

**WORKFORCE CONNECTIONS
ADULT & DISLOCATED WORKER PROGRAM COMMITTEE**

Wednesday, May 13, 2015

9:00 AM

Rosalie Boulware Conference Room

6330 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 150

Las Vegas, NV 89146

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

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

City of North Las Vegas, 2250 Las Vegas Blvd. N., North Las Vegas, NV
City of Las Vegas, City Clerk's Office, 495 S. Main St., Las Vegas, NV
Clark County, County Clerk's Office 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, NV
Esmeralda County Courthouse, 233 Crook Street, Goldfield, NV
Henderson City Hall, 240 Water Street, Henderson, NV
City Hall, Boulder City, 401 California Ave., Boulder City, NV
Workforce Connections, 6330 W. Charleston Blvd., Las Vegas, NV
Nevada JobConnect, 3405 S. Maryland Pkwy., Las Vegas, NV
Lincoln County 181 Main Street Courthouse, Pioche, NV
Nye County School District, 484 S. West St., Pahrump, NV
Pahrump Chamber of Commerce, 1302 S. Highway 160, Pahrump, NV

This Agenda is also available at www.nvworkforceconnections.org.

COMMENTARY BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC

This Board complies with Nevada's Open Meeting Law, by taking Public Comment at the beginning of the meeting immediately after the Board approves the Agenda and 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 Session of the agenda; we respectfully request that you observe the following:

1. Please state your name and home address 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 insure that all relevant information is presented.

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

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 at kford@snvwc.org. Such supporting materials are available at the front desk of Workforce Connections, at 6330 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 150, Las Vegas, Nevada 89146.

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

An Equal Opportunity Employer/Program

MATTERS IN THIS AGENDA MAY BE TAKEN OUT OF ORDER

Adult & Dislocated Worker Program Committee members: Hannah Brown; Chair; Daniel Rose, Vice-Chair; Chelle Bize'; Mark Edgel; Dr. David Lee; Dr. Cecilia Maldonado; Valerie Murzl; Lynda Parven; Bart Patterson; Charles Perry; Maggie Arias-Petrel; Bill Regenhardt.

All items listed on this Agenda are for action by the Adult and Dislocated Worker Program 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 Chairperson, 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 and roll call.
2. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: Approve the agenda with inclusions of any emergency items and deletion of any items.
3. 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 and state your address for the record. Each public comment will be limited to three (3) minutes.
4. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: Accept staff's recommendation to award and execute a contract with HELP of Southern Nevada as a One-Stop Affiliate Site--South. The award amount shall not exceed \$1,000,000. Upon approval by the WC Board, the contract period will be July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016, with an option to renew annually for an additional three years based on performance and available funding 1
5. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: Accept staff's recommendation to award and execute a contract with Nevada Partners, Inc. as a One-Stop Affiliate Site--North. The award amount shall not exceed \$1,000,000. Upon approval by the WC Board, the contract period will be July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016, with an option to renew annually for an additional three years based on performance and available funding 7
6. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: Accept staff's recommendation to award and execute a contract with Goodwill of Southern Nevada to deliver career and training services to Adults with Disabilities. The award amount shall not exceed \$600,000. Upon approval by the WC Board, the contract period will be July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016, with an option to renew annually for an additional three years based on performance and available funding 13
7. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: Accept staff's recommendation to award and execute a contract with Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow to deliver career and training services to Post-Release Re-Entry Adults. The award amount shall not exceed \$600,000. Upon approval by the WC Board, the contract period will be July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016, with an option to renew annually for an additional three years based on performance and available funding 19

- 8. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept staff’s recommendation to award and execute a contract with Arbor E&T dba ResCare Workforce Services, as a One-Stop Center Operator. The award amount shall not exceed \$2,450,000. Upon approval by the WC Board, the contract period will be July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016, with an option to renew annually for an additional three years based on performance and available funding 25

- 9. COMMITTEE COMMENTS** 31

- 10. 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 Board. 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 and state address for the record. Each comment will be limited to three (3) minutes 32

- 11. Adjournment**

1. **Call to Order, confirmation of posting, and roll call:**

2. **DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION:** Approve the agenda with inclusions of any emergency items and/or deletions of any items.

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

4. **DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept staff's recommendation to award and execute a contract with HELP of Southern Nevada as a One-Stop Affiliate Site--South. The award amount shall not exceed \$1,000,000. Upon approval by the WC Board, the contract period will be July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016, with an option to renew annually for an additional three years based on performance and available funding.

Workforce Connections PY 2015 Proposals



Organization

% Score

ADW OSAS - South

HELP of SOUTHERN NEVADA	80.66%
SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL HOUSING AUTHORITY	77.33%

To: Ardell Galbreth, Executive Director, Workforce Connections
From: Vinz Koller, Kristin Wolff, Andrew Wiegand, Social Policy Research Associates
Date: May 6, 2015
Subject: Summary of Methodology and Results of the 2015 Request For Proposal Scoring Process

SPR Background and Qualifications

Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) is a small, employee-owned firm based in Oakland, CA with an outstanding national reputation for conducting high quality evaluations of workforce development, and education programs and supporting such programs through expert technical assistance and capacity building. For more than two decades, SPR has conducted over 100 major process and outcome evaluations of diverse programs at the local, state, and national levels and has trained thousands of practitioners in leadership development, program design, and operational effectiveness.

