b>	<b>\$ 780,632</b>	<b>\$ 5,020,940</b>	<b>52.15%</b>	<b>\$ 4,607,113</b>	
			<b>84%</b>	<b>16%</b>				

**Workforce Connections  
Awards and Expenditures  
Program Year 18 Youth Programs  
January 31, 2019**

Amounts for Providers reflect allowable expenditures through January 2019. Providers marked with an asterisk reflect allowable expenditures through December 2018

**WIOA PY17 One-Stop Operator**

Provider	Contract Dates	Contract Award	Youth In-School Expenditures	Youth Out-Of-School Expenditures	Total Invoiced	% Spent	Remaining Balance
KRA Corporation	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 252,047	\$ 10,792	\$ 128,134	\$ 138,925	55.12%	\$ 113,121
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 252,047</b>	<b>\$ 10,792</b>	<b>\$ 128,134</b>	<b>\$ 138,925</b>	<b>55.12%</b>	<b>\$ 113,121</b>

**WIOA PY18 One-Stop Career Centers and Affiliate Sites**

Provider	Contract Dates	Contract Award	Youth In-School Expenditures	Youth Out-Of-School Expenditures	Total Invoiced	% Spent	Remaining Balance
Goodwill of Southern Nevada - East	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 900,000	\$ 42,013	\$ 323,906	\$ 365,919	40.66%	\$ 534,081
Nevada Partners, Inc. - North	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 900,000	\$ 62,864	\$ 500,744	\$ 563,608	62.62%	\$ 336,392
ResCare Workforce Services - OSCC	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 800,000	\$ 33,951	\$ 319,402	\$ 353,353	44.17%	\$ 446,647
So. NV Regional Housing Authority - East	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 900,000	\$ 19,468	\$ 325,982	\$ 345,450	38.38%	\$ 554,550
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 3,500,000</b>	<b>\$ 158,296</b>	<b>\$ 1,470,035</b>	<b>\$ 1,628,331</b>	<b>46.52%</b>	<b>\$ 1,871,669</b>
			10%	90%			

**WIOA PY18 Youth Rural**

Provider	Contract Dates	Contract Award	Youth In-School Expenditures	Youth Out-Of-School Expenditures	Total Invoiced	% Spent	Remaining Balance
Lincoln County	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 215,000	\$ 26,621	\$ 80,818	\$ 107,439	49.97%	\$ 107,561
Nye Communities Coalition	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 400,000	\$ 35,168	\$ 153,869	\$ 189,037	47.26%	\$ 210,963
ResCare Workforce Services - Laughlin/Boulder City	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 180,000	\$ 3,920	\$ 75,168	\$ 79,088	43.94%	\$ 100,912
ResCare Workforce Services - Mesquite	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 180,000	\$ 28,410	\$ 49,460	\$ 77,870	43.26%	\$ 102,130
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 975,000</b>	<b>\$ 94,119</b>	<b>\$ 359,315</b>	<b>\$ 453,434</b>	<b>46.51%</b>	<b>\$ 521,566</b>
			21%	79%			

**WIOA PY18 Special Populations**

Provider	Contract Dates	Contract Award	Youth In-School Expenditures	Youth Out-Of-School Expenditures	Total Invoiced	% Spent	Remaining Balance
HELP of So. Nevada - Dropout Recovery	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 600,000		\$ 341,481	\$ 341,481	56.91%	\$ 258,519
Nevada Partners, Inc. - Pre-Entry Youth	1/1/18-12/31/18	\$ 650,000		\$ 650,000	\$ 650,000	100.00%	\$ -
Nevada Partners, Inc. - Pre-Entry Youth	1/1/19-6/30/19	\$ 325,000		\$ 42,734	\$ 42,734	13.15%	\$ 282,266
Olive Crest - Foster Youth	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 500,000	\$ 46,715	\$ 191,622	\$ 238,338	47.67%	\$ 261,662
Youth Advocate Programs - WBL Pilot	7/1/18-6/30/19	\$ 400,000	\$ 30,884	\$ 177,546	\$ 208,430	52.11%	\$ 191,570
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 2,475,000</b>	<b>\$ 77,599</b>	<b>\$ 1,403,383</b>	<b>\$ 1,480,982</b>	<b>59.84%</b>	<b>\$ 994,018</b>
			5%	95%			

<b>Total PY18 Youth</b>		<b>\$ 7,202,047</b>	<b>\$ 340,806</b>	<b>\$ 3,360,867</b>	<b>\$ 3,701,673</b>	<b>51.40%</b>	<b>\$ 3,500,374</b>
			9%	91%			

**Workforce Connections  
Awards and Expenditures  
Program Year 2018 Direct Programs  
January 31, 2019**

Amounts for Internal Programs reflect expenditures as of January 2019.

**Direct Grants**

<b>Program</b>	<b>WC FTE</b>	<b>Contract Dates</b>	<b>Contract Award</b>	<b>Total Expended</b>	<b>% Spent</b>	<b>Remaining Balance</b>
Charles Schwab -My Path	0.00	5/1/18-4/30/19	20,000	\$ 4,500	22.50%	15,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>		<b>20,000</b>	<b>4,500</b>	<b>22.50%</b>	<b>15,500</b>

**workforce CONNECTIONS****Title I - ADW Snapshot****PYTD January 31, 2019**

<b>Provider</b>	<b>Enrollments</b>		<b>Work Based</b>		<b>Placed</b>	<b>Wage</b>
	<b>Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Training</b>	<b>Training</b>		
<b>PY18 Enrollment Cohort</b>						
One-Stop Career Center - ResCare	410	370	26	103	57	16.58
North OSAS - NPI	108	145	0	75	39	15.37
South OSAS - HELP	166	116	5	31	1	14.00
East OSAS - Goodwill	55	8	1	0	0	N/A
Re-entry - FIT	125	68	2	34	29	14.98
Re-entry - Hope for Prisoners	125	96	0	44	18	13.72
Rural - Lincoln	25	11	2	4	2	18.13
Rural - Nye	100	41	4	20	11	11.52
Rural - Boulder City - ResCare	25	13	1	4	3	21.58
Rural - Laughlin - ResCare	15	7	0	2	3	9.97
Rural - Mesquite - ResCare	40	28	0	4	11	9.89
Alexander Library - NPI	27	6	0	2	0	N/A
Clark County Library - ResCare	65	29	0	4	2	12.80
West Las Vegas Library - NPI	27	37	1	9	4	11.25
Green Valley Library - Goodwill	50	44	2	17	2	23.68
Gibson Library - Goodwill	40	25	0	17	1	14.00
Belrose - ResCare	65	18	0	1	2	12.88
Henderson JobConnect - Goodwill	55	28	0	19	3	11.50
NLV JobConnect - NPI	54	0	0	0	0	N/A
Maryland Pkwy JobConnect - HELP	50	24	1	11	3	11.89
Other	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
<b>PY18 Cohort Total</b>	<b>1,627</b>	<b>1,114</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>14.84</b>

**workforce CONNECTIONS***Title I - ADW Snapshot**PYTD January 31, 2019*

<b>Provider</b>	<b>Enrollments</b>		<b>Work Based</b>		<b>Placed</b>	<b>Wage</b>
	<b>Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Training</b>	<b>Training</b>		
<b>Prior Cohort <sup>(1)</sup></b>						
One-Stop Career Center - ResCare	697	697	46	237	265	15.32
North OSAS - NPI	266	266	4	127	97	16.87
South OSAS - HELP	145	145	11	81	28	15.73
East OSAS - Goodwill	83	83	5	48	21	15.89
Re-entry - FIT	150	150	15	112	107	14.27
Re-entry - Hope for Prisoners	116	116	0	62	52	11.12
Rural - Lincoln	22	22	4	7	10	13.03
Rural - Nye	86	86	7	37	53	12.94
Rural - Boulder City - ResCare	32	32	0	12	12	12.45
Rural - Laughlin - ResCare	7	7	1	1	5	10.40
Rural - Mesquite - ResCare	47	47	0	0	35	10.73
Alexander Library - NPI	29	29	0	16	10	15.76
Clark County Library - ResCare	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
Clark County Library - HELP	14	14	2	9	1	17.46
Gibson Library - HELP	1	1	0	0	1	16.50
West Las Vegas Library - NPI	32	32	0	6	7	11.47
Green Valley Library - Goodwill	15	15	0	5	2	14.00
Gibson Library - Goodwill	8	8	0	4	2	12.25
Belrose - ResCare	18	18	0	3	8	14.65
Other	1	1	0	0	0	N/A
<b>Prior Cohort Total</b>	<b>1,769</b>	<b>1,769</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>767</b>	<b>716</b>	<b>14.54</b>

## workforce CONNECTIONS

### Title I - ADW Snapshot

PYTD January 31, 2019

Provider	Enrollments		Work Based		Placed	Wage
	Goal	Actual	Training	Training		
<b>Total Served (Enrollments + Prior)</b>						
One-Stop Career Center - ResCare	1,107	1,067	72	340	322	15.54
North OSAS - NPI	374	411	4	202	136	16.44
South OSAS - HELP	311	261	16	112	29	15.67
East OSAS - Goodwill	138	91	6	48	21	15.89
Re-entry - FIT	275	218	17	146	136	14.42
Re-entry - Hope for Prisoners	241	212	0	106	70	11.79
Rural - Lincoln	47	33	6	11	12	13.88
Rural - Nye	186	127	11	57	64	12.70
Rural - Boulder City - ResCare	57	45	1	16	15	14.28
Rural - Laughlin - ResCare	22	14	1	3	8	10.24
Rural - Mesquite - Salvation Army	87	75	0	4	46	10.53
Alexander Library - NPI	56	35	0	18	10	15.76
Clark County Library - ResCare	65	29	0	4	2	12.80
Clark County Library - HELP	14	14	2	9	1	17.46
Gibson Library - HELP	1	1	0	0	1	16.50
West Las Vegas Library - NPI	59	69	1	15	11	11.39
Green Valley Library - Goodwill	65	59	2	22	4	18.84
Gibson Library - Goodwill	48	33	0	21	3	12.83
Belrose - ResCare	83	36	0	4	10	14.29
Henderson JobConnect - Goodwill	55	28	0	19	3	11.50
NLV JobConnect - NPI	54	0	0	0	0	N/A
Maryland Pkwy JobConnect - HELP	50	24	1	11	3	11.89
<b>Title I ADW Total</b>	<b>3,396</b>	<b>2,883</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>1,168</b>	<b>907</b>	<b>14.60</b>

**Notes:**

1) Includes prorated goal for contracts which cross program years.

**workforce CONNECTIONS***Title I - Youth Snapshot**PYTD January 31, 2019*

<b>Provider</b>	<b>Enrollments</b>		<b>Work-Based Learning</b>	<b>Occupational Skills Training</b>	<b>Placement</b>	<b>Avg Wage</b>
	<b>Goal</b>	<b>Actual</b>				
<b>PY18 Enrollment Cohort</b>						
North OSAS - NPI	115	74	30	6	2	9.88
South OSAS - SNRHA	128	33	8	4	14	13.61
East OSAS - Goodwill	128	69	8	16	3	10.13
OSCC - ResCare	117	80	34	0	13	17.00
Drop-out Recovery - HELP	85	59	7	1	4	10.13
Pre-Entry - NPI <sup>(1)</sup>	88	57	18	1	0	N/A
Foster Youth - Olive Crest	80	44	8	0	0	N/A
Work Based Learning Pilot - YAP	57	30	8	2	11	10.67
Rural - Lincoln	28	20	13	1	0	N/A
Rural - Nye	57	30	14	0	2	8.25
Rural - Boulder City - ResCare	20	2	1	0	0	N/A
Rural - Laughlin - ResCare	0	5	3	0	2	13.38
Rural - Mesquite - ResCare	20	11	4	1	3	10.92
West Las Vegas Library - NPI	0	1	1	0	0	N/A
Other	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
<b>PY18 Cohort Total</b>	<b>923</b>	<b>515</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>12.88</b>

**workforce CONNECTIONS***Title I - Youth Snapshot**PYTD January 31, 2019*

Provider	Enrollments		Work-Based Learning	Occupational Skills Training	Placement	Avg Wage
	Goal	Actual				
<b>Prior Cohort <sup>(2)</sup></b>						
North OSAS - NPI	114	114	67	11	40	10.75
South OSAS - SNRHA	42	42	15	4	18	9.65
East OSAS - Goodwill	92	92	37	22	29	11.97
OSCC - ResCare	92	92	34	3	30	12.63
ISY and OSY - HELP	80	80	30	13	24	10.30
Pre-Entry - NPI	109	109	76	46	29	9.93
Foster Youth - Olive Crest	81	81	25	1	22	9.77
Work Based Learning Pilot - YAP	50	50	39	3	19	9.64
Rural - Lincoln	29	29	23	3	11	10.33
Rural - Nye	52	52	15	3	16	10.55
Rural - Boulder City - ResCare	9	9	4	0	8	9.43
Rural - Laughlin - ResCare	7	7	1	0	4	10.13
Rural - Mesquite - ResCare	16	16	8	1	11	10.21
Alexander Library - NPI	16	16	10	4	5	9.65
Clark County Library - SNRHA	3	3	0	0	1	12.00
Gibson Library - SNRHA	3	3	0	0	1	8.50
West Las Vegas Library - NPI	19	19	12	3	5	9.30
Green Valley Library - Goodwill	11	11	3	1	2	8.63
Other	0					
<b>Prior Cohort Total</b>	<b>825</b>	<b>825</b>	<b>399</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>10.57</b>

**workforce CONNECTIONS****Title I - Youth Snapshot****PYTD January 31, 2019**

Provider	Enrollments		Work-Based Learning	Occupational Skills Training	Placement	Avg Wage
	Goal	Actual				
<b>Total Served (Enrollments + Prior)</b>						
North OSAS - NPI <sup>(1)</sup>	229	188	97	17	42	10.71
South OSAS - SNRHA	170	75	23	8	32	11.38
East OSAS - Goodwill	220	161	45	38	32	11.80
OSCC - ResCare	209	172	68	3	43	13.95
Drop-out Recovery - HELP	165	139	37	14	28	10.27
Pre-Entry - NPI	197	166	94	47	29	9.93
Foster Youth - Olive Crest	161	125	33	1	22	9.77
Work Based Learning Pilot - YAP	107	80	47	5	30	10.02
Rural - Lincoln	57	49	36	4	11	10.33
Rural - Nye	109	82	29	3	18	10.29
Rural - Boulder City - ResCare	29	11	5	0	8	9.43
Rural - Laughlin - ResCare	7	12	4	0	6	11.21
Rural - Mesquite - Salvation Army	36	27	12	2	14	10.36
Alexander Library - NPI	16	16	10	4	5	9.65
Clark County Library - SNRHA	3	3	0	0	1	12.00
Gibson Library - SNRHA	3	3	0	0	1	8.50
West Las Vegas Library - NPI	19	20	13	3	5	9.30
Green Valley Library - Goodwill	11	11	3	1	2	8.63
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Title I - Youth Total</b>	<b>1,748</b>	<b>1,340</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>10.95</b>

**Notes:**

- 1) Includes prorated goal for contracts which cross program years.
- 2) Prior Cohort goal is set to actual.

**6. INFORMATION:** Provider Compliance – Status of Pink Papers and Corrective Action Plans.  
*Jaime Cruz, Executive Director.*

## CORRECTIVE ACTION

### **Goodwill of Southern Nevada (GSN)**

#### **Deficiency:**

GSN's Program Year 2018 contract mandates that a minimum of 30% of total expenditures must be spent on Work-Based Learning activities. As of January 31, 2019, GSN has expended \$88,195.10 or 24 % of \$365,919.15 in total expenditures on WBL activities.

#### **Provider Action Plan:**

Contract administrator provided some technical assistance which included improving employer engagement for the sole purpose of providing work experiences to participants to increase the expenditure. GSN has added several work experiences since the issuance of the pink paper, which are not yet reflected in the year to date expenditure reports. This rate, should see GSN on track to meeting the mandated expenditure rate of 30%.

## CORRECTIVE ACTION

### Nye Communities Coalition (NyeCC)

#### **Deficiency:**

NyeCC's Program Year 2018 contract mandates that a minimum of 40% of total expenditures must be spent on training activities. As of January 31, 2019, NyeCC has expended \$92,395.00 or 29% of \$314,447.77 in total expenditures on training activities.

#### **Provider Action Plan:**

Since January 31, 2019, NyeCC ADW has added trainings which include on-the job trainings (OJT) which are not yet reflected in the expenditure reports.

Contract administrator has continued with providing technical assistance to improve in this area.

NyeCC, should be on track to meeting their contractual obligations.

## CORRECTIVE ACTION

### Nye Communities Coalition (NyeCC)

#### **Deficiency:**

NyeCC's Program Year 2018 contract mandates that a minimum of 30% of total expenditures must be spent on Work-Based Learning activities. As of January 31, 2019, NyeCC has expended \$41,357.80 or 22 % of \$189,037.11 in total expenditures on WBL activities.

#### **Provider Action Plan:**

Contract administrator provided technical assistance which included improving employer engagement for the sole purpose of providing work experiences to participants to increase the expenditure. Recently, NyeCC added a new Job Developer to focus on employer engagement and developing work experiences in Tonopah. They have also added several work experiences since December 31, 2018 to February 28 2019, whose expenditures are not yet reflected in the year to date reports. This rate, should see NyeCC on track to meeting the mandated expenditure rate of 30%.

## CORRECTIVE ACTION

### Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority (SNRHA)

#### **Deficiency:**

SNRHA's enrollments goal for Program Year 2018 is 128, per their contract. As of January 31, 2019, SNRHA's enrolments were 32, or 32% of goal.

#### **Provider Action Plan:**

Contract administrator provided technical assistance which included partnering with other local Title I Youth programs. SNRHA has experienced significant turnover among staff and this has impacted their enrolment numbers. They recently hired another staff person and are also doing outreach to enroll 10 participants for the Summer Business Institute through Clark County. SNRHA has added 6 participants since January. The hope is to see more enrollments with the added staff.

## CORRECTIVE ACTION

### Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow, Adult Training Expenditures

#### **Deficiency:**

FIT's Re-Entry Adult sub-award agreement mandates that a minimum of 37% of total expenditures must be spent on training activities (occupational skills training and on-the-job training). As of invoices submitted through December 31, 2018, FIT has expended \$74,509.55, or 25%, of \$294,506.87 in total expenditures on training activities.

#### **Staff Recommended Corrective Action:**

**Improvement Goals:** FIT has enrolled 15 participants into occupational skills training or on-the-job training and obligated \$41,803.

FIT leverages participant costs with Department of Labor Second Chance funding to provide 18 clients with supportive services directly linked to Welding training.

FIT has partnered with Operative Plasters and Cement Masons Local 797 union to provide incoming apprentices with required tools.

FIT will continue weekly outreach in the community for eligible customers and provide resources to individuals seeking training in Las Vegas.

**Accountability:** FIT will set a goal of 5 new adult enrollments by the end of February 2019, and 10 new adult enrollments by the end of March 2019. FIT will enroll of these individuals into on-the-job training or occupational skills training and obligate a minimum of \$36,000.00 in *new* training expenditures.

The WC Contract Administrator will monitor training expenditures and meet biweekly with the Program Director to ensure compliance with training expenditures.

## CORRECTIVE ACTION

### HELP of Southern Nevada, Adult and Dislocated Worker Training Expenditures

#### **Deficiency:**

HELP's Adult and Dislocated Worker sub-award agreement mandates that a minimum of 40% of total expenditures must be spent on training activities (occupational skills training and on-the-job training). As of invoices submitted through December 31, 2018, HELP has expended \$152,093.63, or 30%, of \$498,803.25 in total expenditures on training activities.

#### **Staff Recommended Corrective Action:**

**Improvement Goals:** HELP's ADW program currently has 14 pending training activities and proposes to approve five training activities each week. As of 3/7/19, HELP has obligated \$335,027.45 in occupational skills training activities. HELP also has \$4,500 in outstanding on-the-job training obligations that will be paid by WC upon receiving the invoice from the employer(s).

**Accountability:** HELP's management staff will continue to review the expenditure progress on a weekly basis and update WC as needed on progress.

The WC Contract Administrator will monitor training expenditures and meet biweekly with HELP's Program Director to ensure compliance with training expenditures.

## CORRECTIVE ACTION

### Lincoln County Grants Administration, Adult and Dislocated Worker Training Expenditures

#### **Deficiency:**

LCGA's Adult and Dislocated Worker sub-award agreement mandates that a minimum of 40% of total expenditures must be spent on training activities (occupational skills training and on-the-job training). As of invoices submitted through December 31, 2018, LCGA's Adult and Dislocated Worker Program has expended \$16,025.57, or 26%, of \$62,257.32 in total expenditures on training activities.

#### **Staff Recommended Corrective Action:**

**Improvement Goals:** LCGA has recently approved six participants for occupational skills training for a total obligation of \$13,149.00

LCGA will continue to conduct weekly employer outreach and work to develop new on-the-job training opportunities with at least two employers by the end of March 2019.

**Accountability:** The Program Manager will meet with the two career coaches/job developers on a weekly basis and provide regular status reports of enrollments, obligations and expenditures to WC to track the progress of these goals.

The WC Contract Administrator will monitor training expenditures and meet biweekly with the Program Director to ensure compliance with training expenditures.

## CORRECTIVE ACTION

### **ResCare Workforce Services – Boulder City/Laughlin, Adult and Dislocated Worker Training Expenditures**

#### **Deficiency:**

RWS's Boulder City/Laughlin Adult and Dislocated Worker sub-award agreement mandates that a minimum of 40% of total expenditures must be spent on training activities (occupational skills training and on-the-job training). As of invoices submitted through December 31, 2018, RWS's Boulder City/Laughlin Adult and Dislocated Worker Program has expended \$14,548.00, or 14%, of \$101,625.31 in total expenditures on training activities.

#### **Staff Recommended Corrective Action:**

**Improvement Goals:** Develop new training opportunities by continued outreach to community organizations and Training Providers with online programs. Continue our weekly outreach in the community for eligible customers and provide resources to individuals seeking training in Metro Las Vegas. Business Engagement outreach has resulted in our first OJT of the Program Year in Boulder City.

- Boulder City/Laughlin Projects have obligated \$39,000.00 of our \$70,000.00 PY Budget for ADW Training
- RWS is currently on track to expend their Training Budget during the remainder of the Program Year.

**Accountability:** Project Director will meet with Operations Supervisor in Boulder City/Laughlin and her staff regularly and provide status reports of enrollments, obligations and expenditures to Workforce Connections in order to track the progress of these goals.

The WC Contract Administrator will monitor training expenditures and meet biweekly with the Program Director to ensure compliance with training expenditures.

## CORRECTIVE ACTION

### **ResCare Workforce Services – Boulder City/Laughlin, Work-Based Learning Expenditures**

#### **Deficiency:**

RWS's Boulder City/Laughlin Youth sub-award agreement mandates that a minimum of 30% of total expenditures must be spent on work-based learning activities (work experience, on-the-job training, and pre-apprenticeship activities). As of invoices submitted through December 31, 2018, RWS's Boulder City/Laughlin Youth Program has expended \$17,585.73, or 25%, of \$70,096.00 in total expenditures on work-based learning activities.

#### **Staff Recommended Corrective Action:**

**Improvement Goals:** WBL expenditure has lagged mainly due to challenges in finding eligible and suitable Youth participants in rural areas. RWS Staff in these locations have continued to establish and maintain community outreach with our partners including Drug Court, WIC and the Clark County School District.

#### **Update on WBL Expenditure Goals:**

- Boulder City/Laughlin has Obligated \$15,500.00 of their \$30,500.00 PY18 goal
- With the addition of new staff in the Boulder City One Stop, RWS expects to obligate and expend the work-based learning budget by the end of PY18

**Accountability:** The WC Contract Administrator will monitor training expenditures and meet biweekly with the Program Director to ensure compliance with training expenditures.

## CORRECTIVE ACTION

### **ResCare Workforce Services – Mesquite, Adult and Dislocated Worker Training Expenditures**

#### **Deficiency:**

RWS's Mesquite Adult and Dislocated Worker sub-award agreement mandates that a minimum of 40% of total expenditures must be spent on training activities (occupational skills training and on-the-job training). As of invoices submitted through December 31, 2018, RWS's Mesquite Adult and Dislocated Worker Program has expended \$8,630.00, or 10%, of \$83,283.82 in total expenditures on training activities.

#### **Staff Recommended Corrective Action:**

**Improvement Goals:** Develop new training opportunities utilizing geographically closer training providers in Utah or with online programs. Continue our weekly outreach in the community for eligible customers and provide resources to individuals seeking training in Metro Las Vegas. New training customers have primarily accessed services through Online Training Providers.

- Mesquite Staff have made incredible strides in enrollment goals. They have enrolled 34 new Adult/DW Enrollments towards their enrollment goal of 40. However, while we have funded 9 individuals into training, access to training programs due to location and budget have restricted most of our new enrollments from accessing training services. Instead, they are providing employment and job search support to return them directly into employment.
- RWS expects to continue to enroll suitable customers in Online Training Programs to expend the PY18 Training Budget – with a goal of \$9,000.00 in obligations monthly.

**Accountability:** The RWS Project Director will meet with Operations Supervisor in Mesquite and staff weekly through the end of March 2019, and provide regular status reports of enrollments, obligations and expenditures to Workforce Connections to track the progress of these goals.

The WC Contract Administrator will monitor training expenditures and meet biweekly with the Program Director to ensure compliance with training expenditures.

## CORRECTIVE ACTION

### ResCare Workforce Services – Mesquite, Work-Based Learning Expenditures

#### **Deficiency:**

RWS's Mesquite Youth sub-award agreement mandates that a minimum of 30% of total expenditures must be spent on work-based learning activities (work experience, on-the-job training, and pre-apprenticeship activities). As of invoices submitted through December 31, 2018, RWS's Mesquite Youth Program has expended \$15,934.84, or 25%, of \$63,457.53 in total expenditures on work-based learning activities.

#### **Staff Recommended Corrective Action:**

**Improvement Goals:** Work-based learning expenditures have continued to be slightly behind RWS' 30% goal, but staff have continued to outreach and enroll eligible Out-of School Youth in Mesquite, a programmatic change from prior years where the enrollment was predominately In-School Youth.

#### **Update on WBL Expenditures:**

- Mesquite has Obligated \$16,000.00 of their \$30,500.00 PY18 WBL Goal
- Mesquite expects to continue to enroll Youth for WEX opportunities to expend out our PY WBL Target.

**Accountability:** The WC Contract Administrator will monitor training expenditures and meet biweekly with the Program Director to ensure compliance with training expenditures.

## CORRECTIVE ACTION

### ResCare Workforce Services – One-Stop Career Center, Work-Based Learning Expenditures

#### **Deficiency:**

RWS's One-Stop Career Center Youth sub-award agreement mandates that a minimum of 30% of total expenditures must be spent on work-based learning activities (work experience, on-the-job training, and pre-apprenticeship activities). As of invoices submitted through December 31, 2018, RWS's One-Stop Career Center Youth Program has expended \$79,828.23, or 28%, of \$285,133.03 in total expenditures on work-based learning activities.

#### **Staff Recommended Corrective Action:**

**Improvement Goals:** The OSCC Youth Program is now in compliance with the 30% required expenditure rate as of the end of January. New WEX Obligation has exceeded the original improvement target and RWS expects that expenditures rates will remain on target through the end of the Program Year.

**Accountability:** The RWS Project Director will meet with Youth Program Manager regularly to ensure that they are meeting this expenditure requirement and are on pace with enrollments.

The WC Contract Administrator will monitor training expenditures and meet biweekly with the Program Director to ensure compliance with training expenditures.

7. **INFORMATION:** Strategic Initiatives Update Report.  
*Irene Bustamante Adams, Deputy Director & Chief Strategy Officer*

# **Strategic Initiatives Update Report March 2019**

## a) Status Update on WIOA Compliance Assurance Initiatives

1. Strategic direction from the Board and Local Elected Officials for the next investment cycle:
  - I. Continue transition of WIOA Title I services to One-Stop centers with the other WIOA partner programs
  - II. Maximize the leveraging of resources with effective referrals, co-enrollments and partnerships
  - III. In addition to the unemployed focus on alternate labor pools:
    - A. Underemployed (could include Incumbent Worker Training)
    - B. Re-entry (scaling up/replicating)
    - C. Youth 16-24 (better drop-out re-engagement strategies)
    - D. Veterans (better systemic approach)
    - E. Individuals with disabilities (scaling up/replicating)
  - IV. Scopes that are broad and flexible (that allow service delivery to multiple target populations) and are focused on Nevada's targeted industry sectors/occupations including, but not limited to:
    - A. Traditional and non-traditional apprenticeships
    - B. Pre-apprenticeships/Apprenticeship readiness
    - C. Other work-based learning models
  - V. Programs that demonstrate a measurable high return on investment (ROI)
  - VI. Use performance data to determine ROI and make better strategic decisions

## b) Status Update on Workforce Development System Continual Improvement Initiatives

1. Workforce Connections convened system partners and stakeholders to explore ways in which we could improve how local businesses currently access and receive employment and training services across the entire One-Stop System. Three workshops took place on February 6-7.
2. Upcoming events
  - I. Clark County Commissioner Gibson's Spring Job Fair on Tuesday, March 26 at 8 am
  - II. Gibson Library One-Stop Center Ribbon Cutting on Wednesday, April 24 at 3 pm
  - III. East Las Vegas Library One-Stop Grand Opening on Thursday, April 25 at 10 am

**8. INFORMATION:** Request for Proposals Evaluation and Selection Process Overview.  
*Jaime Cruz, Executive Director.*

## **RFP Evaluation Process for PY2019**

- a. WC Board Chair, Valerie Murzl, identified WC Programs Committee members and representatives from other One-Stop Delivery System partner programs for an Ad-hoc Selection Panel
  1. Jerrie Merritt, WC Board, representing Business
  2. Peter Guzman, WC Board, representing Business
  3. Cecil Fielder, WC Board, representing Business
  4. Louis Louprias, WC Board, representing Labor
  5. Lou DeSalvio, WC Board, representing Labor
  6. Marvin Gebers, WC Board, representing Labor
  7. Liberty Leavitt, WC Board, representing K-12 Education
  8. Jack Martin, WC Board, representing Youth-Serving Organization
  9. Stavan Corbett, WC Programs Committee, representing Youth-Serving Organization
  10. Jill Hersha, WC Board, representing WIOA Title II Adult Education & Family Literacy
  11. Janice John, WC Board, representing WIOA Title IV Vocational Rehabilitation
  12. Michael Yoder, representing Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)
  13. Forrest Lewis, representing North Las Vegas Library District
  14. Marcie Smedley, representing Henderson Public Libraries
  
- b. Received 39 proposals for 13 clusters
  1. Lincoln ADW
  2. Lincoln Youth
  3. Nye and Esmeralda ADW
  4. Nye and Esmeralda Youth
  5. North ADW
  6. North Youth
  7. South ADW
  8. South Youth
  9. Central ADW
  10. Central Youth
  11. Re-entry ADW
  12. Re-entry Youth
  13. Pre-apprenticeship YouthBuild

- c. All 39 proposals passed technical review and were evaluated and scored by independent third party contractor, Social Policy Research Associates (SPRA)
  - 1. Under contract for previous funding processes
  - 2. Scoring sheets available in the back up
  - 3. Did not evaluate past performance or budget information
  - 4. Available over the phone for questions
  
- d. The 34 proposals that met the minimum score of 60 (out of a possible total score of 100) were ranked by the Ad-hoc Selection Panel
  - 1. The panel reviewed the scoring from SPRA and past performance data for each proposer
  - 2. For clusters with multiple proposers, rankings were submitted to WC staff
  - 3. For clusters with only one proposer, a recommendation to fund or not to fund was submitted to WC staff
  - 4. For the Pre-apprenticeship YouthBuild cluster, a recommendation not to fund was submitted to staff. Since the release of the RFP, US DOL awarded a \$1.1M grant award to provide Pre-apprenticeship YouthBuild services in our local area. A recommendation was made to support the new grant with our North, South and Central Youth clusters
  
- e. Selection Panel members met at WC to seek consensus on rankings and funding recommendations
  - 1. WC staff facilitated the consensus process and answered questions
  - 2. The panel reviewed budget information for each proposer
  - 3. The panel decided not to conduct interviews with the proposers
  - 4. The panel engaged in dialogue to seek and reach consensus on rankings
  - 5. The panel provided funding recommendations to WC staff

**9. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to Lincoln County Grants Administration to provide WIOA Title I Adult and Dislocated Worker services in the Lincoln cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$170,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the Workforce Connections (WC) Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

***Jack Martin, Chair***

**Selection Panel Consensus Ranking  
ADW Lincoln County**

Rank	Proposer
1	Lincoln County Grants Administration
2	N/A
3	N/A

**Current Performance**

**Rural - Lincoln**

**PYTD January 31, 2019**

**Population Served:**

Adult and Dislocated Workers

**Performance Metrics:**

Enrollments:	11 enrollments /	25 goal =	44% of goal achieved
Trainings:	7 trainings /	22 prior enrollments =	32% were trained
Placement:	10 placements /	22 prior enrollments =	45% were placed
Average Wage:	\$ 13.03 for placements		
Expenditures:	42% of contract expended		

**Comments:** Current pink paper notification for insufficient training expenditures. Lincoln County is currently showing progress towards meeting this requirement and WC has no concerns.

\*Trainings and placement are measured on the prior cohort enrollments due to the fact that entire cycles of placement can be more accurately evaluated.

**Selection Panel Notes – ADW Lincoln County**

- Recommended

<b>SPRA - Evaluation Summary</b>			
<b>Rural ADW Clusters</b>			
<b>Each Rural Cluster Received One (1) Proposal.</b>			<b>Lincoln Cluster</b>
<b>Prompt #</b>	<b>Prompt</b>		<b>Lincoln County</b>
5.1	Target Population and Outreach - How will this project address the workforce development needs of the Center Cluster that you are proposing to serve? Describe any target populations and outreach activities.	10%	5.00%
5.2	Program Design - Describe your overall program design and how a participant moves through the program from start to finish.	15%	7.50%
5.3	Continued Engagement - Describe your strategies to keep participants actively engaged as they progress through the program.	10%	5.33%
5.4	Collaborations - Describe your current and/or past collaborations with workforce development system partners, employers, and/or other community stakeholders. How do these partnerships contribute to positive results?	10%	3.50%
5.5	Program Results - Describe how you define successful results. Thoroughly describe what your program will achieve, and describe past successes you have had in similar projects. How does it all come together to address the workforce development needs of the target populations you are proposing to serve?	15%	11.00%
5.6	Staffing Elements - Describe the staffing structure identified in the organizational chart and how it supports the program.	5%	4.00%
5.7	Internal and Quality Controls - Describe your internal control framework for both programmatic and fiscal activities and how they relate. How will your organization provide management support and quality control for the program as a whole?	15%	10.50%
5.8	Matching Resources - Describe the sources of your proposed match. How do these resources help to meet the goals of your program?	10%	8.00%
Continuity	Continuity will be evaluated by assessing the Programmatic Narrative and associated attachments as a whole. The attachments included in the Continuity evaluation are: Executive Summary; Service Flow Chart; Program Organizational Chart; Proposed Performance Metrics Form	10%	6.33%
<b>Total SPRA</b>			<b>61.17%</b>

## Evaluation Summary Notes from SPRA – ADW Lincoln County

### **Lincoln County**

5.1 The outreach plan articulates partnerships and plans for referrals, as well as outreach plans for the cluster area. The outreach plan fails to mention the target populations.

5.2 Bidder quotes county procedures manual to describe services; considering the bidder is an incumbent, proposal would be improved by describing the services that are actually available and provided in consideration of present services and circumstances of the county.

The bidder mentions some promising practices/evidence-based strategies in the executive summary; however, not many are described in the actual program design section. The participant flow is now well-described--the design section contains a lot of bullets that are difficult to understand. Further elaboration would have helped. The program design does not specify how the bidder will partner with the one-stop or community partners to create an integrated service delivery.

5.3 Bidder does not address how career coaches will engage participants who drop out. Additionally, proposal would benefit from a description of the methods career coaches will use to communicate and interact with participants.

The proposal describes various activities that will keep participants engaged, such as individualized support, encouragement, mentoring, and workshops, etc. The bidder states that "After 90 days of inactivity, following the generation of the follow-up date, adults are contacted monthly to ensure they remain on "the right track." but the plan for follow-up activities is not mentioned beyond regular phone communications. A plan for re-engaging participants who have dropped out is not mentioned.