SPR is known nationally for its evaluations of programs housed in American Job Centers (AJCs), including the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Adult and Dislocated Worker and Youth programs, the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program, the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP), the WIA Indian and Native American Program, and the WIA National Farmworker Jobs Program. SPR has conducted some landmark evaluations on American Job Centers, their pre-cursors, One-Stop Career Centers. As the national expert on WIA, SPR is currently leading the implementation study for DOL's WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker Gold Standard Evaluation. As part of this study, SPR staff members have conducted multiple rounds of site visits to more than 80 AJCs in 19 local workforce investment areas across the country and are authoring multiple briefing papers on AJC networks and various aspects of their operations.

Background and Context

Workforce Connections (WC) contracted with Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) for assistance with the agency's 2015 procurement process. Specifically, SPR was asked to help WC develop a fair and impartial scoring rubric and score incoming proposals.

Approach

The SPR team worked closely with WC throughout the project. The SPR approach is described below.

The SPR Team

SPR assembled a team of seven: it consisted of SPR's two most experienced procurement experts to assist in the analysis of the procurement process and to lead the development of the scoring methodology. These experts were joined by the director of research who served as specialist on scoring and ranking methods. The team also included four research associates and assistants who served as primary scorers, all well versed in SPR's methodology and knowledgeable about the workforce development system.

Reviewing Existing Materials and Current Effective Practices

SPR reviewed WC past scoring rubrics and tools, together with all 2015 requests for proposals (RFPs):

- Adults and Dislocated Workers One-Stop Affiliate Site Services
- Adults with Disabilities Services
- Adult Re-Entry Post-Release Services
- Youth One-Stop Affiliate Site Services
- Youth Dropout Recovery Services
- One-Stop Operator Services

For comparison purposes, SPR also reviewed recently completed procurement processes involving comparable services by ten government agencies and major foundations, and reviewed several academic papers on effective practices in procurement and scoring methodologies.

Developing the Scoring Rubric

SPR prepared six scoring rubrics – one for each of the RFP types for which services were requested. Each rubric comprised three main sections corresponding to those contained in the RFPs: Demonstrated Performance, Program Narrative, and Fiscal Narrative/Budget. Each section of the rubrics included subsections similar in concept, but specific to the corresponding RFP. (The One-Stop System Operator RFP and rubric contained four sections but was otherwise similar).

SPR then developed indicators for each subsection of each type of RFP – again, similar in concept but specific to the corresponding RFP. The number of indicators ranged from 24-29. Each indicator was scored on a 4-point scale using the following scoring guide:

4 = Exceeds criteria. Proposal also offers insight, capacity, observations, or ideas beyond what was expected.

3 = Criteria is fully met: Response meets all requirements in the RFP.

2 = Criteria is partially met.

1 = Criteria is not met.

SPR employed this universal four-point scale for the following reasons:

- Universal scoring tends to be simpler for scorers to understand and therefore less prone to error than a mix of scales on a single score sheet.
- A four-point scale avoids the problem of “moving to the middle.” When objective scorers have the option of a three on a five-point scale, or a two on a three-point scale, they tend to overuse these middle scores. A four-point scale tends to encourage a closer reading and a stronger commitment to a score.
- Given the total number of questions and possible points, SPR determined that a four-point scale would offer a sufficient range of total scores to allow for a clear ranking of the submitted proposals. In addition, using this scoring approach, failure to answer one or even a few questions would not – on its own – eliminate an otherwise qualified proposal from consideration.

In addition, because the definitions of each numerical score were strictly related to meeting the criteria in the RFP, they discourage the use of more subjective interpretations as a qualitative definition (such as “excellent”) might do.

Training the Team

After senior researchers successfully blind-tested the scoring rubrics on one proposal from each of the six categories, all scorers were trained on how to use them. During the training, SPR reviewed the scoring rubrics and the scoring sheet, and scored hypothetical responses to insure that scorers were interpreting them similarly. When team members had questions, the questions and responses were shared with all team members to insure scorer consistency – also known as inter-rater reliability.

Rating Proposals

Workforce Connections conducted an initial RFP compliance screen of all submitted proposals, eliminating those that were incomplete. Twenty-six proposals passed this screen and were submitted to SPR. As noted, each proposal contained three main sections: Demonstrated Ability (which included the Funder Evaluation Form), Program Narrative, and Fiscal Narrative/Budget.

Section on Demonstrated Ability and Program Narrative

The first two sections of each proposal were read fully by three members of the team and scored by two. The two scores were averaged to determine the final score. In only one case did scores diverge by more than one point in any one section, for a total score that diverged more substantially. In this case, both scores were eliminated and two different members of the team

scored the proposals independently again. They arrived at scores that were consistent with each other. These scores were averaged, and entered as the total. Even in this instance, the re-scoring did not change the status of the total score.

Funder Evaluation Form

As a part of the response package, bidders were required to secure a prior funder to complete for them a Funder Evaluation Form. Bidders who were prior contractors with Workforce Connections were evaluated by them. Otherwise, a funder of the bidder's choosing completed the form. The form assessed the performance of the bidder in ten areas, using a four-point scale, for a maximum total of 40 points. These points comprised 20% of the total score for bidders who had contracted with Workforce Connections before and 15% of the total score for bidders who would be first-time contractors.