5.4 Bidder enumerates county services and indicates an intent to expand partnerships, but does not describe how this will happen.

The bidder lists a few partnerships but does not elaborate on these partnerships, nor do they describe how these partnerships contribute to positive results for the program partners, job seekers, and employers.

5.5 The bidder provides successful results and describes past performance; however, they do not provide future goals in the description.

5.6 The bidder successfully describes the management role and clearly defines the staffing roles.

5.7 Limited description of QC processes.

5.8 Limited description of a substantial cash and in-kind match.

Continuity - The proposal is not clearly written in some places (see pages 7-9). The flow chart is nicely displayed.

**10. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to Lincoln County Grants Administration to provide WIOA Title I Youth services in the Lincoln cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$250,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the (WC) Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. *Jack Martin, Chair*

**Selection Panel Consensus Ranking  
Youth Lincoln County**

Rank	Proposer
1	Lincoln County Grants Administration
2	N/A
3	N/A

**Current Performance**

**Rural - Lincoln**

**PYTD January 31, 2019**

**Population Served:**

Youth

**Performance Metrics:**

Enrollments:	20 enrollments /	28	goal =	71% of goal achieved
Work-Based Learning:	23 Work-Based Learning /	29	prior enrollments =	79% did Work-Based Learning
Trainings:	3 trainings /	29	prior enrollments =	10% were trained
Placement:	11 placements /	29	prior enrollments =	38% were placed
Average Wage:	\$ 10.33 for placements			
Expenditures:	50% of contract expended			

**Comments:** No concerns noted.

\*Work-Based Learning, Trainings and placement are measured on the prior cohort enrollments due to the fact that entire cycles of placement can be more accurately evaluated.

**Selection Panel Notes – Youth Lincoln County**

- Recommended

<b>SPRA - Evaluation Summary</b>			
<b>Rural Youth Clusters</b>			
<b>Each Rural Cluster Received One (1) Proposal.</b>			<b>Lincoln Cluster</b>
<b>Prompt #</b>	<b>Prompt</b>		<b>Lincoln County</b>
5.1	Target Population and Outreach - How will this project and the service location(s) address the workforce development needs of the Youth Cluster that you are proposing to serve? Describe any target populations and outreach activities.	10%	7.00%
5.2	Program Design - Describe your overall program design and how a participant moves through the program from start to finish.	15%	10.00%
5.3	Continued Engagement - Describe your strategies to keep participants actively engaged as they progress through the program.	10%	4.67%
5.4	Collaborations - Describe your current and/or past collaborations with workforce development system partners, employers, and/or other community stakeholders. How do these partnerships contribute to positive results?	10%	6.50%
5.5	Program Results - Describe how you define successful results. Thoroughly describe what your program will achieve, and describe past successes you have had in similar projects. How does it all come together to address the workforce development needs of the target populations you are proposing to serve?	15%	11.50%
5.6	Staffing Elements - Describe the staffing structure identified in the organizational chart and how it supports the program.	5%	4.00%
5.7	Internal and Quality Controls - Describe your internal control framework for both programmatic and fiscal activities and how they relate. How will your organization provide management support and quality control for the program as a whole?	15%	9.00%
5.8	Matching Resources - Describe the sources of your proposed match. How do these resources help to meet the goals of your program?	10%	8.00%
Continuity	Continuity will be evaluated by assessing the Programmatic Narrative and associated attachments as a whole. The attachments included in the Continuity evaluation are: Executive Summary; Service Flow Chart; Program Organizational Chart; Proposed Performance Metrics Form	10%	7.33%
<b>Total SPRA</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>68.00%</b>

## Evaluation Summary Notes from SPRA – Youth Lincoln County

### **Lincoln**

5.1 Bidder discusses the needs of the type of youth who would qualify for program services. Would be helpful to have greater description of the existing needs in the county to be served (e.g., prevalence of barriers, at-risk youth, etc.).

5.2 Bidder describes program flow through expected stages; would like more comprehensive detail about the services youth will have access to. No mention of services such as adult mentoring, financial literacy, counseling, support services, etc. (These are mentioned as engagement strategies in section 5.3.)

5.3 Bidder describes required youth service elements, such as support services, as incentives for engagement. No discussion of engagement strategies should youth drop out. Would also like more detail about the methods career coaches plan to use to maintain engagement.

5.4 Bidder mentions several employer partners, as well as education and community partners. Would like more detail about how these partnerships contributed to positive results and what those results were.

While details about the partnerships are spread throughout the proposal, it would have been useful for the bidder to describe in greater detail some examples of past partnerships in this section and anticipated roles for partners and not just list the names of partners.

5.5 No comments

5.6 No comments

5.7 Description of controls is quite limited

5.8 Meets the requirements though description is limited.

Continuity - Proposal is difficult to assess for capacity and ability because of limited detailed information.

**11. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to Nye Communities Coalition to provide WIOA Title I Adult and Dislocated Worker services in the Nye and Esmeralda cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$630,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. *Jack Martin, Chair*

**Selection Panel Consensus Ranking  
ADW Nye and Esmeralda County**

Rank	Proposer
1	Nye Community Coalition
2	N/A
3	N/A

**Current Performance**

**Rural - Nye**

**PYTD January 31, 2019**

**Population Served:**

Adult and Dislocated Workers

**Performance Metrics:**

Enrollments:	41 enrollments /	100 goal =	41% of goal achieved
Trainings:	37 trainings /	86 prior enrollments =	43% were trained
Placement:	53 placements /	86 prior enrollments =	62% were placed
Average Wage:	\$ 12.94 for placements		
Expenditures:	55% of contract expended		

**Comments:** Nye Community Coalition also serves the Tonapah area.

\*Trainings and placement are measured on the prior cohort enrollments due to the fact that entire cycles of placement can be more accurately evaluated.

**Selection Panel Notes – ADW Nye and Esmeralda County**

- Recommended

<b>SPRA - Evaluation Summary</b>			
<b>Rural ADW Clusters</b>			
<b>Each Rural Cluster Received One (1) Proposal.</b>			<b>Nye Cluster</b>
<b>Prompt #</b>	<b>Prompt</b>		<b>NyeCC</b>
5.1	Target Population and Outreach - How will this project address the workforce development needs of the Center Cluster that you are proposing to serve? Describe any target populations and outreach activities.	10%	9.00%
5.2	Program Design - Describe your overall program design and how a participant moves through the program from start to finish.	15%	11.50%
5.3	Continued Engagement - Describe your strategies to keep participants actively engaged as they progress through the program.	10%	6.33%
5.4	Collaborations - Describe your current and/or past collaborations with workforce development system partners, employers, and/or other community stakeholders. How do these partnerships contribute to positive results?	10%	9.00%
5.5	Program Results - Describe how you define successful results. Thoroughly describe what your program will achieve, and describe past successes you have had in similar projects. How does it all come together to address the workforce development needs of the target populations you are proposing to serve?	15%	13.50%
5.6	Staffing Elements - Describe the staffing structure identified in the organizational chart and how it supports the program.	5%	4.50%
5.7	Internal and Quality Controls - Describe your internal control framework for both programmatic and fiscal activities and how they relate. How will your organization provide management support and quality control for the program as a whole?	15%	9.00%
5.8	Matching Resources - Describe the sources of your proposed match. How do these resources help to meet the goals of your program?	10%	8.00%
Continuity	Continuity will be evaluated by assessing the Programmatic Narrative and associated attachments as a whole. The attachments included in the Continuity evaluation are: Executive Summary; Service Flow Chart; Program Organizational Chart; Proposed Performance Metrics Form	10%	8.33%
<b>Total SPRA</b>			<b>79.17%</b>

## **Evaluation Summary Notes from SPRA – ADW Nye and Esmeralda County**

### **NyeCC**

5.1 Bidder provides a comprehensive understanding of workforce needs and describes nimble outreach strategies to serve the communities and target populations.

Although it is implied, the bidder does not specifically state that they will be serving all target populations, particularly the unemployed and under-employed. However, the bidder is very in tune with the cluster's workforce needs (such as substance abuse and mental health) and presents many nimble or innovative outreach partnerships and methods.

5.2 While the program design is clear and detailed, it does not mention evidence based practices or promising practices such as career pathways or apprenticeships; although, the bidder does mention wraparound services in the engagement section. The service delivery model is integrated with other community partners.

5.3 The bidder describes various innovative strategies for keeping participants engaged, including wrap around services, promoting civic engagement, social media, and minimum contact agreements. However, the bidder does not describe the follow-up plan or strategies for re-engaging participants that have dropped out of the program. The bidder does briefly mention follow-up in the staffing section but does not describe the process for follow-up.

5.4 Bidder describes various partnerships that contribute to the success of participants. Bidder describes how services are delivered through partnerships at each of the cluster settings.

5.5 Bidder describes how they define successful results and triangulates with past performance and success stories. The bidder describes practices that contribute to successful results, connecting to the participant's success.

5.6 Management role and staffing roles clearly defined. The bidder describes additional staff supports on site to assist customers, including an ASL interpreter and a Spanish interpreter.

5.7 Limited description of QC processes.

5.8 Detailed description of substantial cash and in-kind match.

Continuity - The flow chart and org chart are clear and easy to read.

**12. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to Nye Communities Coalition to provide WIOA Title I Youth services in the Nye and Esmeralda cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$450,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. *Jack Martin, Chair*

**Selection Panel Consensus Ranking  
Youth Nye and Esmeralda County**

Rank	Proposer
1	Nye Community Coalition
2	N/A
3	N/A

**Current Performance**

**Rural - Nye**

**PYTD January 31, 2019**

**Population Served:**

Youth

**Performance Metrics:**

Enrollments:	30 enrollments /	57	goal =	53% of goal achieved
Work-Based Learning:	15 Work-Based Learning /	52	prior enrollments =	29% did Work-Based Learning
Trainings:	3 trainings /	52	prior enrollments =	6% were trained
Placement:	16 placements /	52	prior enrollments =	31% were placed
Average Wage:	\$ 10.55 for placements			
Expenditures:	47% of contract expended			

**Comments:** Currently not meeting the work-based learning requirement at 40% of expenditures, however they have a plan in place to meet this expenditure by end of contract. NyeCC also serves the Tonopah area.

\*Work-Based Learning, Trainings and placement are measured on the prior cohort enrollments due to the fact that entire cycles of placement can be more accurately evaluated.

**Selection Panel Notes – Youth Nye and Esmeralda County**

- Recommended

<b>SPRA - Evaluation Summary</b>			
<b>Rural Youth Clusters</b>			
<b>Each Rural Cluster Received One (1) Proposal.</b>			<b>Nye Cluster</b>
<b>Prompt #</b>	<b>Prompt</b>		<b>NyeCC</b>
5.1	Target Population and Outreach - How will this project and the service location(s) address the workforce development needs of the Youth Cluster that you are proposing to serve? Describe any target populations and outreach activities.	10%	8.33%
5.2	Program Design - Describe your overall program design and how a participant moves through the program from start to finish.	15%	12.50%
5.3	Continued Engagement - Describe your strategies to keep participants actively engaged as they progress through the program.	10%	8.00%
5.4	Collaborations - Describe your current and/or past collaborations with workforce development system partners, employers, and/or other community stakeholders. How do these partnerships contribute to positive results?	10%	8.50%
5.5	Program Results - Describe how you define successful results. Thoroughly describe what your program will achieve, and describe past successes you have had in similar projects. How does it all come together to address the workforce development needs of the target populations you are proposing to serve?	15%	11.50%
5.6	Staffing Elements - Describe the staffing structure identified in the organizational chart and how it supports the program.	5%	4.00%
5.7	Internal and Quality Controls - Describe your internal control framework for both programmatic and fiscal activities and how they relate. How will your organization provide management support and quality control for the program as a whole?	15%	9.00%
5.8	Matching Resources - Describe the sources of your proposed match. How do these resources help to meet the goals of your program?	10%	8.00%
Continuity	Continuity will be evaluated by assessing the Programmatic Narrative and associated attachments as a whole. The attachments included in the Continuity evaluation are: Executive Summary; Service Flow Chart; Program Organizational Chart; Proposed Performance Metrics Form	10%	8.33%
<b>Total SPRA</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>78.17%</b>

## **Evaluation Summary Notes from SPRA – Youth Nye and Esmeralda Cluster**

### **NyeCC**

5.1 Bidder seems to be well rooted and knowledgeable about the community.

Bidder articulates a solid understanding of needs across the county and presents multiple community-relevant engagement strategies to reach youth across the two counties.

5.2 Bidder discusses evidence-based practices and braided program models integrated into program flow

5.3 Bidder describes innovative approach to engagement which includes opportunities for youth to engage with the bidder through social activities.

Bidder offers strategies for engaging youth during program and after program exit, in multiple communities.

5.4 Bidder discusses multiple well-established partnerships in the counties that appear to provide essential community services.

5.5 No comments

5.6 No comments

5.7 Limited description of QC processes.

5.8 Detailed description of substantial cash and in-kind match.

Continuity - Bidder demonstrates insight, capacity, and experience to effectively serve youth.

**13. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to ResCare Workforce Services to provide WIOA Title I Adult and Dislocated Worker services in the North cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$2,200,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

***Jack Martin, Chair***

**Selection Panel Consensus Ranking  
ADW North**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Proposer</b>
1	ResCare Workforce Services
2	C2 Global
3	Goodwill of Southern Nevada
N/A	Community Assistance Program
N/A	Nevada Partners, Inc.

**Current Performance**

**One-Stop Career Center - ResCare**

**PYTD January 31, 2019**

**Population Served:**

Adult and Dislocated Workers

**Performance Metrics:**

Enrollments:	417 enrollments /	540 goal =	77% of goal achieved
Trainings:	240 trainings /	715 prior enrollments =	34% were trained
Placement:	273 placements /	715 prior enrollments =	38% were placed
Average Wage:	\$ 15.30 for placements		
Expenditures:	56% of contract expended		

**Comments:** ResCare currently has open pink paper notifications for insufficient training expenditures in Boulder City/Laughlin and Mesquite. Both projects are showing improvement towards meeting this requirement. No concerns noted.

\*Trainings and placement are measured on the prior cohort enrollments due to the fact that entire cycles of placement can be more accurately evaluated.

**Selection Panel Notes – ADW North**

**ResCare Workforce Services**

- ResCare has a great proposal, backed up by extremely positive reviews from agencies that have utilized their services. I was very impressed with their plans for outreach to the community, along with their built in technology and programming. In the end, my decision to select them as my main choice, over my #2 selection was based on the fact that they are already imbedded in the Las Vegas community, with important collaborations and partnerships already formed.
- Comprehensive, complete.

- 425 Adults, do appreciate they have taken their “program in a box” and added efforts to provide access to other titled providers in the area. Potential opportunity for Title II programs to access the GED Academy. Appreciate the focus on targeted industries. Identified experience in co-enrollments with other Titled partners.

## **C2 Global**

- C2 Global presented an impressive proposal with a demonstrated track record of success. They obviously have put a lot of thought into providing ADW services in partnership with workforce training boards in various locations, and they have technology and training locked in place. I also liked their emphasis on customer service. My review had them very close to ResCare, but I ranked them 2<sup>nd</sup> because it was clear that they were not extremely familiar with the Las Vegas Valley and it would be very difficult to reform relationships that are already in place.
- Concerned about lack of internal controls.
- High marks on use of technology, and specific programming addressing client needs. Concerns about the “program in a box” format of providers coming to Nevada. Love “No Wrong Door” approach but am concerned about ability to replicate integrated programming into a less integrated system and the ability to access and utilize current providers from other titles. Liked that they identified the unique characteristics of the cluster they will be serving.

## **Goodwill of Southern Nevada**

- Goodwill presented a strong proposal, and they obviously have a good track record of providing workforce training and services in the valley. Where Goodwill was lacking in my assessment was the fact that they have lots of experience running their own workforce training programs, but not as much in working within the One-Stop format. Also, I was troubled by their evaluation noting recent staff turnover. Consistency in staff is extremely important to forming strong working relationships between agencies.
- Where is the integration? What other funding supports?
- 375 adults. Liked the high touch individualized programming offered by GWSN, and their intent to staff all North Cluster locations with a physical body, as well as flexibility in offering services online or in person. Focus on WEX, OJT, Apprenticeships (pre).

**SPRA - Evaluation Summary**

**ADW North**

<b>Prompt #</b>	<b>Prompt</b>	<b>Prompt Weight</b>	<b>ResCare</b>	<b>C2 Global</b>	<b>Goodwill</b>	<b>Community Assistance Program</b>	<b>NPI</b>
5.1	Target Population and Outreach - How will this project address the workforce development needs of the Center Cluster that you are proposing to serve? Describe any target populations and outreach activities.	10%	8.33%	7.00%	7.67%	7.67%	5.00%
5.2	Program Design - Describe your overall program design and how a participant moves through the program from start to finish.	15%	12.00%	11.50%	11.50%	11.00%	9.50%
5.3	Continued Engagement - Describe your strategies to keep participants actively engaged as they progress through the program.	10%	5.33%	8.00%	7.00%	7.67%	5.33%
5.4	Collaborations - Describe your current and/or past collaborations with workforce development system partners, employers, and/or other community stakeholders. How do these partnerships contribute to positive results?	10%	9.00%	8.50%	8.50%	7.50%	4.00%
5.5	Program Results - Describe how you define successful results. Thoroughly describe what your program will achieve, and describe past successes you have had in similar projects. How does it all come together to address the workforce development needs of the target populations you are proposing to serve?	15%	11.50%	11.00%	12.00%	13.00%	10.50%
5.6	Staffing Elements - Describe the staffing structure identified in the organizational chart and how it supports the program.	5%	3.50%	4.50%	4.50%	4.50%	3.00%
5.7	Internal and Quality Controls - Describe your internal control framework for both programmatic and fiscal activities and how they relate. How will your organization provide management support and quality control for the program as a whole?	15%	15.00%	12.00%	12.00%	10.50%	9.00%
5.8	Matching Resources - Describe the sources of your proposed match. How do these resources help to meet the goals of your program?	10%	8.00%	8.00%	6.00%	4.00%	8.00%
Continuity	Continuity will be evaluated by assessing the Programmatic Narrative and associated attachments as a whole. The attachments included in the Continuity evaluation are: Executive Summary; Service Flow Chart; Program Organizational Chart; Proposed Performance Metrics Form	10%	8.33%	7.33%	8.00%	9.00%	6.00%
<b>Total SPRA</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>81.00%</b>	<b>77.83%</b>	<b>77.17%</b>	<b>74.83%</b>	<b>60.33%</b>

## Evaluation Summary Notes from SPRA – ADW North

### **ResCare**

5.1 Bidder provides concrete examples of outreach strategies, and responds to each of the high-interest populations. The bidder does not address service adjustments to rural areas such as Mesquite.

The proposal offers many examples of planned outreach particular to each of the target populations. The proposed partnering with local utility companies is particularly innovative.

5.2 Bidder provides a comprehensive review of service flow, but does not address how services vary across service locations, particularly in more rural areas.

The bidder provides many examples of evidence-based practices, such as career pathways, apprenticeships, and assessments. The bidder also discusses using an integrated service delivery model.

5.3 Bidder presents limited strategies for engaging participants, and does not speak to the variables of rural communities with differing population demographics.

The organization describes various activities to keep participants engaged while in the program. However, they fail to mention strategies for re-engaging participants who have dropped out beyond traditional telephone communications.

5.4 The bidder discusses ways in which they have partnered with WP programs to create system efficiencies.

5.5 The past performance results are not included in this section. The bidder does a good job at describing how their program leads to good results.

5.6 The proposal describes the manager and staffing roles; however, this section does not describe how coverage will occur at each location within the cluster.

5.7 Very detailed description of internal and fiscal controls and QC processes.

5.8 Required match met and quantified.

Continuity - Bidder proposes to enroll 425 total participants (with 361 obtaining employment), but also indicates in section 5.2 that 493 participants exited into employment during the last program year. It would be interesting for the bidder to discuss reasons for the anticipated decline in performance expectations in the coming year. As a bidder to both the Central and Northern cluster, it would be valuable to hear how services may differ across populations and urbanicity

The proposal is very well written.

## **C2 Global**

5.1 The response only states that the organization will be focusing outreach on under-employed, re-entry populations, and veterans. It does not mention low-income and recipients of public assistance, unemployed, or persons with disabilities.

5.2 Describes innovative practices to service delivery; also mentions integrated services, but does not provide tangible examples.

The participant flow through services is explained well and the proposal mentions some promising practices (i.e. career pathways). However, it fails to provide concrete examples of service delivery integration.

5.3 Offers multiple innovative strategies to engage participants. Strategies do not specifically indicate which (or if) the strategies are used for re-engaging participants or available after program exit.

The program has innovative practices for keeping participants engaged, such as paid work experience; however, it does not mention strategies for re-engaging participants at risk of dropping out. Follow-up activities extend beyond basic phone calls and email communication, including webinars and Alumni events.

5.4 The organization describes how their partnerships improve customer service and outcomes. They provide a collaboration example and describe how it led to positive results for both participants and partners.

5.5 The proposal describes successful results but does not link it to an execution of an employment plan.

5.6 The proposal provides a clear description of the management and staffing roles.

5.7 No comments

5.8 No comments

Continuity - The required attachments are provided; the flow chart nicely describes services and flow through the program.

## **Goodwill**

5.1 Bidder articulates area needs, outreach strategies, and target populations they have experience serving.

Bidder addresses planned outreach for all of the target populations, except for individuals receiving public assistance or low-income individuals.

5.2 Bidder does not discuss integrated service delivery models, though they do mention partnering with several government and community entities to serve diverse populations.

Bidder addresses participant flow through the program; the program design contains promising practices, such as apprenticeship programs.

5.3 Bidder describes typical engagement strategies to maintain engagement, and standard methods (email/phone) for connecting or re/connecting with participants.

The bidder describes various strategies for keeping participants engaged while in the program, including contact by the Career Coach, workshops, work experience, supportive services, and financial literacy as described in Eric's success story. The success story is particularly innovative for maintaining success in the program. The bidder briefly addresses maintaining contact with participants who have dropped out but does not elaborate on specific strategies to be used. The plan for follow-up at program exit (described in the design section) does not extend beyond regular phone contact.

5.4 Bidder describes service partnerships with employers and government entities, as well as system-wide collaboration (targeting veterans) as a means to support participants and the community at large.

Bidder addresses several partnerships that contribute to positive results for job seekers and partners. A plan for warm hand-off referral is addressed in another section.

5.5 Bidder clearly describes past successful results and future goals for the proposed program.

5.6 Bidder describes recognition from workforce board for staffing functions operating in library locations across the cluster.

The proposal addresses the planned staffing roles for each location as well as the management role.

5.7 Detailed description of business processes, with somewhat limited description of QC.

5.8 Match mentioned, but impossible to quantify.

Continuity - The flow chart and staffing chart are clearly described.

## **Community Assistance Program**

5.1 The bidder addresses all of the target populations. The response addresses an outreach plan for both participants and business partners, which is innovative.

5.2 Need more information about how an integrated service delivery model will support participant needs as they progress through the program.

The program design is well-designed and contains innovative partnering with employers to ensure placement. Bidder describes the participant flow through the program and is well-integrated with business partners.

5.3 The bidder describes multiple strategies for maintaining engagement in the program, including a Retention Monitoring Report and subsidized work experience/OJT. While the bidder does not specifically indicate strategies for re-engaging participants who have dropped out, they do describe how the Retention Monitoring Report and constant contact prevents dis-engagement. The bidder also describes several follow-up activities beyond basic communication, including post-employment seminars and guest speakers, as well as continued job skills training workshops.

5.4 The bidder describes past collaboration with partners as well as the plan for establishing new partnerships in the region. The bidder describes how past partnerships have contributed to positive results for participants and employers. The proposal fails to mention partnering with the one-stop or plan for warm hand-offs in referrals.

5.5 Bidder uses performance based outcomes to drive evaluation and reimbursement

Bidder describes successful results. Bidder describes future goals and outcomes, connecting to business partners. The bidder demonstrates excellent ability to operate a training program of similar size and scope, with excellent past performance reports.

5.6 The individual staff roles and management roles are clearly described and defined. The Bidder goes above and beyond to describe training (in another section) and how their organization prevents staff turnover.

5.7 No comments

5.8 The answer is somewhat vague and hard to quantify.

Continuity - Bidder articulates clear goals and supporting strategies to achieve them, as well as evidence of past performance in similar service areas.

The proposal is well-written and flows nicely. The flow chart in particular is well-written and visually pleasing. It's easy to understand the program simply from reading the flow chart.

## **NPI**

5.1 Bidder identifies a number of regional referral partnerships but does not address how outreach activities will occur. Additionally, bidder does not indicate how workforce development needs will be met.

Bidder does not articulate how the cluster's workforce development needs will be met. The outreach plan is vague. While the bidder addresses each of the target populations to be served and partnerships for referrals, the proposal does not state how outreach will occur for each population, nor does it specify specific outreach plans for each location.

5.2 Proposal lacks clarity regarding exit and follow-up process. No discussion of a fully integrated service delivery model.

The response includes some evidence-based practices as well as addresses participant's flow through the program. However, the plan fails to address how the bidder will use an integrated service delivery model to serve participants, particularly partnering with the one-stop.

5.3 Bidder describes an array of follow-up services available, but does not provide information on the strategies to maintain contact/engagement with participants post exit or those who drop out.

The bidder addresses strategies for engaging individuals in the program, such as supportive services. The bidder does not specifically strategies for re-engaging participants who have dropped out of activities, however it does address strategies for re-engaging participants who are no longer employed. The bidder does not specify strategies beyond basic contacts from Career Coaches.

5.4 Bidder describes a number of partnerships, but it would be helpful to articulate the impacts these relationships yield.

The bidder states several partnerships, but does not describe these collaborations, nor does illustrate how these partnerships were mutually beneficial or how they addressed programmatic need gaps. There is also no mention of how the bidder will address plans for warm hand-offs. The bidder does not describe how these partnerships contributed to positive results for partners, job seekers, and employers.

5.5 The bidder describes results and discusses some individualized and employment services but does not specifically connect good results to execution of an individual employment plan. The bidder does not articulate plan for partners in achieving outcomes.

5.6 Proposal would benefit from a description of how each location within the cluster will be serviced.

The bidder addresses staffing structure and management plan; however, the staffing coverage for each location within the cluster is not outline.

5.7 The approach seems limited and does not include detailed descriptions of systems in place.

5.8 Although the first part of the answer is hard to substantiate, the in-kind match through FIT is substantial.

Continuity - Proposal has frequent spelling or grammar errors that make it difficult to follow the intent of what the bidder is attempting to communicate. The flow chart is difficult to read both on paper and in the PDF.

**14. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to HELP of Southern Nevada to provide WIOA Title I Youth services in the North cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$1,300,000. The award amount shall not exceed \$1,300,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.  
*Jack Martin, Chair*

**Selection Panel Consensus Ranking  
Youth North**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Proposer</b>
1	Help of Southern Nevada
2	ResCare Workforce Services
3	Nevada Partners, Inc.
N/A	CPLC
N/A	Olive Crest

**Current Performance**

**Drop-out Recovery - HELP**

**PYTD January 31, 2019**

**Population Served:**

Youth

**Performance Metrics:**

Enrollments:	59 enrollments /	85	goal =	69% of goal achieved
Work-Based Learning:	30 Work-Based Learning /	80	prior enrollments =	38% did Work-Based Learning
Trainings:	13 trainings /	80	prior enrollments =	16% were trained
Placement:	24 placements /	80	prior enrollments =	30% were placed
Average Wage:	\$ 10.30 for placements			
Expenditures:	57% of contract expended			

**Comments:** No concerns noted.

\*Work-Based Learning, Trainings and placement are measured on the prior cohort enrollments due to the fact that entire cycles of placement can be more accurately evaluated.

**Selection Panel Notes – Youth North**

**HELP of Southern Nevada**

- Help of Sothern Nevada put forth a strong proposal with a proven track record of providing quality youth programs in the valley. What set them apart from the other proposals was the fact that they already have solid community support and partnerships that would allow them to hit the ground running. Also, the proposal demonstrated an understanding of youth in non-traditional learning situations, who have fallen through the cracks. This is of particular interest to our organization.
- Very concerned about no reference to match resources. Can we ask them to clarify this?

- 100 Youth. Well defined and outlined program elements. Extensive thoughts put into how to connect youth in unique and engaging workforce training and skill development. Includes NCRC.

### **ResCare Workforce Services**

- ResCare put forth a very complete and professional proposal. I chose Help over them, only because I feel that Help has a better understanding, and proven record of reaching youth who have fallen between the cracks of the traditional education model.
- Best example of integration – like more detail though.
- 145 Youth. Comprehensive program plan with integration identified.

### **Nevada Partners, Inc.**

- NPI's proposal was a bit lacking in specifics, especially in the realm of specific outreach strategies.
- Curious about in-kind coming from FIT? Integration effort?
- 210 Youth. Focus seems to be more on personal identity versus career development, programming seems more consistent with previous program years, did not see the innovation identified with the amazing potential provided by the new career development center.

<b>SPRA - Evaluation Summary</b>							
<b>Youth North</b>							
<b>Prompt #</b>	<b>Prompt</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Help</b>	<b>ResCare</b>	<b>NPI</b>	<b>CPLC</b>	<b>Olive</b>
5.1	Target Population and Outreach - How will this project and the service location(s) address the workforce development needs of the Youth Cluster that you are proposing to serve? Describe any target populations and outreach activities.	10%	8.00%	7.67%	7.67%	7.00%	5.33%
5.2	Program Design - Describe your overall program design and how a participant moves through the program from start to finish.	15%	12.50%	12.00%	12.50%	12.50%	12.00%
5.3	Continued Engagement - Describe your strategies to keep participants actively engaged as they progress through the program.	10%	7.33%	7.00%	7.67%	6.67%	5.33%
5.4	Collaborations - Describe your current and/or past collaborations with workforce development system partners, employers, and/or other community stakeholders. How do these partnerships contribute to positive results?	10%	8.50%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	6.50%
5.5	Program Results - Describe how you define successful results. Thoroughly describe what your program will achieve, and describe past successes you have had in similar projects. How does it all come together to address the workforce development needs of the target populations you are proposing to serve?	15%	12.00%	11.00%	11.00%	11.00%	9.00%
5.6	Staffing Elements - Describe the staffing structure identified in the organizational chart and how it supports the program.	5%	3.00%	4.00%	3.50%	3.50%	4.00%
5.7	Internal and Quality Controls - Describe your internal control framework for both programmatic and fiscal activities and how they relate. How will your organization provide management support and quality control for the program as a whole?	15%	12.00%	13.50%	9.00%	12.00%	12.00%
5.8	Matching Resources - Describe the sources of your proposed match. How do these resources help to meet the goals of your program?	10%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	6.00%	4.00%
Continuity	Continuity will be evaluated by assessing the Programmatic Narrative and associated attachments as a whole. The attachments included in the Continuity evaluation are: Executive Summary; Service Flow Chart; Program Organizational Chart; Proposed Performance Metrics Form	10%	8.33%	8.00%	8.00%	7.67%	6.67%
<b>Total SPRA</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>79.67%</b>	<b>79.17%</b>	<b>75.33%</b>	<b>74.33%</b>	<b>64.83%</b>

## Evaluation Summary Notes from SPRA – Youth North

### **Help**

5.1 Bidder demonstrates particular insight regarding out-of-school youth (OSY) and indicates a capacity to reach this population in particular.

5.2 Bidder comprehensively describes both expected and unique training programs that leverage integrated community partnerships and aim to match growth sectors with participants' interests.

5.3 Bidder describes strategies for establishing trusting and supportive relationships between participants and a team of staff. Score also takes into consideration information provided in section 5.2 regarding engagement strategies during follow-up services.

5.4 Bidder describes numerous examples of existing partnerships with employers, service providers, and education programs to support participant outcomes and benefit the workforce system.

5.5 No comments

5.6 Proposal would benefit from a brief explanation of how services will be covered in distant locations in the cluster.

5.7 Detailed description of QC processes.

5.8 No comments

Continuity - Bidder demonstrates the capacity and insight to serve all target youth populations, including particularly challenging groups.

## **ResCare**

5.1 Bidder discusses basic outreach strategies to target youth populations which include leveraging existing partnerships serving targeted youth populations. Bidder does demonstrate an awareness of youth circumstances.

5.2 Bidder emphasizes an integrated service delivery model which include systems for shared documents and space-sharing. Would like to know if these systems are used regularly and used across partners

5.3 Bidder offers basic engagement strategies combined with plans to develop more innovative strategies to engage youth after exit, including an alumni program and adapted IRT model. Would like more concrete explanation of how these new strategies will be integrated into service delivery.

5.4 Nice inclusion of partners that are specific to rural areas including engagement with Moapa River Indian Nation.

5.5 Bidder describes success in broad strokes; would like an articulation of measurable outcomes and the anticipated role partners will play in achieving them.

5.6 No comments

5.7 Very detailed description of internal and fiscal controls and QC processes.

5.8 Required match met and quantified.

Continuity – No comments

## **NPI**

5.1 Bidder indicates using a best practice model of outreach to youth, engaging youth in their environment and community. Information in section 5.2 regarding outreach is taken into consideration.

While the program design provides a nice detailed overview of their outreach strategies, it would have been useful to have a little more detail in this section of their outreach strategies, even if only a quick preview before providing the extensive detail in the program design section.

5.2 Program design reflects use of evidence-based practices.

Bidder provides a very detailed and useful explanation of the program, including the follow-up stage.

5.3 Bidder describes implementing youth-involved approaches to addressing service updates after identifying existing gaps in service. Would like more detail about how innovative ideas such as the youth advisory board work in practice.

Bidder provides description of internal efforts to evaluate and improve engagement efforts and describes how these efforts now inform their current work.

5.4 No comments

5.5 Bidder couches past success based on youth service incumbency; would prefer to see performance indicator outcomes data to assess past success.

5.6 Unclear if staffing caseloads for case managers are a bit high for effective implementation of engagement strategies. Would also like more detail around service coverage across different locations.

5.7 The approach seems limited and does not include detailed descriptions of systems in place.

5.8 Although the first part of the answer is hard to substantiate, the in-kind match through FIT is substantial.

Continuity - Overall proposal makes sense, though frequent sentence fragmentation (particularly in sections 5.5 and 5.6.) made comprehension challenging at times.

## CPLC

5.1 Bidder mentions services they currently provide, but do not indicate particular workforce need(s) of area youth, nor an articulation of how those needs will be addressed.

Bidder provides useful detail of how they will work to identify participants for the program and discusses how partnerships support outreach. Bidder also has a focus on youth with disabilities.

5.2 Bidder describes several evidence-based strategies and coordinated services delivered through an integrated program model.

Bidder describes program design elements, it's alignment with WIOA, and highlights evidence based practices. Bidder also integrates the work of partners, including connections between other youth wrap around services and its connections with WIOA funded workforce training programs.

5.3 Bidder describes engagement strategies targeted to specific youth populations, but does not address how youth who drop out will be re-engaged.

5.4 Bidder enumerates several existing and potential partnerships to meet the needs of target youth population.

Bidder describes in detail concrete examples of various partnerships that will be used for the project and that they have used before.

5.5 Bidder provides a general statement of success; would like a further articulation of what the program will achieve. Bidder does indicate notable past successes in other communities, though it's unclear how these achievements apply to North Las Vegas cluster.

5.6 Additional description about the staffing structure and the roles and responsibilities of different staff would have been useful.

5.7 Detailed description of internal and fiscal controls and QC processes.

5.8 Limited description with a limited match.

Continuity - Some discrepancies of the figures (or missing figures) in attached performance metrics form.

Bidder provides a really nice and detailed service flow chart.

## **Olive Crest**

5.1 Bidder provides a token description of target youth, though does mention transition age youth in executive summary. Bidder does not differentiate between in-school and out-of school youth. Outreach strategies are similarly discussed in only broad strokes.

5.2 Bidder presents several evidence-based program elements and indicates utilization of an integrated service delivery model with community partners.

5.3 Bidder discusses staff performance expectations rather than participant engagement activities. In section 5.2, bidder does discuss planned transition meetings.

5.4 Bidder discusses past collaborations to make services for at-risk youth available; would like more substance regarding the outcomes or results of those efforts.

5.5 Bidder discusses experience with similar program design, but description of past successes is somewhat vague and discussed in terms of being able to offer services rather than the outcomes of services, or the impacts for youth or the community.