Section on Fiscal Narrative/Budget

The Fiscal Narrative and Budget were scored separately from the narrative proposals by the two senior members of the team with experience in workforce procurement and in budgeting for workforce services. They were scored on four indicators with a focus on compliance – the degree to which bidders provided precisely the information requested in the narrative, and in the summary budget and expense categories affiliated with the budget and RFP. They were scored using the same four-point scale described above.

Proposals in Response to the One-Stop Operator RFP

The two One-Stop Operator proposals were rated independently by two senior team members with experience in One-Stop systems operations. In each case, the two sets of scores – which were very similar – were averaged for a final score.

Quality Control

As noted, each proposal was read in its entirety by three team members and scored by two, with a high degree of consistency in scoring.

Results

Of the 26 proposals submitted, 15 met the qualifications to be considered for a contract award (75 out of 100 points, as noted in the RFPs). All of the RFPs for which responses were submitted (no proposals were submitted in response to the Youth One-Stop Affiliate Site Southwest RFP) generated at least one qualifying proposal. The scores ranged from a low of 58.22 (an outlier, the next lowest score was 66.48) to a high of 80.66.

These proposals and their corresponding scores are listed in Attachment A.

5. **DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept staff's recommendation to award and execute a contract with Nevada Partners, Inc. as a One-Stop Affiliate Site--North. The award amount shall not exceed \$1,000,000. Upon approval by the WC Board, the contract period will be July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016, with an option to renew annually for an additional three years based on performance and available funding.

Workforce Connections PY 2015 Proposals

Organization	% Score
ADW OSAS - North	
NEVADA PARTNERS INC.	79.16%
GOODWILL OF SOUTHERN NEVADA	77.52%
LAS VEGAS URBAN LEAGUE	76.85%
FOUNDATION FOR AN INDEPENDENT TOMORROW	76.23%
SALVATION ARMY	72.31%

To: Ardell Galbreth, Executive Director, Workforce Connections
From: Vinz Koller, Kristin Wolff, Andrew Wiegand, Social Policy Research Associates
Date: May 6, 2015
Subject: Summary of Methodology and Results of the 2015 Request For Proposal Scoring Process

SPR Background and Qualifications

Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) is a small, employee-owned firm based in Oakland, CA with an outstanding national reputation for conducting high quality evaluations of workforce development, and education programs and supporting such programs through expert technical assistance and capacity building. For more than two decades, SPR has conducted over 100 major process and outcome evaluations of diverse programs at the local, state, and national levels and has trained thousands of practitioners in leadership development, program design, and operational effectiveness.

SPR is known nationally for its evaluations of programs housed in American Job Centers (AJCs), including the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Adult and Dislocated Worker and Youth programs, the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program, the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP), the WIA Indian and Native American Program, and the WIA National Farmworker Jobs Program. SPR has conducted some landmark evaluations on American Job Centers, their pre-cursors, One-Stop Career Centers. As the national expert on WIA, SPR is currently leading the implementation study for DOL's WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker Gold Standard Evaluation. As part of this study, SPR staff members have conducted multiple rounds of site visits to more than 80 AJCs in 19 local workforce investment areas across the country and are authoring multiple briefing papers on AJC networks and various aspects of their operations.

Background and Context

Workforce Connections (WC) contracted with Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) for assistance with the agency's 2015 procurement process. Specifically, SPR was asked to help WC develop a fair and impartial scoring rubric and score incoming proposals.

Approach

The SPR team worked closely with WC throughout the project. The SPR approach is described below.

The SPR Team

SPR assembled a team of seven: it consisted of SPR's two most experienced procurement experts to assist in the analysis of the procurement process and to lead the development of the scoring methodology. These experts were joined by the director of research who served as specialist on scoring and ranking methods. The team also included four research associates and assistants who served as primary scorers, all well versed in SPR's methodology and knowledgeable about the workforce development system.

Reviewing Existing Materials and Current Effective Practices

SPR reviewed WC past scoring rubrics and tools, together with all 2015 requests for proposals (RFPs):

- Adults and Dislocated Workers One-Stop Affiliate Site Services
- Adults with Disabilities Services
- Adult Re-Entry Post-Release Services
- Youth One-Stop Affiliate Site Services
- Youth Dropout Recovery Services
- One-Stop Operator Services

For comparison purposes, SPR also reviewed recently completed procurement processes involving comparable services by ten government agencies and major foundations, and reviewed several academic papers on effective practices in procurement and scoring methodologies.

Developing the Scoring Rubric

SPR prepared six scoring rubrics – one for each of the RFP types for which services were requested. Each rubric comprised three main sections corresponding to those contained in the RFPs: Demonstrated Performance, Program Narrative, and Fiscal Narrative/Budget. Each section of the rubrics included subsections similar in concept, but specific to the corresponding RFP. (The One-Stop System Operator RFP and rubric contained four sections but was otherwise similar).

SPR then developed indicators for each subsection of each type of RFP – again, similar in concept but specific to the corresponding RFP. The number of indicators ranged from 24-29. Each indicator was scored on a 4-point scale using the following scoring guide:

4 = Exceeds criteria. Proposal also offers insight, capacity, observations, or ideas beyond what was expected.

3 = Criteria is fully met: Response meets all requirements in the RFP.

2 = Criteria is partially met.

1 = Criteria is not met.

SPR employed this universal four-point scale for the following reasons:

- Universal scoring tends to be simpler for scorers to understand and therefore less prone to error than a mix of scales on a single score sheet.
- A four-point scale avoids the problem of “moving to the middle.” When objective scorers have the option of a three on a five-point scale, or a two on a three-point scale, they tend to overuse these middle scores. A four-point scale tends to encourage a closer reading and a stronger commitment to a score.
- Given the total number of questions and possible points, SPR determined that a four-point scale would offer a sufficient range of total scores to allow for a clear ranking of the submitted proposals. In addition, using this scoring approach, failure to answer one or even a few questions would not – on its own – eliminate an otherwise qualified proposal from consideration.

In addition, because the definitions of each numerical score were strictly related to meeting the criteria in the RFP, they discourage the use of more subjective interpretations as a qualitative definition (such as “excellent”) might do.

Training the Team

After senior researchers successfully blind-tested the scoring rubrics on one proposal from each of the six categories, all scorers were trained on how to use them. During the training, SPR reviewed the scoring rubrics and the scoring sheet, and scored hypothetical responses to insure that scorers were interpreting them similarly. When team members had questions, the questions and responses were shared with all team members to insure scorer consistency – also known as inter-rater reliability.

Rating Proposals

Workforce Connections conducted an initial RFP compliance screen of all submitted proposals, eliminating those that were incomplete. Twenty-six proposals passed this screen and were submitted to SPR. As noted, each proposal contained three main sections: Demonstrated Ability (which included the Funder Evaluation Form), Program Narrative, and Fiscal Narrative/Budget.

Section on Demonstrated Ability and Program Narrative

The first two sections of each proposal were read fully by three members of the team and scored by two. The two scores were averaged to determine the final score. In only one case did scores diverge by more than one point in any one section, for a total score that diverged more substantially. In this case, both scores were eliminated and two different members of the team

scored the proposals independently again. They arrived at scores that were consistent with each other. These scores were averaged, and entered as the total. Even in this instance, the re-scoring did not change the status of the total score.

Funder Evaluation Form

As a part of the response package, bidders were required to secure a prior funder to complete for them a Funder Evaluation Form. Bidders who were prior contractors with Workforce Connections were evaluated by them. Otherwise, a funder of the bidder's choosing completed the form. The form assessed the performance of the bidder in ten areas, using a four-point scale, for a maximum total of 40 points. These points comprised 20% of the total score for bidders who had contracted with Workforce Connections before and 15% of the total score for bidders who would be first-time contractors.

Section on Fiscal Narrative/Budget

The Fiscal Narrative and Budget were scored separately from the narrative proposals by the two senior members of the team with experience in workforce procurement and in budgeting for workforce services. They were scored on four indicators with a focus on compliance – the degree to which bidders provided precisely the information requested in the narrative, and in the summary budget and expense categories affiliated with the budget and RFP. They were scored using the same four-point scale described above.

Proposals in Response to the One-Stop Operator RFP

The two One-Stop Operator proposals were rated independently by two senior team members with experience in One-Stop systems operations. In each case, the two sets of scores – which were very similar – were averaged for a final score.

Quality Control

As noted, each proposal was read in its entirety by three team members and scored by two, with a high degree of consistency in scoring.

Results

Of the 26 proposals submitted, 15 met the qualifications to be considered for a contract award (75 out of 100 points, as noted in the RFPs). All of the RFPs for which responses were submitted (no proposals were submitted in response to the Youth One-Stop Affiliate Site Southwest RFP) generated at least one qualifying proposal. The scores ranged from a low of 58.22 (an outlier, the next lowest score was 66.48) to a high of 80.66.

These proposals and their corresponding scores are listed in Attachment A.

6. **DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept staff's recommendation to award and execute a contract with Goodwill of Southern Nevada to deliver career and training services to Adults with Disabilities. The award amount shall not exceed \$600,000. Upon approval by the WC Board, the contract period will be July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016, with an option to renew annually for an additional three years based on performance and available funding.

Workforce Connections PY 2015 Proposals

Organization	% Score
Adults with Disabilities	
GOODWILL OF SOUTHERN NEVADA	79.72%
EASTER SEALS	76.17%
NEVADA PARTNERS INC.	71.96%

To: Ardell Galbreth, Executive Director, Workforce Connections
From: Vinz Koller, Kristin Wolff, Andrew Wiegand, Social Policy Research Associates
Date: May 6, 2015
Subject: Summary of Methodology and Results of the 2015 Request For Proposal Scoring Process

SPR Background and Qualifications

Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) is a small, employee-owned firm based in Oakland, CA with an outstanding national reputation for conducting high quality evaluations of workforce development, and education programs and supporting such programs through expert technical assistance and capacity building. For more than two decades, SPR has conducted over 100 major process and outcome evaluations of diverse programs at the local, state, and national levels and has trained thousands of practitioners in leadership development, program design, and operational effectiveness.

SPR is known nationally for its evaluations of programs housed in American Job Centers (AJCs), including the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Adult and Dislocated Worker and Youth programs, the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program, the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP), the WIA Indian and Native American Program, and the WIA National Farmworker Jobs Program. SPR has conducted some landmark evaluations on American Job Centers, their pre-cursors, One-Stop Career Centers. As the national expert on WIA, SPR is currently leading the implementation study for DOL's WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker Gold Standard Evaluation. As part of this study, SPR staff members have conducted multiple rounds of site visits to more than 80 AJCs in 19 local workforce investment areas across the country and are authoring multiple briefing papers on AJC networks and various aspects of their operations.