5.6 No comments

5.7 Detailed description of internal and fiscal controls and QC processes and description of staff qualifications in QC and oversight roles.

5.8 Insufficiently documented match. Requires probing in interview.

Continuity - Overall the proposal makes sense, however in several places responses do not appear to answer the question being posed (See 5.3 and 5.5 in particular). Would also like to see justification for proposing to serve equal numbers of various target populations.

The placement of information and detail was not always in the anticipated sections. For example, a detailed discussion of the follow-up process was in the program design, but then no reference was made to it in under continued engagement.

**15. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to ResCare Workforce Services to provide WIOA Title I Adult and Dislocated Worker services in the South cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$2,200,000. The award amount shall not exceed \$1,300,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020.

***Jack Martin, Chair***

**Selection Panel Consensus Ranking  
ADW South**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Proposer</b>
1	ResCare Workforce Services
2	Goodwill of Southern Nevada
3	C2 Global
N/A	Southern Nevada CHIPS

**Current Performance**

**One-Stop Career Center - ResCare**

**PYTD January 31, 2019**

**Population Served:**

Adult and Dislocated Workers

**Performance Metrics:**

Enrollments:	417 enrollments /	540 goal =	77% of goal achieved
Trainings:	240 trainings /	715 prior enrollments =	34% were trained
Placement:	273 placements /	715 prior enrollments =	38% were placed
Average Wage:	\$ 15.30 for placements		
Expenditures:	56% of contract expended		

**Comments:** ResCare currently has open pink paper notifications for insufficient training expenditures in Boulder City/Laughlin and Mesquite. Both projects are showing improvement towards meeting this requirement. No concerns noted.

\*Trainings and placement are measured on the prior cohort enrollments due to the fact that entire cycles of placement can be more accurately evaluated.

**Selection Panel Notes – ADW South**

**ResCare Workforce Services**

- 5.1 – A lot of outreach identified, but not comprehensively defined, thorough evaluation of special populations; 5.2 – Comprehensive program details, seems to excel in OJT; 5.3 – Contact and co-enrollment, but does not detail how; 5.4 – Co-enrollment/concurrent services/integration; 5.6 – Roles sufficiently described, training and certifications for positions; 5.7 – Comprehensive QC in place; PPEFs – reported high satisfaction (Performance Goals: 425 enrolled, 361 (85%) placed, \$14.25 average)
- Does not show amount requested. Has a good track record. Would like to see breakdown of salaries and benefits.
- Existing relationship with State entities for collaboration to optimize services. Purposed support for those with disabilities. Intro to trauma informed care principles with assessment. High past performance.

- Best package...most knowledge...most experience...best definition of success of program...best outreach.
- Collaboration with WC partners and other organizations – appreciate reaching out to utility companies – innovative- bilingual coaches, working with not just veterans, but families and spouses as well. Online courses, activities, and ResumeHero, and IEPs are constantly reviewed and career counselors, ResAcademy also include HSE. Using information from LVGEA to direct individuals into jobs and licensure. Collaboration with HOPE through DETR’s Wagner-Peyser programs, and ELL programs – love that this was addressed.

### **Goodwill of Southern Nevada**

- 5.1 –Narrative of re-entry, lacking outreach efforts – but highlights referrals through partner programs; 5.2 – Clearly outlined from initial contact to post-employment; 5.3 – Narrative of OJT demonstrated engagement: 5.4 – Many collaborations noted, strong employer relationships; 5.6 – Roles laid out, career coaches are required to proactively recruit participants, mentoring for new positions by existing in-library career coaches; 5.7 – Quality checks in place, Processes detailed; PPEFs – not as highly satisfactory, but that appears to be due to turnover (Performance Goals; 366 enrolled, 201 (55%) placed, \$14.00 average)
- Shows amount requested. Has a good track record. Would like to see breakdown of expenses.
- Hosts similar efforts and collaborations as others. Clearly understands concepts and scope concerned about past performance around program quality.
- Great support of management...good internal control explanation...great community partner.
- Focus on underemployed and low income, and career coaches match the populations that they are working with – like veterans and career counselors make contact every 30 days post-employment. Would like more information innovative outreach programs outside of Boulevard mall and Goodwill stores as well as GED information. Great real success stories, partnerships with business, and political relationships.

### **C2 GPS**

- 5.1 – Outreach through technology, need for more face to face where people are for populations that face barriers – fewer special populations identified; 5.2 – Comprehensive defined structure for program; 5.3 – Innovative engagement with technology; 5.4 – Onsite w/employers, executive understanding of relationships; 5.6 – Roles sufficiently described, emphasis on mentoring; 5.7 – Processes in place for compliance; PPEFs – high Satisfaction, comes highly recommended (Performance Goals: 352 enrolled, 282 (80%) placed, \$14.00 average)
- Does not show amounts requested. Has a good record in Texas. Like to see breakdown of salaries.

- Tech integration – cco system development and collaboration for multi-disciplinary impact. Provides for cross training internal / external. High past performance.
- Good staffing controls...overall a very good package and was a really close contender for 2 rating...
- Low income and reentry. Social media for older populations seems off, and also discusses partnerships in TX, not sure they exist in NV. Like the SMS help desk and use of social media and video conferencing, reminders and tours. Think they have the potential for funding in the future but need to know the community and partners first.

**SPRA - Evaluation Summary**

**ADW South**

Prompt #	Prompt	Weight	ResCar	C2 Global	Goodwill	SNV
5.1	Target Population and Outreach - How will this project address the workforce development needs of the Center Cluster that you are proposing to serve? Describe any target populations and outreach activities.	10%	8.33%	6.67%	7.67%	9.33%
5.2	Program Design - Describe your overall program design and how a participant moves through the program from start to finish.	15%	12.00%	11.50%	11.50%	8.00%
5.3	Continued Engagement - Describe your strategies to keep participants actively engaged as they progress through the program.	10%	5.67%	8.00%	7.00%	6.33%
5.4	Collaborations - Describe your current and/or past collaborations with workforce development system partners, employers, and/or other community stakeholders. How do these partnerships contribute to positive results?	10%	8.50%	8.50%	8.50%	6.00%
5.5	Program Results - Describe how you define successful results. Thoroughly describe what your program will achieve, and describe past successes you have had in similar projects. How does it all come together to address the workforce development needs of the target populations you are proposing to serve?	15%	11.50%	11.00%	12.00%	9.50%
5.6	Staffing Elements - Describe the staffing structure identified in the organizational chart and how it supports the program.	5%	3.50%	4.50%	4.50%	4.50%
5.7	Internal and Quality Controls - Describe your internal control framework for both programmatic and fiscal activities and how they relate. How will your organization provide management support and quality control for the program as a whole?	15%	13.50%	12.00%	12.00%	9.00%
5.8	Matching Resources - Describe the sources of your proposed match. How do these resources help to meet the goals of your program?	10%	8.00%	8.00%	6.00%	8.00%
Continuity	Continuity will be evaluated by assessing the Programmatic Narrative and associated attachments as a whole. The attachments included in the Continuity evaluation are: Executive Summary; Service Flow Chart; Program Organizational Chart; Proposed Performance Metrics Form	10%	8.33%	7.67%	8.00%	7.33%
<b>Total SPRA</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>79.33%</b>	<b>77.83%</b>	<b>77.17%</b>	<b>68.00%</b>

## Evaluation Summary Notes from SPRA – ADW South

### **ResCare**

5.1 Bidder provides concrete examples of outreach strategies, and also specifically highlights each of the high-interest populations identified by the board.

The bidder provides many examples of planned outreach particular to each target population. The proposal also provides examples of partnerships for conducting outreach and co-enrollment, such as TANF. The proposed partnering with local utility companies is an innovative outreach strategy.

5.2 Bidder provides a comprehensive overview of program flow. Language is nearly identical to service provision for proposal to the Central Cluster and Northern Cluster; it would be valuable to hear how integrated service delivery would serve specific communities in the Southern Cluster.

Bidder provides examples of evidence-based practices and promising practices, including referring to pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeships, career pathways, etc. The proposal also discusses using an integrated service delivery model, particularly innovative was the referral form.

5.3 Bidder presents limited strategies for engaging participants, and does not speak to the differences of urban and rural communities across the Southern Cluster.

Bidder describes various activities to keep participants engaged while in the program, including unique career planning/IEPs, motivational interviewing, use of SARA, and supportive services. However, the bidder fails to mention strategies for re-engaging participants who have dropped out beyond traditional communications (i.e. phone calls or emails). Follow-up strategies described are somewhat vague.

5.4 Proposal discusses ways in which they have partnered with WP programs to create system efficiencies and between the two programs. The electronic signature system for accessing supportive services is innovative.

5.5 Their past successes and results are not included in this section, although there are a few examples throughout the proposal. The bidder does a good job at describing how their program leads to good results.

5.6 The proposal describes the manager and staffing roles; however, this section does not describe how coverage will occur at each location within the cluster.

5.7 Very detailed description of internal and fiscal controls and QC processes.

5.8 Required match met and quantified.

Continuity - Bidder proposes to enroll 425 total participants (with 361 obtaining employment), but also indicates in section 5.2 that 493 participants exited into employment during the last program year. It would be interesting for the bidder to discuss reasons for the anticipated decline

in performance expectations in the coming year. This appears to be a duplication of information provided for the proposal for the Northern Cluster. As a bidder to the Central, Northern, and Southern cluster, it would be valuable to hear how services may differ across populations and urbanicity.

The proposal is very well written and the bidder demonstrates capacity and ability to provide services, especially through pre-existing partnerships and service strategies.

## **C2 Global**

5.1 Provides examples of innovative approaches to service delivery across diverse locations. Does not specifically address strategies for veterans.

The bidder does not mention plan for focusing outreach or services on re-entry populations. While the bidder discusses innovative outreach strategies, their plans for reaching specific populations are vague and fails to mention a plan for reaching specific people at the cluster locations.

5.2 Bidder indicates training dispersed staff to provide integrated services, but does not provide concrete examples or strategies.

The bidder does a great job describing participant flow and mentions some promising practices. However, they do not provide examples of service delivery integration.

5.3 Presents several innovative strategies, though does not specifically indicate which (or if) strategies are used for re-engaging participants or used after program exit.

The program design describes innovative practices for keeping participants engaged, such as paid work experience. However, it does not mention strategies for re-engaging participants who have dropped out of the program. Follow-up activities extend beyond basic phone calls and email communication, including webinars and Alumni events.

5.4 The bidder nicely describes how their partnerships improve customer service and outcomes. They provide a collaboration example and how it led to positive results for both the partners and participants.

5.5 The proposal describes successful results but does not link it to execution of an employment plan.

5.6 There is a clear description of the management role and staffing roles.

5.7 No comments

5.8 Match is well described but relatively low. In-kind is somewhat speculative.

Continuity - Flow chart nicely describes services and flow through the program.

## **Goodwill**

5.1 Bidder articulates area needs, outreach strategies, and target populations they have experience serving.

Bidder addresses planned outreach for all of the target populations, except for individuals receiving public assistance.

5.2 Bidder does not discuss integrated service delivery models, though they do mention partnering with several government and community entities to serve diverse populations.

Bidder addresses participant flow through the program; the program design contains promising practices, such as referring to pre-apprenticeship programs.

5.3 Bidder describes typical engagement strategies to maintain engagement, and standard methods (email/phone) for connecting or re/connecting with participants.

The bidder describes various strategies for keeping participants engaged while in the program, including contact by the Career Coach, workshops, work experience, supportive services, and financial literacy as described in Eric's success story. The success story is particularly innovative for maintaining success in the program. The bidder briefly addresses maintaining contact with participants who have dropped out but does not elaborate on specific strategies to be used. The plan for follow-up at program exit (described in the design section) does not extend beyond regular phone contact.

5.4 Bidder describes service partnerships with employers and government entities, as well as system-wide collaboration (targeting veterans) as a means to support participants and the community at large.

Bidder addresses several partnerships that contribute to positive results for job seekers. A plan for warm hand-off referral is addressed in another section.

5.5 Bidder clearly describes past successful results and future goals for the proposed program.

5.6 Bidder describes recognition from workforce board for staffing functions operating in library locations across the cluster.

The proposal addresses the planned management and staffing roles for each location.

5.7 Detailed description of business processes, with somewhat limited description of QC.

5.8 Match mentioned, but impossible to quantify.

Continuity - The staffing chart and flow chart are clearly described.

## **SNV Chips**

5.1 Bidder outlines strategies to serve specific populations including high interest populations, and indicates both experience and partnerships that enable nimbleness/innovation. Additionally, bidder offers insight into, and capacity for serving identified populations.

Bidder describes all target populations, as well as outreach plans for other sub-groups, including those experiencing homelessness or transportation barriers and English learners. Bidder describes an outreach plan that is integrated with the one-stop system and provides innovative outreach strategies.

5.2 Bidder clearly articulates their program design yet does not describe promising practices.

The design does not describe promising practices. While the design section does not describe addressing participants' barriers in the participant flow, the bidder describes it in the outreach section. The proposal mentions integrating outreach with the local one-stop and other community partners in the outreach section but could do more to describe service integration.

5.3 Discusses engagement strategies with concrete examples. Would like to hear engagement strategies that address participants who drop out.

The bidder describes multiple activities that keep participants engaged while in the program that go beyond regular phone communication. The workshops, including the banking workshop are innovative. However, the proposal does not mention strategies for re-engaging participants once they have dropped out (except that it's important to do so). The bidder does not describe follow-up strategies.

5.4 The bidder describes past partnerships but does not elaborate much on how these partnerships contribute to positive results for program partners, job seekers, and employers. Additionally, the proposal does not describe how these partnerships fill a pragmatic need gap, plan for warm hand-off, or how the services that are provided through partnership are delivered in the cluster setting.

5.5 Bidder provides quantitative employment outcomes and intangible goals that go beyond employment. Would like to hear about past performance outcomes with similar sized efforts.

The bidder does not describe past performances.

5.6 The staffing roles management structure are clearly described.

5.7 Limited description of QC processes.

5.8 Detailed description of cash and in-kind match.

Continuity - The flow chart is difficult to read.

**16. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to ResCare Workforce Services to provide WIOA Title I Youth services in the South cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$1,300,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. *Jack Martin, Chair*

**Selection Panel Consensus Ranking  
Youth South**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Proposer</b>
1	ResCare Workforce Services
2	Help of Southern Nevada
3	Olive Crest
N/A	Southern Nevada CHIPS

**Current Performance**

**OSCC - ResCare**

**PYTD January 31, 2019**

**Population Served:**

Youth

**Performance Metrics:**

Enrollments:	80 enrollments /	117 goal =	68% of goal achieved
Work-Based Learning:	34 Work-Based Learning /	92 prior enrollments =	37% did Work-Based Learning
Trainings:	3 trainings /	92 prior enrollments =	3% were trained
Placement:	30 placements /	92 prior enrollments =	33% were placed
Average Wage:	\$ 12.63 for placements		
Expenditures:	44% of contract expended		

**Comments:** ResCare's OSCC, Boulder City/Laughlin and Mesquite Youth programs currently have an open pink paper for insufficient work-based learning expenditures. As of invoices submitted through January 2019, the OSCC contract is meeting this requirement. BoulderCity/Laughlin and Mesquite are showing improvement. No concerns noted.

\*Work-Based Learning, Trainings and placement are measured on the prior cohort enrollments due to the fact that entire cycles of placement can be more accurately evaluated.

**Selection Panel Notes – Youth South**

**ResCare Workforce Services**

- 5.1- In-depth information about specific populations, including partnership opportunities to support service and outreach efforts; 5.2 – Extensive description of programs, including partnerships and wrap-around services; 5.3 – Relationship building, partner interventions, plans for alumni program, incentives for reaching goals; 5.5 – Many partnerships identified (including those from section 5.1), co-enrollment, 5.6- Roles described, extensive training opportunities available; 5.7 – Comprehensive QC; PPEFs – reported high satisfaction (Performance Goals; 145 enrollments, 116 (80%) w/jobs or higher ed, \$12.00 average)
- After discussion with group, they were the better provider.

- Has good results in past WIOA funding projects. Would like to show more social media projections.
- Modified to #1 based on group discussion and additional perspective being provided on points of proposal.
- Clear articulation of target population / outreach. Understands scope and clear program design to meet need. High past performance. Shared purposed engagement enhancements for recruitment.
- Great package...great staffing goals...great understanding... very close to being 1.
- Direct focus on areas and ZIP codes and loads of time with the youth – couple times a week, and love the alumni program working directly with LGBTQ and the Center, NPHY as well as with other WC partners and organizations – faith based too. Specific on CCSD programs they work with, and the specific partners for each possible barrier – homeless, etc. Mentoring not much Info – AARP? Field trips, and classes for experience seems vague. Focus on disabilities and homeless.

### **HELP of Southern Nevada**

- 5.1 – Extensive outreach identified, lacked info for some specific populations; 5.2 – Comprehensive description of programs offered, though the actual path is not clear; 5.3 – Various methods for engagement described, including acceptance back into program after a period of absence; 5.4 – Many partnerships described, with supporting info on how they help youth; 5.6- staffing structure defined, opportunities for staff training mentioned; 5.7 Controls/checks in place and described; PPEFs – rated highly by other programs, but pretty low by WC (Performance Goals: 200 enrollments, 145 (72%) w/jobs or higher ed, \$12.00 average)
- Rethinking of proposal change my mind.
- They have had good success in the past. Need to see more social media outlets.
- Is able to articulate collaboration. Base strategic – concern is despite knowledge has low past performance. Clear understanding in purposed program design.
- Excellent package turned in ...clear understanding of the project...Best engagement process.
- Appreciate the outreach to Harbor, faith based groups, etc for OSY, and the start of ISY at Clark and Beacon. Should be working with social workers in schools though too – missing this piece. Discussed what they do when they disengage. STEM partnership with DRI – personally love it missing other partners, also appreciate vast partnerships and collaboration with HOPE and Bloom, as well as others. Focus most on pregnancy and reentry.