Background and Context

Workforce Connections (WC) contracted with Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) for assistance with the agency's 2015 procurement process. Specifically, SPR was asked to help WC develop a fair and impartial scoring rubric and score incoming proposals.

Approach

The SPR team worked closely with WC throughout the project. The SPR approach is described below.

The SPR Team

SPR assembled a team of seven: it consisted of SPR's two most experienced procurement experts to assist in the analysis of the procurement process and to lead the development of the scoring methodology. These experts were joined by the director of research who served as specialist on scoring and ranking methods. The team also included four research associates and assistants who served as primary scorers, all well versed in SPR's methodology and knowledgeable about the workforce development system.

Reviewing Existing Materials and Current Effective Practices

SPR reviewed WC past scoring rubrics and tools, together with all 2015 requests for proposals (RFPs):

- Adults and Dislocated Workers One-Stop Affiliate Site Services
- Adults with Disabilities Services
- Adult Re-Entry Post-Release Services
- Youth One-Stop Affiliate Site Services
- Youth Dropout Recovery Services
- One-Stop Operator Services

For comparison purposes, SPR also reviewed recently completed procurement processes involving comparable services by ten government agencies and major foundations, and reviewed several academic papers on effective practices in procurement and scoring methodologies.

Developing the Scoring Rubric

SPR prepared six scoring rubrics – one for each of the RFP types for which services were requested. Each rubric comprised three main sections corresponding to those contained in the RFPs: Demonstrated Performance, Program Narrative, and Fiscal Narrative/Budget. Each section of the rubrics included subsections similar in concept, but specific to the corresponding RFP. (The One-Stop System Operator RFP and rubric contained four sections but was otherwise similar).

SPR then developed indicators for each subsection of each type of RFP – again, similar in concept but specific to the corresponding RFP. The number of indicators ranged from 24-29. Each indicator was scored on a 4-point scale using the following scoring guide:

4 = Exceeds criteria. Proposal also offers insight, capacity, observations, or ideas beyond what was expected.

3 = Criteria is fully met: Response meets all requirements in the RFP.

2 = Criteria is partially met.

1 = Criteria is not met.

SPR employed this universal four-point scale for the following reasons:

- Universal scoring tends to be simpler for scorers to understand and therefore less prone to error than a mix of scales on a single score sheet.
- A four-point scale avoids the problem of “moving to the middle.” When objective scorers have the option of a three on a five-point scale, or a two on a three-point scale, they tend to overuse these middle scores. A four-point scale tends to encourage a closer reading and a stronger commitment to a score.
- Given the total number of questions and possible points, SPR determined that a four-point scale would offer a sufficient range of total scores to allow for a clear ranking of the submitted proposals. In addition, using this scoring approach, failure to answer one or even a few questions would not – on its own – eliminate an otherwise qualified proposal from consideration.

In addition, because the definitions of each numerical score were strictly related to meeting the criteria in the RFP, they discourage the use of more subjective interpretations as a qualitative definition (such as “excellent”) might do.

Training the Team

After senior researchers successfully blind-tested the scoring rubrics on one proposal from each of the six categories, all scorers were trained on how to use them. During the training, SPR reviewed the scoring rubrics and the scoring sheet, and scored hypothetical responses to insure that scorers were interpreting them similarly. When team members had questions, the questions and responses were shared with all team members to insure scorer consistency – also known as inter-rater reliability.

Rating Proposals

Workforce Connections conducted an initial RFP compliance screen of all submitted proposals, eliminating those that were incomplete. Twenty-six proposals passed this screen and were submitted to SPR. As noted, each proposal contained three main sections: Demonstrated Ability (which included the Funder Evaluation Form), Program Narrative, and Fiscal Narrative/Budget.

Section on Demonstrated Ability and Program Narrative

The first two sections of each proposal were read fully by three members of the team and scored by two. The two scores were averaged to determine the final score. In only one case did scores diverge by more than one point in any one section, for a total score that diverged more substantially. In this case, both scores were eliminated and two different members of the team

scored the proposals independently again. They arrived at scores that were consistent with each other. These scores were averaged, and entered as the total. Even in this instance, the re-scoring did not change the status of the total score.

Funder Evaluation Form

As a part of the response package, bidders were required to secure a prior funder to complete for them a Funder Evaluation Form. Bidders who were prior contractors with Workforce Connections were evaluated by them. Otherwise, a funder of the bidder's choosing completed the form. The form assessed the performance of the bidder in ten areas, using a four-point scale, for a maximum total of 40 points. These points comprised 20% of the total score for bidders who had contracted with Workforce Connections before and 15% of the total score for bidders who would be first-time contractors.

Section on Fiscal Narrative/Budget

The Fiscal Narrative and Budget were scored separately from the narrative proposals by the two senior members of the team with experience in workforce procurement and in budgeting for workforce services. They were scored on four indicators with a focus on compliance – the degree to which bidders provided precisely the information requested in the narrative, and in the summary budget and expense categories affiliated with the budget and RFP. They were scored using the same four-point scale described above.

Proposals in Response to the One-Stop Operator RFP

The two One-Stop Operator proposals were rated independently by two senior team members with experience in One-Stop systems operations. In each case, the two sets of scores – which were very similar – were averaged for a final score.

Quality Control

As noted, each proposal was read in its entirety by three team members and scored by two, with a high degree of consistency in scoring.

Results

Of the 26 proposals submitted, 15 met the qualifications to be considered for a contract award (75 out of 100 points, as noted in the RFPs). All of the RFPs for which responses were submitted (no proposals were submitted in response to the Youth One-Stop Affiliate Site Southwest RFP) generated at least one qualifying proposal. The scores ranged from a low of 58.22 (an outlier, the next lowest score was 66.48) to a high of 80.66.

These proposals and their corresponding scores are listed in Attachment A.

7. **DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept staff's recommendation to award and execute a contract with Foundation for an Independent Tomorrow to deliver career and training services to Post-Release Re-Entry Adults. The award amount shall not exceed \$600,000. Upon approval by the WC Board, the contract period will be July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016, with an option to renew annually for an additional three years based on performance and available funding.

Workforce Connections PY 2015 Proposals

Organization	% Score
Adult Re-Entry Post Release	
FOUNDATION FOR AN INDEPENDENT TOMORROW	75.48%
THE MOVE PROJECT	70.60%
LAS VEGAS URBAN LEAGUE	66.48%

To: Ardell Galbreth, Executive Director, Workforce Connections
From: Vinz Koller, Kristin Wolff, Andrew Wiegand, Social Policy Research Associates
Date: May 6, 2015
Subject: Summary of Methodology and Results of the 2015 Request For Proposal Scoring Process

SPR Background and Qualifications

Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) is a small, employee-owned firm based in Oakland, CA with an outstanding national reputation for conducting high quality evaluations of workforce development, and education programs and supporting such programs through expert technical assistance and capacity building. For more than two decades, SPR has conducted over 100 major process and outcome evaluations of diverse programs at the local, state, and national levels and has trained thousands of practitioners in leadership development, program design, and operational effectiveness.

SPR is known nationally for its evaluations of programs housed in American Job Centers (AJCs), including the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Adult and Dislocated Worker and Youth programs, the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program, the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP), the WIA Indian and Native American Program, and the WIA National Farmworker Jobs Program. SPR has conducted some landmark evaluations on American Job Centers, their pre-cursors, One-Stop Career Centers. As the national expert on WIA, SPR is currently leading the implementation study for DOL's WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker Gold Standard Evaluation. As part of this study, SPR staff members have conducted multiple rounds of site visits to more than 80 AJCs in 19 local workforce investment areas across the country and are authoring multiple briefing papers on AJC networks and various aspects of their operations.

Background and Context

Workforce Connections (WC) contracted with Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) for assistance with the agency's 2015 procurement process. Specifically, SPR was asked to help WC develop a fair and impartial scoring rubric and score incoming proposals.

Approach

The SPR team worked closely with WC throughout the project. The SPR approach is described below.

The SPR Team

SPR assembled a team of seven: it consisted of SPR's two most experienced procurement experts to assist in the analysis of the procurement process and to lead the development of the scoring methodology. These experts were joined by the director of research who served as specialist on scoring and ranking methods. The team also included four research associates and assistants who served as primary scorers, all well versed in SPR's methodology and knowledgeable about the workforce development system.

Reviewing Existing Materials and Current Effective Practices

SPR reviewed WC past scoring rubrics and tools, together with all 2015 requests for proposals (RFPs):

- Adults and Dislocated Workers One-Stop Affiliate Site Services
- Adults with Disabilities Services
- Adult Re-Entry Post-Release Services
- Youth One-Stop Affiliate Site Services
- Youth Dropout Recovery Services
- One-Stop Operator Services

For comparison purposes, SPR also reviewed recently completed procurement processes involving comparable services by ten government agencies and major foundations, and reviewed several academic papers on effective practices in procurement and scoring methodologies.

Developing the Scoring Rubric

SPR prepared six scoring rubrics – one for each of the RFP types for which services were requested. Each rubric comprised three main sections corresponding to those contained in the RFPs: Demonstrated Performance, Program Narrative, and Fiscal Narrative/Budget. Each section of the rubrics included subsections similar in concept, but specific to the corresponding RFP. (The One-Stop System Operator RFP and rubric contained four sections but was otherwise similar).

SPR then developed indicators for each subsection of each type of RFP – again, similar in concept but specific to the corresponding RFP. The number of indicators ranged from 24-29. Each indicator was scored on a 4-point scale using the following scoring guide:

4 = Exceeds criteria. Proposal also offers insight, capacity, observations, or ideas beyond what was expected.

3 = Criteria is fully met: Response meets all requirements in the RFP.

2 = Criteria is partially met.

1 = Criteria is not met.

SPR employed this universal four-point scale for the following reasons:

- Universal scoring tends to be simpler for scorers to understand and therefore less prone to error than a mix of scales on a single score sheet.
- A four-point scale avoids the problem of “moving to the middle.” When objective scorers have the option of a three on a five-point scale, or a two on a three-point scale, they tend to overuse these middle scores. A four-point scale tends to encourage a closer reading and a stronger commitment to a score.
- Given the total number of questions and possible points, SPR determined that a four-point scale would offer a sufficient range of total scores to allow for a clear ranking of the submitted proposals. In addition, using this scoring approach, failure to answer one or even a few questions would not – on its own – eliminate an otherwise qualified proposal from consideration.

In addition, because the definitions of each numerical score were strictly related to meeting the criteria in the RFP, they discourage the use of more subjective interpretations as a qualitative definition (such as “excellent”) might do.