### **Olive Crest**

- 5.1 – Does not address specific populations, outreach efforts lack description; 5.2 – Comprehensive description of program, including contact after placement; 5.3 – Description of team performance rather than engagement, some engagement methodology included in section 5.2; 5.4 – Partnerships identified in areas of support

services, not specific to workforce; 53.6 – Staffing structure explained; 5.7 – Complete QC processes; PPEFs – highly rated (Performance Goals; 160 enrollments, 115 (72%) w/jobs or higher ed, \$14.75 average)

- Changed my vote after group discussion.
- Past performance shows good results. Have been doing this for a while. Would stress better tracking upon completions.
- Strong organizational frame work design – High scores on past performance clear outcome. Strong and clear articulation of program design – High Explanation to collaboration.
- Not impressed.
- Partnerships with FIT, Step Up, others \_ 50 outside agencies – Lost on who is ISY and OSY. Similar to HELP – STEM, Gov. Sandoval’s plan, field trips, etc. Not as specific on employers and mentors, or GED or adult ed info. Lack of research for mentor programs. Career Coach minimum of one time a month – need a higher requirement. Not specific on who partner with homelessness. Much seems vague. Equal focus on groups.

**SPRA - Evaluation Summary**

**Youth South**

<b>Prompt #</b>	<b>Prompt</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Help</b>	<b>ResCare</b>	<b>SNV</b>	<b>Olive Crest</b>
5.1	Target Population and Outreach - How will this project and the service location(s) address the workforce development needs of the Youth Cluster that you are proposing to serve? Describe any target populations and outreach activities.	10%	8.00%	7.67%	6.00%	5.33%
5.2	Program Design - Describe your overall program design and how a participant moves through the program from start to finish.	15%	12.50%	12.00%	8.50%	12.00%
5.3	Continued Engagement - Describe your strategies to keep participants actively engaged as they progress through the program.	10%	7.33%	7.00%	5.00%	5.33%
5.4	Collaborations - Describe your current and/or past collaborations with workforce development system partners, employers, and/or other community stakeholders. How do these partnerships contribute to positive results?	10%	8.50%	8.00%	8.00%	6.50%
5.5	Program Results - Describe how you define successful results. Thoroughly describe what your program will achieve, and describe past successes you have had in similar projects. How does it all come together to address the workforce development needs of the target populations you are proposing to serve?	15%	12.00%	11.00%	11.00%	9.00%
5.6	Staffing Elements - Describe the staffing structure identified in the organizational chart and how it supports the program.	5%	3.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%
5.7	Internal and Quality Controls - Describe your internal control framework for both programmatic and fiscal activities and how they relate. How will your organization provide management support and quality control for the program as a whole?	15%	12.00%	13.50%	9.00%	12.00%
5.8	Matching Resources - Describe the sources of your proposed match. How do these resources help to meet the goals of your program?	10%	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%	4.00%
Continuity	Continuity will be evaluated by assessing the Programmatic Narrative and associated attachments as a whole. The attachments included in the Continuity evaluation are: Executive Summary; Service Flow Chart; Program Organizational Chart; Proposed Performance Metrics Form	10%	8.33%	8.00%	6.67%	6.67%
<b>Total SPRA</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>79.67%</b>	<b>79.17%</b>	<b>66.17%</b>	<b>64.83%</b>

## Evaluation Summary Notes from SPRA – Youth South

### **Help**

5.1 Bidder demonstrates particular insight regarding out-of-school youth (OSY) and indicates capacity to reach this population in particular, as well as an established relationship with programs working within Clark HS.

5.2 Bidder comprehensively describes both expected and unique training programs that leverage integrated community partnerships and aim to match growth sectors with participants' interests.

5.3 Provides innovative approach to use social media webinars and videoconferencing to connect and engage with participants who are located far from these resources and the use of a cohort model to connect participants together.

Bidder describes strategies for establishing trusting and supportive relationships between participants and a team of staff. Score also takes into consideration information provided in section 5.2 regarding engagement strategies during follow-up services.

5.4 Bidder describes numerous examples of existing partnerships with employers, service providers, and education programs to support participant outcomes and benefit the workforce system.

5.5 No comments

5.6 Proposal would benefit from a brief explanation of how services will be covered in distant locations in the cluster.

5.7 Detailed description of QC processes.

5.8 No comments

Continuity – No comments

## **ResCare**

5.1 Bidder discusses basic outreach strategies to target youth populations which include leveraging existing partnerships serving targeted youth populations. Bidder does demonstrate an awareness of youth circumstances.

5.2 Bidder emphasizes an integrated service delivery model which include systems for shared documents and space-sharing. Would like to know if these systems are used regularly and used across partners.

5.3 Bidder offers basic engagement strategies combined with plans to develop more innovative strategies to engage youth after exit, including an alumni program and adapted IRT model. Would like more concrete explanation of how these new strategies will be integrated into service delivery.

Would have liked more detail about process for keeping participants on path after exiting from the program.

5.4 No comments

5.5 Bidder describes success in broad strokes; would like an articulation of measurable outcomes and the anticipated role partners will play in achieving them.

5.6 No comments

5.7 Very detailed description of internal and fiscal controls and QC processes.

5.8 Required match met and quantified.

Continuity – No comments

## **SNV Chips**

5.1 Bidder discusses target population in broad strokes. Bidder discusses an outreach strategy of going into the community; would like to hear specifics such as outreach frequency, strategy for different communities/populations, etc.

5.2 Description of program is fairly opaque after description of ISS development. Integrated service delivery is not addressed.

5.3 Bidder does not describe strategies for how to re-engage participants who have dropped out of activities.

Bidder describes innovative ways to engage youth during the career exploration phase of the program, but does not address strategies for youth who drop out, and few suggestions for participants after exit.

5.4 Bidder discusses beneficial partnerships with workforce agencies, employers, and community services.

5.5 Bidder provides concrete indicators of success that is useful in understanding the goals of the proposed project.

Bidder discusses participant-tied success measures, and indicates past programs have resulted in some successful outcomes. Response lacks enough substance to gauge whether bidder is able to operate an employment/training program of this size and scope.

5.6 Bidder provides nice details about the proposed staff as well as the positions and functions that support the program design.

5.7 Limited description of QC processes.

5.8 Detailed description of cash and in-kind match.

Continuity - Proposal is lacking in detail or substance in several places but flows in broad strokes. Service flow chart is indecipherable between ISS and work experience.

## **Olive Crest**

5.1 Bidder provides a token description of target youth, though does mention transition age youth in executive summary. Bidder does not differentiate between in-school and out-of school youth. Outreach strategies are similarly discussed in only broad strokes.

5.2 Bidder presents several evidence-based program elements and indicates utilization of an integrated service delivery model with community partners.

5.3 Bidder discusses staff performance expectations rather than participant engagement activities. In section 5.2, bidder does discuss planned transition meetings.

5.4 Bidder discusses past collaborations to make services for at-risk youth available; would like more substance regarding the outcomes or results of those efforts.

5.5 Bidder discusses experience with similar program design, but description of past successes is somewhat vague and discussed in terms of being able to offer services rather than the outcomes of services, or the impacts for youth or the community.

5.6 No comments

5.7 Detailed description of internal and fiscal controls and QC processes and description of staff qualifications in QC and oversight roles.

5.8 Insufficiently documented match. Requires probing in interview.

Continuity - Overall the proposal makes sense, however in several places responses do not appear to answer the question being posed (See 5.3 and 5.5 in particular). Would also like to see justification for proposing to serve equal numbers of various target populations.

**17. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to ResCare Workforce Services to provide WIOA Title I Adult and Dislocated Worker services in the Central cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$3,400,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. *Jack Martin, Chair*

**Selection Panel Consensus Ranking  
ADW Central**

Rank	Proposer
1	ResCare Workforce Services
2	C2 Global
3	N/A

**Current Performance**

**One-Stop Career Center - ResCare**

**PYTD January 31, 2019**

**Population Served:**

Adult and Dislocated Workers

**Performance Metrics:**

Enrollments:	417 enrollments /	540 goal =	77% of goal achieved
Trainings:	240 trainings /	715 prior enrollments =	34% were trained
Placement:	273 placements /	715 prior enrollments =	38% were placed
Average Wage:	\$ 15.30 for placements		
Expenditures:	56% of contract expended		

**Comments:** ResCare currently has open pink paper notifications for insufficient training expenditures in Boulder City/Laughlin and Mesquite. Both projects are showing improvement towards meeting this requirement. No concerns noted.

\*Trainings and placement are measured on the prior cohort enrollments due to the fact that entire cycles of placement can be more accurately evaluated.

**Selection Panel Notes – ADW Central**

**ResCare Workforce Services**

- Adopted Malcom Baldrige Quality criteria for performance excellence
- Targeted Population: has identified and knows their targeted population; bilingual staff; works with faith-based organizations for outreach activities; outreach efforts include veterans at Indian Springs and Nellis.
- Question is what has ResCare done that would necessitate changing providers? While past performance evaluations are somewhat lowered with ResCare, they have personnel that provide oversight and are very responsible to both customer and Board. Both proposals are nearly equal to me.
- On the evaluation summary, ResCare was the front runner in 5 categories (notably in program design and program results). ResCare fell short in “Continued Engagement” and

“Staffing Elements”, and performed as well as the other bidder in “Matching Resources” and “Collaborations.” Comparatively, ResCare’s percentage of training completions was superior and the number of placements exceeded goals. In their proposal, employee enrichment and engagement strategies were impressive and the budget targets were comprehensive. Specific strategies and practices are in place that highlight the mandated partnerships and collaborations in Southern Nevada. 60% proposed enrollments for “low-income/public assistance recipient enrollments” shows better ambition than other bidders 28%.

- 5.1 Targeted Population and Outreach - ResCare demonstrated a thought forward and innovative approach to introduce a web-based suite to its partners and clients to access basic system services for applicants online. This approach maximizes efficiency and management of time and resources. With diversity as a key ingredient within their staff, incorporating a business solution staff to obtain a deeper understanding of employers needs and creating opportunities to upskill the underemployed population.
- 5.3 Continued Engagement – ResCare did not demonstrate strategic methods to keep clients engaged throughout the process. Excitement by the client will typically dissipate after approximately three weeks. There were opportunities to highlight leadership techniques to keep clients committed through the program. “Success is not running into a burning building to save a cat. It is the little things we do exceptionally well, every day that make us great.”
- 5.5 Program Results \_ Though, ResCare tracks, monitors, and captures survey data – there was no verifiable and quantifiable description defining their results. Clearly, their past performance evaluations are favorable, this could have been better highlighted within the proposal.
- I agree with the initial reviewer in that, the two proposals were ranked only 3% different. ResCare provided a well written proposal, demonstrating the keen ability to provide business services by-way of: collaborative partnerships strategic methods and strategies, and innovative technology. – Clearly, the past performance evaluations reflect ResCare has met or exceeded its annual goals.

## **C2 Global**

- 6 Pillars of success: invest in staff; incentivize staff; foster communication; aggressively incorporate technology; embed analytics; demand rigorous and constructive partnerships
- Knows their targeted population (EEO stats)
- Operation of special programs – targeted ex-offenders
- 2012-2018 good years with exception of 2017
- Salary of managing director – bonuses?
- C2Global was the front runner in “Continued Engagement” and Staffing Elements”, however they fell short in 5 other categories (notably in Program Design and Program Results). I do however disagree with the Evaluation Summary regarding C2 Global’s focus on Veterans, examples of service delivery integration (pg. 17), and lack of strategy for re-engaging participants who have exited (mention in Alumni Events and Job

Retention tracking). The lack of more detailed information on strategies in these areas and specific client exit reasons, may have been the reason for falling behind in this area on the evaluation summary. On the upside, it would be interesting to see results from the implementation of IBEST model of integrating basic education skills and occupational skills to see if C2 Global's business processing flow would lead to quicker training and employment outcomes than another bidder's somewhat lengthy process. C2 Global's social media / High Engagement Outreach Strategies are impressive and their 2017 WIOA Trailblazer Award from the National Association of Workforce Boards, make them highly competitive.

- 5.1 Target Population and Outreach – C2 Global demonstrated a clearly defined marketing strategy to include social media campaigns, text messaging, live-stream video logging, and bilingual marketing campaigns. This approach generates leverage to reach a larger group within the central cluster. Clearly defined effective administration services bolsters concentrated focus on recruiting second chance workers and customized training for better placement and higher retention ratings for the underemployed population.
- 5.3 Continued Engagement – C2 Global demonstrated strategic methods to keep clients engaged throughout the process. Partnering with TAD Grants and implementation of a customized career advising model also for the adult and dislocated worker to identify a career path as opposed to just seeking employment. This approach will keep the clients engaged and committed throughout the process. Their leadership approach through community partnerships proves effective, efficient, and demonstrates cost reductions.
- 5.5 Program Results – Though, C2 demonstrated verifiable and quantifiable descriptions defining their results. Perhaps, a different approach may have better articulated their progress.
- I agree with the initial reviewer in that the two proposals were ranked only 3% different. C2 Global, too, provided a well written proposal, demonstrating the keen ability to provide business services by-way of; collaborative partnerships, business methods and solutions and marketing strategies. – Clearly defined, the past performance evaluations reflect C2 Global has met or exceeded its annual goals.

**SPRA - Evaluation Summary**

**ADW Central**

Prompt #	Prompt	Weight	ResCare	C2 Global
5.1	Target Population and Outreach - How will this project address the workforce development needs of the Center Cluster that you are proposing to serve? Describe any target populations and outreach activities.	10%	8.33%	6.33%
5.2	Program Design - Describe your overall program design and how a participant moves through the program from start to finish.	15%	13.00%	10.50%
5.3	Continued Engagement - Describe your strategies to keep participants actively engaged as they progress through the program.	10%	6.00%	8.00%
5.4	Collaborations - Describe your current and/or past collaborations with workforce development system partners, employers, and/or other community stakeholders. How do these partnerships contribute to positive results?	10%	8.50%	8.50%
5.5	Program Results - Describe how you define successful results. Thoroughly describe what your program will achieve, and describe past successes you have had in similar projects. How does it all come together to address the workforce development needs of the target populations you are proposing to serve?	15%	11.50%	11.00%
5.6	Staffing Elements - Describe the staffing structure identified in the organizational chart and how it supports the program.	5%	3.50%	5.00%
5.7	Internal and Quality Controls - Describe your internal control framework for both programmatic and fiscal activities and how they relate. How will your organization provide management support and quality control for the program as a whole?	15%	13.50%	12.00%
5.8	Matching Resources - Describe the sources of your proposed match. How do these resources help to meet the goals of your program?	10%	8.00%	8.00%
Continuity	Continuity will be evaluated by assessing the Programmatic Narrative and associated attachments as a whole. The attachments included in the Continuity evaluation are: Executive Summary; Service Flow Chart; Program Organizational Chart; Proposed Performance Metrics Form	10%	8.67%	7.67%
<b>Total SPRA</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>81.00%</b>	<b>77.00%</b>
<b>Selection Panel Rank</b>			<b>#1</b>	<b>#2</b>

## Evaluation Summary Notes from SPRA - ADW Central

### **ResCare**

5.1 Bidder provides concrete examples of outreach strategies, and also specifically highlights each of the high-interest populations identified by the board.

The proposal provides many examples of planned outreach particular to each target population. The proposed partnering with local utility companies is an innovative outreach strategy.

5.2 Bidder provides a comprehensive overview of program flow, and cites inclusion of trauma-informed care principles as part of the assessment process.

The proposal gives many examples of evidence -based practices and promising practices and provides an integrated service delivery model. The referral form for partners is particularly innovative.

5.3 Bidder offers just basic strategies for keeping participants engaged, and limited alternatives for participant engagement after exit or dropout.

Bidder describes various activities to keep participants engaged while in the program, including career planning, use of an IEP, use of SARA, and supportive services. However, the proposal fails to mention strategies for re-engaging participants who have dropped out beyond the traditional communications such as telephone or email. Follow-up strategies described are vague.

5.4 The bidder describes ways in which they have partnered with other programs to create system efficiencies between the programs. The electronic signature system for accessing supportive services is innovative.

5.5 The past performance results are not included in this section. The bidder does a good job at describing how their program leads to good results.

5.6 The proposal describes the manager and staffing roles. It does not mention how staffing will occur (or may differ) at the comprehensive one-stop and Maryland Parkway JobConnect locations.

5.7 Very detailed description of internal and fiscal controls and QC processes.

5.8 Required match met and quantified.

Continuity - Service flow chart does not address exit or follow-up services

The proposal is well written and the bidder demonstrates capacity and the ability to provide services, particularly through pre-existing partnerships and service strategies.

## **C2 Global**

5.1 Presents a few innovative and nimble strategies; speaks to experience with some priority populations, but does not address veterans or underemployed.

Proposal only states that the organization will be focusing outreach or services on under-employed, unemployed, low-income and recipients of public assistance, and re-entry populations; it does not mention focusing on Veterans. While the organization offers innovative outreach practices, their plans for reaching specific populations are vague and the proposal lacks a plan for reaching people specific to the one-stop. The proposal identifies types of partnerships they have used for outreach at another board in Texas but fails to connect these partnership strategies to the Southern Nevada board or mention how they might form these partnerships in the Central Cluster.

5.2 Describes innovative practices to service delivery, however does not address integrated service delivery.

The proposal does a very good job of describing participant flow through services and mentions some promising practices (i.e. career pathways). However, it fails to provide concrete examples of service delivery integration.

5.3 Offers several innovative and nimble strategies to engage participants. Does not specifically indicate which (or if) strategies are used for re-engaging participants, or used after program exit.

The program has innovative practices for keeping participants engaged (such as paid work experience); however, it does not mention strategies for re-engaging participants that have dropped out. Follow-up activities extend beyond basic phone calls and email communication, including webinars and Alumni events.

5.4 The proposal describes how their partnerships improve customer service and outcomes. They provide a collaboration example and how it led to positive results for both participants and partners.

5.5 Bidder described success & results systemically and organizationally; would like to see more concrete or tangible language.

Bidder describes successful results but does not link it to execution of an employment plan.

5.6 Clear description of management role and staffing roles. Proposes collocation at the community college as well as staffing at additional AJC.

5.7 No comments

5.8 Match is well described but relatively low. In-kind is somewhat speculative.

Continuity - All attachments are provided and the flow chart nicely describes services and flow through the program.