Training the Team

After senior researchers successfully blind-tested the scoring rubrics on one proposal from each of the six categories, all scorers were trained on how to use them. During the training, SPR reviewed the scoring rubrics and the scoring sheet, and scored hypothetical responses to insure that scorers were interpreting them similarly. When team members had questions, the questions and responses were shared with all team members to insure scorer consistency – also known as inter-rater reliability.

Rating Proposals

Workforce Connections conducted an initial RFP compliance screen of all submitted proposals, eliminating those that were incomplete. Twenty-six proposals passed this screen and were submitted to SPR. As noted, each proposal contained three main sections: Demonstrated Ability (which included the Funder Evaluation Form), Program Narrative, and Fiscal Narrative/Budget.

Section on Demonstrated Ability and Program Narrative

The first two sections of each proposal were read fully by three members of the team and scored by two. The two scores were averaged to determine the final score. In only one case did scores diverge by more than one point in any one section, for a total score that diverged more substantially. In this case, both scores were eliminated and two different members of the team

scored the proposals independently again. They arrived at scores that were consistent with each other. These scores were averaged, and entered as the total. Even in this instance, the re-scoring did not change the status of the total score.

Funder Evaluation Form

As a part of the response package, bidders were required to secure a prior funder to complete for them a Funder Evaluation Form. Bidders who were prior contractors with Workforce Connections were evaluated by them. Otherwise, a funder of the bidder's choosing completed the form. The form assessed the performance of the bidder in ten areas, using a four-point scale, for a maximum total of 40 points. These points comprised 20% of the total score for bidders who had contracted with Workforce Connections before and 15% of the total score for bidders who would be first-time contractors.

Section on Fiscal Narrative/Budget

The Fiscal Narrative and Budget were scored separately from the narrative proposals by the two senior members of the team with experience in workforce procurement and in budgeting for workforce services. They were scored on four indicators with a focus on compliance – the degree to which bidders provided precisely the information requested in the narrative, and in the summary budget and expense categories affiliated with the budget and RFP. They were scored using the same four-point scale described above.

Proposals in Response to the One-Stop Operator RFP

The two One-Stop Operator proposals were rated independently by two senior team members with experience in One-Stop systems operations. In each case, the two sets of scores – which were very similar – were averaged for a final score.

Quality Control

As noted, each proposal was read in its entirety by three team members and scored by two, with a high degree of consistency in scoring.

Results

Of the 26 proposals submitted, 15 met the qualifications to be considered for a contract award (75 out of 100 points, as noted in the RFPs). All of the RFPs for which responses were submitted (no proposals were submitted in response to the Youth One-Stop Affiliate Site Southwest RFP) generated at least one qualifying proposal. The scores ranged from a low of 58.22 (an outlier, the next lowest score was 66.48) to a high of 80.66.

These proposals and their corresponding scores are listed in Attachment A.

8. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:** Accept staff's recommendation to award and execute a contract with Arbor E&T dba ResCare Workforce Services, as a One-Stop Center Operator. The award amount shall not exceed \$2,450,000. Upon approval by the WC Board, the contract period will be July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016, with an option to renew annually for an additional three years based on performance and available funding.

Workforce Connections PY 2015 Proposals

**ONE-STOP SYSTEM OPERATOR RFP
PROPOSALS**

ARBOR E&T, LLC d/b/a RESCARE WORKFORCE SERVICES	80.25%
ERISS CORPORATION	66.50%

To: Ardell Galbreth, Executive Director, Workforce Connections
From: Vinz Koller, Kristin Wolff, Andrew Wiegand, Social Policy Research Associates
Date: May 6, 2015
Subject: Summary of Methodology and Results of the 2015 Request For Proposal Scoring Process

SPR Background and Qualifications

Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) is a small, employee-owned firm based in Oakland, CA with an outstanding national reputation for conducting high quality evaluations of workforce development, and education programs and supporting such programs through expert technical assistance and capacity building. For more than two decades, SPR has conducted over 100 major process and outcome evaluations of diverse programs at the local, state, and national levels and has trained thousands of practitioners in leadership development, program design, and operational effectiveness.

SPR is known nationally for its evaluations of programs housed in American Job Centers (AJCs), including the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Adult and Dislocated Worker and Youth programs, the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program, the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP), the WIA Indian and Native American Program, and the WIA National Farmworker Jobs Program. SPR has conducted some landmark evaluations on American Job Centers, their pre-cursors, One-Stop Career Centers. As the national expert on WIA, SPR is currently leading the implementation study for DOL's WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker Gold Standard Evaluation. As part of this study, SPR staff members have conducted multiple rounds of site visits to more than 80 AJCs in 19 local workforce investment areas across the country and are authoring multiple briefing papers on AJC networks and various aspects of their operations.

Background and Context

Workforce Connections (WC) contracted with Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) for assistance with the agency's 2015 procurement process. Specifically, SPR was asked to help WC develop a fair and impartial scoring rubric and score incoming proposals.

Approach

The SPR team worked closely with WC throughout the project. The SPR approach is described below.

The SPR Team

SPR assembled a team of seven: it consisted of SPR's two most experienced procurement experts to assist in the analysis of the procurement process and to lead the development of the scoring methodology. These experts were joined by the director of research who served as specialist on scoring and ranking methods. The team also included four research associates and assistants who served as primary scorers, all well versed in SPR's methodology and knowledgeable about the workforce development system.