**18. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel’s recommendation to award a new contract to ResCare Workforce Services to provide WIOA Title I Youth services in the Central cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$900,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. *Jack Martin, Chair*

**Selection Panel Consensus Ranking  
Youth Central**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Proposer</b>
1	ResCare Workforce Services
2	C2 Global
3	N/A

**Current Performance**

**OSCC - ResCare**

**PYTD January 31, 2019**

**Population Served:**  
Youth

**Performance Metrics:**

Enrollments:	80 enrollments /	117 goal =	68% of goal achieved
Work-Based Learning:	34 Work-Based Learning /	92 prior enrollments =	37% did Work-Based Learning
Trainings:	3 trainings /	92 prior enrollments =	3% were trained
Placement:	30 placements /	92 prior enrollments =	33% were placed
Average Wage:	\$ 12.63 for placements		
Expenditures:	44% of contract expended		

**Comments:** ResCare's OSCC, Boulder City/Laughlin and Mesquite Youth programs currently have an open pink paper for insufficient work-based learning expenditures. As of invoices submitted through January 2019, the OSCC contract is meeting this requirement. BoulderCity/Laughlin and Mesquite are showing improvement. No concerns noted.

\*Work-Based Learning, Trainings and placement are measured on the prior cohort enrollments due to the fact that entire cycles of placement can be more accurately evaluated.

**Selection Panel Notes – Youth Central**

**ResCare Workforce Services**

- Group discussion revealed information that allowed me to change my preference for ranking for ResCare – Experience provided in the LV area has been impressive.
- Strong training plan, liked integrated services delivery model
- Collaborations in place are extensive
- 5.1 Target Population also encompasses LGBTQ+
- 5.2 – Integrated Resource Team (IRT) is umbrella for everything. Requires youth buy-in, reduces duplication of services, collaboration, integration, utilized several referral organizations, GED Academy Program, Individual Services Strategy (ISS).
- 5.3 – SARA Program usage which provides day-to-day documentation by anyone working on case. 12 month follow-up. Explain financial incentives to meet which goals???

- 5.4 – Electronic signature. Rest was vague.
- 5.5 Emphasized TESLA / JAG efforts for program results. Not impressed with listing just one.
- 5.6 Highlighted LGBTQ training X2 members.
- 5.7 – Utilizes Malcolm Baldrige alignment. Weekly scorecard, sound financial monitoring.
- On the evaluation summary, ResCare was the front runner in 5 categories (notably in key categories such as Program Design, Continued Engagement, and Collaborations with workforce development system partners). In their program design, ResCare includes post-exit follow-up and support. Retention services are provided for at least 12 months to ensure satisfaction with their employment decision and to remediate any emerging barriers. If drop-off engagement is detected, ResCare immediately reaches out to reengage whereas, another bidder does not appear to detail strategies in these instances. Expressive detailed information is given on the collaborative efforts and strategies among specific Southern Nevada System Partners.
- 5.3 Continued Engagement – ResCare did not demonstrate strategic methods to keep young adults engaged throughout the program. Written strategies utilizing the principles of planning salt and peppered with goals and objectives would have been ideal. Too, this provides a platform for ResCare to demonstrate their ability to connect with the youth to keep them engaged through their leadership approach.
- 5.5 Program Results – Though, ResCare provided methods to track historical data – there is no verifiable and quantifiable description defining how to achieve results. Moreover, I would have liked to see a more granular explanation of how ResCare would drive “achieve” program results.
- I agree with the initial reviewer, in that the two proposals were ranked less than 3% different. The above mentioned two sub-sections stood out to me. ResCare provided a well written proposal, demonstrating their ability to be a front runner within the community – standing on their collaborative partnerships, staff to lean on, and innovative technology. Clearly, the past performance evaluations reflect ResCare has continued to meet or exceed its annual goals.

## **C2 Global**

- Strong, innovative outreach plan to youth
- Excellent references from other states
- Great focus on use of technology
- Strong outreach to community partners
- Interesting tier system
- 5.1 Target population fully identified, but no mention of LGBTQ+
- 5.2 – 3E’s \_ Empower – Educate \_ Employ, 14 serviced deliveries all beginning with HSE, 4-day workshop covering professional development opportunity and soft skill exposure.

- 5.3 – 95% C2 trainee approval of Career Advising Model (TAD Grants - Nation-wide provider of business services and career development). Numerous technology enabled services to communicate.
- 5.4 – Structured Tier Support – Partnered services and community youth serving programs ID’s in tiers.
- 5.5 - \$700k staff support incentives???
- 5.6 – Staffing looks good for all positions. Mentor from corporate for Youth Manager.
- 5.7 – Electronic attendance timesheets. Sound fiscal practices. Annual Risk Assessment.
- 5.8 – Matching Resources???
- 2% return as cash matching fund for WC mission support, 3\$ return for WC support of Local Plan Goals, Strategies and Tactics.
- C2 Global was the front runner in Target Population and Outreach, Program Results, and Staffing Elements, however the fell short in 5 other categories (notably in Program Design, Continued Engagement, and Collaborations with workforce development systems). C2 Global seems to be the front runner in Program Results, however another bidder offers an impressive success story regarding Tesla and their partnership with JAG of Nevada. In addition another bidder details specific success outcome strategies such as the use of community partnerships, braided funding, the use of EmployNV, and a resounding approach to success through trust in partnerships and collaborative efforts.
- 5.3 Continued Engagement – C2 Global demonstrated strategic methods to keep clients engaged throughout the process. Partnering with TAD Grants and implementation of a customized career advising model allows for the adult and dislocated worker to identify career –pathways opposed to just seeking employment. However, I would like to see a more thought forward approach (the connectivity piece) to keep the young adults committed to the process.
- 5.5 Program Results – Though, C2 demonstrated verifiable and quantifiable descriptions defining their results. Perhaps a different approach may have a better articulated their progress.
- I agree with the initial reviewer, in that two proposals were ranked less than 3% different. The above mentioned two sub-sections stood out to me. C2 Global provided an overall well written proposal, demonstrating their ability to lean on staff and community partnerships. The past performance evaluations reflect C2 has continued to meet or exceed its annual goals.

**SPRA - Evaluation Summary**

**Youth Central**

<b>Prompt #</b>	<b>Prompt</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>ResCar</b>	<b>C2 Global</b>
5.1	Target Population and Outreach - How will this project and the service location(s) address the workforce development needs of the Youth Cluster that you are proposing to serve? Describe any target populations and outreach activities.	10%	7.67%	8.67%
5.2	Program Design - Describe your overall program design and how a participant moves through the program from start to finish.	15%	12.00%	11.50%
5.3	Continued Engagement - Describe your strategies to keep participants actively engaged as they progress through the program.	10%	7.33%	5.33%
5.4	Collaborations - Describe your current and/or past collaborations with workforce development system partners, employers, and/or other community stakeholders. How do these partnerships contribute to positive results?	10%	8.00%	7.50%
5.5	Program Results - Describe how you define successful results. Thoroughly describe what your program will achieve, and describe past successes you have had in similar projects. How does it all come together to address the workforce development needs of the target populations you are proposing to serve?	15%	10.50%	11.00%
5.6	Staffing Elements - Describe the staffing structure identified in the organizational chart and how it supports the program.	5%	4.00%	4.50%
5.7	Internal and Quality Controls - Describe your internal control framework for both programmatic and fiscal activities and how they relate. How will your organization provide management support and quality control for the program as a whole?	15%	13.50%	12.00%
5.8	Matching Resources - Describe the sources of your proposed match. How do these resources help to meet the goals of your program?	10%	8.00%	8.00%
Continuity	Continuity will be evaluated by assessing the Programmatic Narrative and associated attachments as a whole. The attachments included in the Continuity evaluation are: Executive Summary; Service Flow Chart; Program Organizational Chart; Proposed Performance Metrics Form	10%	8.00%	7.67%
<b>Total SPRA</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>79.00%</b>	<b>76.17%</b>

## Evaluation Summary Notes from SPRA – Youth Central

### **ResCare**

5.1 Bidder discusses basic outreach strategies to target youth populations which include leveraging existing partnerships serving targeted youth populations. Bidder does demonstrate an awareness of youth circumstances.

Unique approach to reaching out to homeless youth by focusing on LGBTQ+ youth who represent a large portion of homeless youth.

5.2 Bidder emphasizes an integrated service delivery model which include systems for shared documents and space-sharing. Would like to know if these systems are used regularly and used across partners.

Bidder provides detailed discussion and process of participant's flow through the program.

5.3 Bidder offers basic engagement strategies combined with plans to develop more innovative strategies to engage youth after exit, including an alumni program and adapted IRT model. Would like more concrete explanation of how these new strategies will be integrated into service delivery.

Proposal described in detail how they use an integrated system to continue engagement with youth and how to reconnect with participants who appear to disengage.

5.4 No comments

5.5 Bidder describes success in broad strokes; would like an articulation of measurable outcomes and the anticipated role partners will play in achieving them.

Would have liked to see a few more concrete examples of measurable outcomes or milestones that youth would have.

5.6 No comments

5.7 Very detailed description of internal and fiscal controls and QC processes.

5.8 Required match met and quantified.

Continuity - Proposal provides nice detail about structure of proposed program, prior past experience, and ways to deal with some challenges (e.g., disengagement of youth).

## **C2 Global**

5.1 Bidder offers innovative outreach strategies targeting youth, and clearly articulates other innovative service strategies to meet the need of area youth based, drawing on previous experience from similar communities.

Described innovative use of technology to conduct outreach to youth population. In addition, they had an interesting focus on youth with some college, but no degree - an "unrecognized potential group" as they describe.

5.2 Program flow score takes into consideration the attached service flow chart, which bidder cites in their response.

5.3 Bidder describes innovative approaches to engaging youth, however none of the strategies appear to support participants who have exited or dropped out of the program.

Describes extensively strategies to address buy-in such as numerous workshops and initiatives. However, proposal does not address strategies for re-engaging participants who have dropped out or strategies for engaging participants after exiting from the program.

5.4 Proposal had interesting mapping of collaborators through tier system. However, proposal could have provided more detail about how partnerships are used and they connect with partners.

5.5 Bidder describes goals systematically and organizationally; would like more tangible language regarding desired outcomes and the role partners will play in achieving them.

5.6 Well articulated and fleshed out description of staffing structure. Interesting placement of counselor in community college setting.

5.7 No comments

5.8 Match is well described but relatively low. In-kind is somewhat speculative.

Continuity - The vendor proposes interesting use of social media and technology to engage with youth. The vendor provides examples of workshops or other services provided in other similar settings. However, would have like to see more detail and specifics in certain areas of the proposal and more cluster specific detail.

**19. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel's recommendation to award new contracts to Hope for Prisoners and Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow to provide WIOA Title I Adult and Dislocated Worker services in the ADW Re-entry cluster. The award amounts shall not exceed \$750,000 each. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. *Jack Martin, Chair*

**Selection Panel Consensus Ranking  
ADW Re-entry**

Rank	Proposer
1	Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow
1	HOPE for Prisoners
N/A	Southern Nevada CHIPs
N/A	Bridge Counselling Associates

**Current Performance**

**Re-entry - FIT**

**PYTD January 31, 2019**

**Population Served:**

Re-entry population

**Performance Metrics:**

Enrollments:	68 enrollments /	125 goal =	54% of goal achieved
Trainings:	112 trainings /	150 prior enrollments =	75% were trained
Placement:	107 placements /	150 prior enrollments =	71% were placed
Average Wage:	\$ 14.27 for placements		
Expenditures:	51% of contract expended		

**Comments:** Current pink paper notification for insufficient training expenditures. FIT is currently showing progress towards meeting this requirement and WC has no concerns.

\*Trainings and placement are measured on the prior cohort enrollments due to the fact that entire cycles of placement can be more accurately evaluated.

**Re-entry - Hope for Prisoners**

**PYTD January 31, 2019**

**Population Served:**

Re-entry population

**Performance Metrics:**

Enrollments:	96 enrollments /	125 goal =	77% of goal achieved
Trainings:	62 trainings /	116 prior enrollments =	53% were trained
Placement:	52 placements /	116 prior enrollments =	45% were placed
Average Wage:	\$ 11.12 for placements		
Expenditures:	49% of contract expended		

**Comments:** No concerns noted.

\*Trainings and placement are measured on the prior cohort enrollments due to the fact that entire cycles of placement can be more accurately evaluated.

## Selection Panel Notes – ADW Re-entry

### **Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow**

- 125 adults. Workforce skills focused, includes behavioral and mental therapy. Program plan and services have evidenced results. Use of WorkKeys for job readiness. Use of OJT's, WEX's. Provide practical vocational training opportunities through previous and apprenticeships. Provide stackable credentials. Behavioral and emotional supports are provided but not primary focus. Creative partnerships – transportation.
- Strong program services – strong participant engagement plan – great community collaborations outlined, especially legal supports and services – absence of VR partnership.
- Outcome results well defined – good internal and QC measures established. On one case management – throughout case and for continuity of service delivery.
- Strong strategies to keep engagement w/ population able to define success to meet workforce needs. High past performance.
- FIT was clearly the front runner upon review of all evaluations and proposal elements. They utilized 98% funding in past performance and dominated in key evaluation categories such as Continued Engagement, Collaborations with workforce development system partners, Quality Controls, and Continuity, past performance of 93% training enrollment with a 90.1% completion rate and 77% placement. The only area of improvement seems to be in re-engaging participants who have dropped out of activities and services. Program design points address complex barriers within this unique population of clientele, peeling back the onion for a more probable success rate than methods that incorporate a more expedient work ready processing style. Follow-up strategies provide years of support beyond the minimum 12 month policy that they've established to ensure continued success. Well detailed information is provided on FIT's collaborative efforts with Southern Nevada's workforce development agencies and community support systems.
- High success rate, proven track record and seamless program that makes sense. All data is above and beyond required DOL. Love the positive incentive program with Bank of America, DWSS at FIT, and JobConnect. Appropriate staffing who have the qualifications to work with re-entry population. Well written and answered everything. Only flaw I saw is similar to other comment – what happens when one drops out?

### **HOPE for Prisoners**

- 150 or 400 adults. Programming is comprehensive with multiple career pathways, designed to meet needs of re-entry clients. Limited description about assisting those without HS Diploma or HSE; Incorporates NCRC into the program.
- Extended services for target groups outside scope of work – strong community collaborations – use of mentors – Bilingual resources, success stories – effective outcomes +

- Clear understanding in target population and addressing workforce needs for population – Strong program design. Strong program design – high articulation of program achievement. High collaborations – High past performance.
- Hope is the front runner in Program Design and matching resources and outperformed 2 other bidders in all categories, however lacks performance compared to a front runner in the categories of Continued Engagement, Collaborations, Staffing Elements, and Continuity. 81.8% Training Completion Rate and 50.38% placement rate. Good collaboration with community stakeholders. Specific success stories were given – other bidder’s did not include this element.
- GEDs or other diplomas should be higher for all of these. RJC program like the Harbor for adults with JobConnect, Welfare and other services. Just wondering about the RJC. Also appreciated the construction and manufacturing pieces. Great examples of success stories and strong partnerships.

**SPRA - Evaluation Summary**

**ADW Re-entry**

<b>Prompt #</b>	<b>Prompt</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>FIT</b>	<b>HOPE</b>	<b>SNV Chips</b>	<b>Bridge</b>
5.1	Target Population and Outreach - How will this project address the workforce development needs of the Center Cluster that you are proposing to serve? Describe any target populations and outreach activities.	10%	8.00%	8.00%	5.00%	5.00%
5.2	Program Design - Describe your overall program design and how a participant moves through the program from start to finish.	15%	12.00%	12.50%	8.50%	10.50%
5.3	Continued Engagement - Describe your strategies to keep participants actively engaged as they progress through the program.	10%	8.33%	6.00%	6.00%	5.33%
5.4	Collaborations - Describe your current and/or past collaborations with workforce development system partners, employers, and/or other community stakeholders. How do these partnerships contribute to positive results?	10%	8.00%	7.50%	7.00%	6.00%
5.5	Program Results - Describe how you define successful results. Thoroughly describe what your program will achieve, and describe past successes you have had in similar projects. How does it all come together to address the workforce development needs of the target populations you are proposing to serve?	15%	12.00%	12.00%	8.00%	8.00%
5.6	Staffing Elements - Describe the staffing structure identified in the organizational chart and how it supports the program.	5%	4.00%	3.50%	3.50%	2.50%
5.7	Internal and Quality Controls - Describe your internal control framework for both programmatic and fiscal activities and how they relate. How will your organization provide management support and quality control for the program as a whole?	15%	12.00%	12.00%	9.00%	10.50%
5.8	Matching Resources - Describe the sources of your proposed match. How do these resources help to meet the goals of your program?	10%	8.00%	10.00%	8.00%	6.00%
Continuity	Continuity will be evaluated by assessing the Programmatic Narrative and associated attachments as a whole. The attachments included in the Continuity evaluation are: Executive Summary; Service Flow Chart; Program Organizational Chart; Proposed Performance Metrics Form	10%	8.33%	7.67%	6.00%	6.67%
<b>Total SPRA</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>80.67%</b>	<b>79.17%</b>	<b>61.00%</b>	<b>60.50%</b>

## **Evaluation Summary Notes from SPRA – ADW Re-entry**

### **FIT**

5.1 No comments

5.2 Bidder demonstrates use of evidence-based practices, and both experience and insight in their service-delivery to re-entry population.

The bidder does a good job of explaining its service flow and integrating evidence-based practices into its planned service delivery design.

5.3 Bidder describes multiple strategies, including innovative approaches, to engage participants. Specifics for how to engage dropouts are left to be inferred based on the strategies offered though.

Bidder fully articulates and describes strategies for engaging participants in pre-release and post-release services. The bidder's response does not directly address how staff will re-engage with participants who have dropped out of activities and services, instead the proposal concentrates on strategies to mitigate potential drop-outs.

5.4 No comments

5.5 The bidder has successfully operated employment and training programs for the adult reentry population and provides a description of past performance and outcomes achieved.

5.6 No comments

5.7 Detailed description of QC processes.

5.8 Substantial match documented

Continuity - Bidder's responses overall offer well-articulated strategies supported by evidence or experience, as well as insight to serving the target population.

## **HOPE**

5.1 The bidder provides innovative strategies for encouraging use of their services at CCDC (e.g., use of closed-circuit TVs with videos, bi-lingual materials, etc.). The bidder, however, discusses obtaining referrals and serving individuals from outside the CCDC. The bid is intended to provide pre- and post-release services to CCDC inmates only.

5.2 The bidder has a strong integrated service delivery model that incorporates the use of community partners providing other wrap-around services such as housing, counseling and supportive services. Again, the bidder discusses providing services to individuals from other justice-entities such as Nevada Department of Corrections and the Clark County District Attorney's office. The bid is intended to provide pre- and post-release services to CCDC inmates only.

5.3 Bidder does not address strategies for re-engaging participants who dropout.

The bidder does a good job of discussing their mentoring and case management approach, but this section lacks clarity on the actual communication strategies that will be used to keep participants engaged. The bidder does not address how it will re-engage participants who have dropped out of activities.

5.4 The bidder did not document how additional funding from collaborators led to positive results for participants, employers and program partners.

5.5 The bidder does a good job of using actual success stories to document program successes for justice-involved individuals. The bidder also provided strong validation of past performance to document its ability to offer employment and training programs of a similar nature. The bidder, however, combines proposed program outcomes across multiple facilities (CCDC, NDOC and District Attorney's Office) and should provide proposed outcomes for CCDC.

5.6 The bidder does not provide descriptive details about staffing levels at CCDC (pre-release) compared to its post-release service center at the Regional Justice Center.

5.7 Detailed description of internal and fiscal controls and QC processes.

5.8 Detailed description of a substantial match

Continuity - The bidder's service flowchart does not document referrals as part of the service flow process; the Proposed Performance worksheet does not differentiate performance outcomes for CCDC only and combines outcomes across all service locations (NDOC and District Attorney's Office).

## **SNV Chips**

5.1 Bidder addresses work within Clark County Detention Center, but does not discuss strategies for working with CCDC to identify candidates. Bidder also describes work with other incarceration centers, which are not a focus of this RFP.

The bidder's response states that one of their target groups will be individuals that have been released within the past year, which is outside the scope of work which states that all participants must be served in the pre-release and post-release phases of the program. The bidder plans to serve 150 individuals, but only 50 are from CCDC. The bidder also discusses serving individuals from outside CCDC through the Las Vegas Community Corrections Center, a federal halfway house, which is outside the scope of work. The bidder does not expound on how they will coordinate with CCDC staff to identify good candidates for the program.

5.2 Proposal would benefit from a description of the integrated service delivery model to be used, including how and when services not available at the Home Office are provided.

The bidder does not present evidence-based practices for serving the adult reentry population nor does the bidder address common barriers among the reentry population that may affect employment prospects such as mental health issues and substance and alcohol abuse.

5.3 Bidder does not discuss engagement of dropouts. Additionally, proposal would benefit from strategies specifically targeting the re-entry population.

The bidder does a good job of explaining how it will use workshops (e.g., family reunification, financial literacy, self-care) to keep participants engaged and informed. The bidder does not address what strategies they will use to specifically re-engage participants who have dropped out of the program. The bidder states that it will conduct employment site visits to stay engaged with participants, but provides no descriptive language about how these visits will be coordinated with employers and frequency.

5.4 The bidder does a good job of listing their partnerships with workforce development system partners, social service agencies and employers. It is also unclear which partners can provide coordinate services in the pre-release and post-release phases of the service continuum.

5.5 Proposal would benefit from a discussion of strategies that specifically target the re-entry population to be served, including the barriers anticipated or the partnerships in place to meet unanticipated participant needs.

The bidder response provides details about proposed outcomes for the adult reentry population, but the discussion lacks cohesion with how the bidder has provided successful service strategies in the past to achieve desired outcomes. The bidder's response does not provide evidence of past or current experience with similar program design nor is it clear.

5.6 The bidder's response does not clearly outline which staff will serve pre-release and post-release adult reentry population; the response is not specific to the target population.

5.7 Limited description of QC processes.

## 5.8 Detailed description of cash and in-kind match.

Continuity - The Proposed Performance Metrics Form includes adult reentrants recruited from outside the CCDC facility, which makes it difficult to assess outcomes for CCDC pre-release and post-release adult entrants. The bidder's response does not provide clarity on service interventions offered pre-release to CCDC participants compared to interventions intended post-release.

## **Bridge Counseling**

5.1 Bidder does not articulate employment-related services that will be provided to participants.

The bidder does not address its target population within the CCDC nor does the bidder discuss how it will coordinate with CCDC to identify good candidates for the program. The bidder also discusses serving individuals from outside the CCDC facility (i.e., Bureau of Prison, U.S. parole and Probation and U.S. Pretrial Programs), which is outside the scope of work. The bidder also discusses serving individuals post-release from CCDC that were not part of the pre-release population, which is also outside the scope of work.

5.2 Bidder demonstrates insight with wrap-around pre- and post-release services; though program is designed to serve populations outside of CCDC.

The bidder states that they will enhance in-custody (pre-release) vocational training programs based on labor market data, but the proposal lacks a discussion of existing CCDC vocational training programs already available, which suggests a lack of coordination with existing One-Stop and technical training providers within the community.

5.3 Unclear what methods will be used to maintain contact with participants. Re-engagement strategies for participants who have dropped out is not addressed.

The bidder does a good job of describing its Supported Employment position to assist participants in maintaining employment. The bidder does not address strategies for re-engaging participants who have dropped out of program activities nor is there mention of communication strategies/methods for keeping participants engaged.

5.4 Bidder states that it holds multiple MOUs with partner organizations but does not describe how combined services support participant or programmatic objectives.

The bidder describes other funding sources but does not link these additional resources to positive results for program participants.

5.5 Bidder indicates metrics that will be tracked but does not identify a goal and/or quantitative objective within each measure to be achieved.

The bidder does a good job of articulating planned program outcomes, but does not address past successes

5.6 Staff are clearly experts in mental health and recovery, but it is unclear who will provide coordinated employment services.

Strong discussion of mental health and substance abuse counseling services and staff qualifications by bidder. The bidder does not address how staff will work to connect participants to employment and training services nor is there a discussion of each location within the pre-release (CCDC) and post-release locations.

5.7 Limited description of QC processes.

5.8 Limited description with a limited match.

Continuity - Proposal is clear, though bidder may be unclear about the scope of work.

The bidder's program flow chart shows service locations outside of CCDC (i.e., NV State Parole and Probation, Local Courts, Federal Prisons), which are outside the scope of work. The Proposed Performance worksheet contains participants outside of CCDC, as mentioned above, which makes it difficult to assess CCDC planned metrics.

**20. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION** Accept the Ad-hoc Selection Panel's recommendation to award a new contract to Youth Advocate Programs to provide WIOA Title I Youth services in the Youth Re-entry cluster. The award amount shall not exceed \$650,000. This is a new competitive procurement, which allows for a contract with an initial one-year term with up to three extensions of one year each. Upon approval by the WC Board and authorization by the Local Elected Officials Consortium, the contract and budget period shall be July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020. *Jack Martin, Chair*

**Selection Panel Consensus Ranking  
Youth Re-entry**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Proposer</b>
1	Youth Advocate Programs
2	SUMNU Marketing
3	Nevada Partners, Inc.

**Current Performance**

**Work Based Learning Pilot - YAP**

**PYTD January 31, 2019**

**Population Served:**

Work based learning pilot - Youth

**Performance Metrics:**

Enrollments:	30 enrollments /	57 goal =	53% of goal achieved
Work-Based Learning:	39 Work-Based Learning /	50 prior enrollments =	78% did Work-Based Learning
Trainings:	3 trainings /	50 prior enrollments =	6% were trained
Placement:	19 placements /	50 prior enrollments =	38% were placed
Average Wage:	\$ 9.64 for placements		
Expenditures:	52% of contract expended		

**Comments:** No concerns noted.

\*Work-Based Learning, Trainings and placement are measured on the prior cohort enrollments due to the fact that entire cycles of placement can be more accurately evaluated.

**Selection Panel Notes – Youth Re-entry**

**Youth Advocate Programs**

- Comprehensive, complete, good history with Spring Mountain Youth Camp.
- 60 Youth. Programming services appear more simultaneous, developing education and workplace skills together. Use of appropriate educational assessments and work readiness assessments (WorkKeys) focus on building skills and thought processes resulting in success. Career exploration and pathway identification is more thorough.
- Project understanding of target population and outreach strategies. Articulation explaining partners and collaborations. Low past performance ratings.
- Best understanding of project...impressive package and writing...
- Education at forefront. Like the initial contact at DJJS. Harbor? Clear and well-written RFP, but not very specific throughout. Lists partners, but doesn't describe the

partnerships in depth. What in-school resources are being used? Track record of success with DJJS.

### **Sumnu Marketing**

- 5.2 Program Design – The program design is well-made providing structure throughout. From eligibility and intake, youth assessment and system design to usher their clients through the Youth program. The system has success pillars to support their clients; mentorship, entrepreneurship (great focus), internship, allowing their clients to look inward and discover greatness within themselves oppose to always looking outward. Note: Agree with initial reviewer.
- 5.3 Continued Engagement – I would have liked a system design to target those that drop the program. Often we highlighted the success but fail to address the failures. However, Sumnu provided excellent articulation of a robust engagement plan for youth once assessment is complete, which includes monthly tracking and monitoring of their clients progress. Note: Agree with ignition reviewer.
- 5.4 Collaborations – The cultivation and nurturing of collaborative partnerships in this sub-section is well articulated and well designed. This approach maximizes the possibilities for their clients. “Association brings about assimilation”. Note: Agree with initial reviewer.
- No plan or history to treat kids.
- 100 youth. Would like to see clearer picture of how they will assist clients with basic skill deficiencies, such as reading, writing and math. Appreciate the connection with the superintendent and CSN president, but would like to see on the ground connections as well. Like the entrepreneurial bent to the programming and clearly identified work experiences.
- Clear understanding of target population along with outreach strategies. Clear program design and engagement strategies. Clear human resource management structure. Top proposal.
- No experience at all.
- Close Second to YAP. Like the number of foster youth being targeted. Like the relationship with GOED, DETR, etc. and meaningful service projects. Mentions PAYBAC and Woodhouse. Not sure what he plans on doing with CCSD – PAYBAC is middle school. Don’t now Mentoring Mindsets, and question some of his partners and their impact or consistency, no CCSD program? Where are these mentors from? 100 Black Men and the Urban Chamber meeting? No Hispanic or Latino groups?

### **Nevada Partners, Inc.**

- Below standard scores
- 135 re-entry youth. Programming has had results. Focus on educational attainment is light and would like to see use of WorkKeys and curriculum developing these much needed workplace competencies.

- Least effective proposal. Struggled to articulate target population and outreach strategies along with engagement. Low past performance.
- Not that good of package turned in, but does have some experience.
- Can't read the flow chart. Past numbers and review are worrisome, and I would like to include more foster care population. Appreciate what they have on site, but who are they working with at CCSD, other outside of MBK? Very vague. Education I not at the forefront, but I like the partnership with US Bank.

<b>SPRA - Evaluation Summary</b>					
<b>Youth Re-entry</b>					
<b>Prompt #</b>	<b>Prompt</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>YAP</b>	<b>Sumnu</b>	<b>NPI</b>
5.1	Target Population and Outreach - How will this project and the service location(s) address the workforce development needs of the Youth Cluster that you are proposing to serve? Describe any target populations and outreach activities.	10%	8.00%	8.50%	5.50%
5.2	Program Design - Describe your overall program design and how a participant moves through the program from start to finish.	15%	12.50%	13.50%	10.50%
5.3	Continued Engagement - Describe your strategies to keep participants actively engaged as they progress through the program.	10%	5.33%	6.67%	3.67%
5.4	Collaborations - Describe your current and/or past collaborations with workforce development system partners, employers, and/or other community stakeholders. How do these partnerships contribute to positive results?	10%	7.50%	8.00%	5.50%
5.5	Program Results - Describe how you define successful results. Thoroughly describe what your program will achieve, and describe past successes you have had in similar projects. How does it all come together to address the workforce development needs of the target populations you are proposing to serve?	15%	12.50%	8.50%	8.50%
5.6	Staffing Elements - Describe the staffing structure identified in the organizational chart and how it supports the program.	5%	4.50%	4.50%	3.00%
5.7	Internal and Quality Controls - Describe your internal control framework for both programmatic and fiscal activities and how they relate. How will your organization provide management support and quality control for the program as a whole?	15%	12.00%	10.50%	9.00%
5.8	Matching Resources - Describe the sources of your proposed match. How do these resources help to meet the goals of your program?	10%	8.00%	6.00%	8.00%
Continuity	Continuity will be evaluated by assessing the Programmatic Narrative and associated attachments as a whole. The attachments included in the Continuity evaluation are: Executive Summary; Service Flow Chart; Program Organizational Chart; Proposed Performance Metrics Form	10%	8.67%	8.67%	6.33%
<b>Total SPRA</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>79.00%</b>	<b>74.83%</b>	<b>60.00%</b>

## Evaluation Summary Notes from SPRA – Youth Reentry

### YAP

5.1 The bidder states that they already have a pre-existing relationship with Spring Mountain Youth Camp and will solidify the referral process if they win the contract.

Bidder discusses participant needs and how they will be met, as well as outreach strategy to recruit them.

5.2 "Bidder indicates that post-release services will be conducted at the YAP office located in North Las Vegas and participant homes, communities, schools, etc. Bidder describes various evidence-based practices, including motivational interviewing, cultural responsiveness, strengths-based approaches, and trauma responsiveness."

Bidder describes evidence-based practices and integrated services throughout the duration of services.

5.3 Bidder describes various strategies for maintaining engagement, including mentors and individualized support. Bidder describes follow-up activities that don't go beyond basic telephone communication. The response fails to mention strategies for re-engaging youth who have dropped out.

Bidder identifies several engagement strategies while youth are enrolled, and implies services to encourage engagement after exit; does not address engaging dropouts.

5.4 Bidder describes various partnerships but does not elaborate much on the mutual benefit provided to partners or participants from these partnerships, plan for warm hand-off, etc. Bidder does describe how partnerships offer support to partnerships.

Bidder identifies numerous educational, employer, and community partners that currently support services for youth.

5.5 Bidder describes successful results as they relate to youth's success. Bidder describes goals and past performance.

Bidder discusses successful results and provides evidence of past successes in southern Nevada.

5.6 The management plan and staffing roles are clearly defined.

Bidder discusses staffing structure as well as training opportunities and obligations that support the program.

5.7 Detailed description of internal and fiscal controls and QC processes.

5.8 Meets the requirements though description is limited.

Continuity - The flow chart and org chart clearly support the narrative.

Proposal is organized clearly and thoughtfully, responding fully to all prompts, and bidder demonstrates the ability to effectively administer the program.

## Sumnu

5.1 Though the outreach section does not articulate the plan for conducting outreach at Spring Mountain Youth Camp, the plan is stated in the program design section.

Bidder thoughtfully discusses youth needs and strategies employed to meet them, but does not address outreach strategy in this section. Bidder did add an outreach section to 5.2.

5.2 The bidder describes a well-designed program with several evidence-based practices, including mentoring, trauma-informed care, several assessments, such as the ACE, etc.

Bidder describes a comprehensive service flow which leverages highly qualified staff and key partners at almost every step or program element.

5.3 The bidder describes various strategies for keeping participants engaged, including career counseling, behavioral counseling, case management support, and workshops, as well as monthly progress reports connected to their individual employment plan. The bidder does state that the program will provide support for youth that struggle with the program; however, it does not describe the various strategies for re-engaging youth. Follow-up is mentioned in the design section; however, specific strategies are not described.

Bidder describes several engagement strategies available both during program and after exit. Bidder does not address methods for engaging youth or dropouts however.

5.4 Bidder clearly describes how past and current partnerships will contribute to success for partners and participants.

Bidder articulates partnerships and anticipated impact of those relationships. (One minor detail that would be helpful to discuss is whether the mentoring partner - 100 Black Men - is able to effectively mentor youth of all backgrounds, genders, and abilities.)

5.5 The bidder does not elaborate on past results, nor does it mention much about current goals.

Bidder does not speak to past successes, though does address expectations here and in previous sections.

5.6 The staffing roles are clearly defined.

Bidder discusses key roles as well as roles likely to positively influence successful outcomes such as a certified rehabilitation counselor.

5.7 Detailed description of staffing but vague description of QC.

5.8 Impressive partnerships but very hard to quantify matches.

Continuity - This was a really well-written and engaging proposal to read. The flow chart and org chart are also clear and easy to follow.

Overall proposal is well written and demonstrates the staffing and partnerships to serve the target population.

## **NPI**

5.1 The bidder fails to articulate how the youth reentry workforce development needs will be met. The bidder states that they will work with Spring Mountain Youth Camp to identify good candidates for youth.

Bidder describes youth needs in broad terms only. Bidder also states they will ensure a proper referral system, but do not describe the system.

5.2 The bidder uses several evidence-based practices, such as mentoring, etc. The participant's flow through the program is not clear.

Bidder does not indicate how exit or follow-up services are incorporated into the program design.

5.3 The bidder discusses several strategies for keeping participants engaged in the program, such as wraparound supports and workshops. However, the response does not mention follow-up strategies or strategies for keeping participants engaged if they drop out.

Bidder repeat program elements from previous sections, but largely do not address strategies for maintaining youth engagement. (Bidder does mention weekly meetings with career coach to reaffirm or adjust ISS, though does not discuss how contact is maintained.)

5.4 The bidder describes two partnerships the role for each partner. However, the response does not mention how these partnerships contribute to positive results for program partners, job seekers, and employers.

Bidder discusses several partnerships with justice system and community services. Would like more detail about the impact these current partnerships have made for participants to date.

5.5 Bidder describes successful results but does not articulate desired goals in connection with the roles of specific partners.

Bidder repeats information from previous sections before discussing service outcomes.

5.6 The staffing roles are vague and not clearly defined.

5.7 The approach seems limited and does not include detailed descriptions of systems in place.

5.8 Although the first part of the answer is hard to substantiate, the in-kind match through FIT is substantial.

Continuity - The flow chart is difficult to read both in print and in electronic copy.

It is unclear why the flow chart includes a challenges box and does not include exit or follow-up services. Proposal repeats itself in several sections, and in several sections would benefit from more substantive responses.

**21. INFORMATION:** Programs Committee members' comments and updates  
*Jack Martin, Chair*

**22. SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION:** Members of the public may now comment on any matter or topic, which is relevant to or within the authority or jurisdiction of the Committee. You may comment now even if you commented earlier, however, please do not simply repeat the same comment you previously made. Please clearly state and spell your name for the record. Each public comment will be limited to three (3) minutes. *Jack Martin, Chair*

**23. ADJOURNMENT**