Reviewing Existing Materials and Current Effective Practices

SPR reviewed WC past scoring rubrics and tools, together with all 2015 requests for proposals (RFPs):

- Adults and Dislocated Workers One-Stop Affiliate Site Services
- Adults with Disabilities Services
- Adult Re-Entry Post-Release Services
- Youth One-Stop Affiliate Site Services
- Youth Dropout Recovery Services
- One-Stop Operator Services

For comparison purposes, SPR also reviewed recently completed procurement processes involving comparable services by ten government agencies and major foundations, and reviewed several academic papers on effective practices in procurement and scoring methodologies.

Developing the Scoring Rubric

SPR prepared six scoring rubrics – one for each of the RFP types for which services were requested. Each rubric comprised three main sections corresponding to those contained in the RFPs: Demonstrated Performance, Program Narrative, and Fiscal Narrative/Budget. Each section of the rubrics included subsections similar in concept, but specific to the corresponding RFP. (The One-Stop System Operator RFP and rubric contained four sections but was otherwise similar).

SPR then developed indicators for each subsection of each type of RFP – again, similar in concept but specific to the corresponding RFP. The number of indicators ranged from 24-29. Each indicator was scored on a 4-point scale using the following scoring guide:

4 = Exceeds criteria. Proposal also offers insight, capacity, observations, or ideas beyond what was expected.

3 = Criteria is fully met: Response meets all requirements in the RFP.

2 = Criteria is partially met.

1 = Criteria is not met.

SPR employed this universal four-point scale for the following reasons:

- Universal scoring tends to be simpler for scorers to understand and therefore less prone to error than a mix of scales on a single score sheet.
- A four-point scale avoids the problem of “moving to the middle.” When objective scorers have the option of a three on a five-point scale, or a two on a three-point scale, they tend to overuse these middle scores. A four-point scale tends to encourage a closer reading and a stronger commitment to a score.
- Given the total number of questions and possible points, SPR determined that a four-point scale would offer a sufficient range of total scores to allow for a clear ranking of the submitted proposals. In addition, using this scoring approach, failure to answer one or even a few questions would not – on its own – eliminate an otherwise qualified proposal from consideration.

In addition, because the definitions of each numerical score were strictly related to meeting the criteria in the RFP, they discourage the use of more subjective interpretations as a qualitative definition (such as “excellent”) might do.

Training the Team

After senior researchers successfully blind-tested the scoring rubrics on one proposal from each of the six categories, all scorers were trained on how to use them. During the training, SPR reviewed the scoring rubrics and the scoring sheet, and scored hypothetical responses to insure that scorers were interpreting them similarly. When team members had questions, the questions and responses were shared with all team members to insure scorer consistency – also known as inter-rater reliability.

Rating Proposals

Workforce Connections conducted an initial RFP compliance screen of all submitted proposals, eliminating those that were incomplete. Twenty-six proposals passed this screen and were submitted to SPR. As noted, each proposal contained three main sections: Demonstrated Ability (which included the Funder Evaluation Form), Program Narrative, and Fiscal Narrative/Budget.

Section on Demonstrated Ability and Program Narrative

The first two sections of each proposal were read fully by three members of the team and scored by two. The two scores were averaged to determine the final score. In only one case did scores diverge by more than one point in any one section, for a total score that diverged more substantially. In this case, both scores were eliminated and two different members of the team

scored the proposals independently again. They arrived at scores that were consistent with each other. These scores were averaged, and entered as the total. Even in this instance, the re-scoring did not change the status of the total score.

Funder Evaluation Form

As a part of the response package, bidders were required to secure a prior funder to complete for them a Funder Evaluation Form. Bidders who were prior contractors with Workforce Connections were evaluated by them. Otherwise, a funder of the bidder's choosing completed the form. The form assessed the performance of the bidder in ten areas, using a four-point scale, for a maximum total of 40 points. These points comprised 20% of the total score for bidders who had contracted with Workforce Connections before and 15% of the total score for bidders who would be first-time contractors.

Section on Fiscal Narrative/Budget

The Fiscal Narrative and Budget were scored separately from the narrative proposals by the two senior members of the team with experience in workforce procurement and in budgeting for workforce services. They were scored on four indicators with a focus on compliance – the degree to which bidders provided precisely the information requested in the narrative, and in the summary budget and expense categories affiliated with the budget and RFP. They were scored using the same four-point scale described above.

Proposals in Response to the One-Stop Operator RFP

The two One-Stop Operator proposals were rated independently by two senior team members with experience in One-Stop systems operations. In each case, the two sets of scores – which were very similar – were averaged for a final score.

Quality Control

As noted, each proposal was read in its entirety by three team members and scored by two, with a high degree of consistency in scoring.

Results

Of the 26 proposals submitted, 15 met the qualifications to be considered for a contract award (75 out of 100 points, as noted in the RFPs). All of the RFPs for which responses were submitted (no proposals were submitted in response to the Youth One-Stop Affiliate Site Southwest RFP) generated at least one qualifying proposal. The scores ranged from a low of 58.22 (an outlier, the next lowest score was 66.48) to a high of 80.66.

These proposals and their corresponding scores are listed in Attachment A.

9. **COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

10. **SECOND PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION:** Members of the public may now comment on any matter or topic that is relevant to; or within the authority or jurisdiction of the Board However; if you commented earlier, please do not repeat the same comment you previously made. Please clearly state and spell your name and your address for the record. Each comment will be limited to three (3) minutes

11. ADJOURNMENT