

EVALUATION TEAM  
Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, April 05, 2006  
IETC 407 N. Franklin St. Danville

**Present:** Chuck Brooks                      Brian Hensgen                      Nancy Hamilton                      Angela Joy  
Peggy Kunze                                      Sandy Martin                              Dee Ann Ryan                              Amy Streuer

**Staff:** Lori Brewster

**Call to Order:** Chuck Brooks called Meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

**Review Proposal for Year Round Youth Program:** Brooks stated that the Committee would review the 3 proposals received, decide which bidders will give a presentation and decide on the day and time of the bidders presentations next week.

Hensgen announced that Streuer had been out of the office due to illness and had not filled out the evaluation sheets.

Sandy Martin commented that there is a discrepancy between the evaluation forms and the RFP. Item #2 on the evaluation form is no longer listed under the RFP as a requirement, but certificate requirement is added under the RFP. Brooks stated that the Committee should follow what is in the RFP.

Brooks explained that the committee is very liberal in deciding who comes in for a presentation. If the majority of the committee scores a bidder 104 points or more than the bidder will be asked to come in and give a presentation. If the majority of the committee scores a bidder lower than 104 points, the bidder will not be invited in for a presentation and will be contacted that the bidders proposal was not accepted.

Hensgen stated that he would contact the bidders by letter if the proposal were not accepted.

Brooks asked that Evaluation Sheets be turned in as the committee reviews proposals.

**Life Building Institute**

**Evaluation Scores:** Chuck Brooks -57      Brian Hensgen - 53      Nancy Hamilton – 92  
Angela Joy – 63      Peggy Kunze - 18      Sandy Martin - 51      Dee Ann Ryan – 78  
Amy Streuer – No Score

Hensgen stated that everyone scored lower than 104 points.

- Hensgen commented that the proposal was over 50 pages. Hensgen concern was that the WIA performance measures were not mentioned, and that Life Building Institute had developed their own goals.
- Brooks concerns were that number of hours that were going to be put in the program and the cost of that. Brooks was unclear until after reviewing the budget sheet if the program was an in-school or out-of-school program.

- Hensgen stated that the history listed a lot of background working with ages 5-14 and the proposal listed ages 17-45. On page 37 stated that the bidder would cover service provider fee in amount of \$50 compensation for each participant referred.
- Martin had a concern that in the budget lists \$100 per student for referral. Martin questioned that the proposal referred to secondary education but appeared to be post-secondary education.
- Brooks had concern with the discrepancy with the insurance and if Life Building Institute was fiscally sound.

**Center for Children Services**

**Evaluation Scores:** Chuck Brooks -123    Brian Hensgen - 111    Nancy Hamilton – 125  
 Angela Joy – 105    Peggy Kunze - 120    Sandy Martin - 127    Dee Ann Ryan – 120  
 Amy Streuer – No Score

- Brooks had concern with the Required Element, Item #5 the Workforce Investment Board is not listed and the Budget Sheet under “Limited Work Experience” figures for Employer Share FICA is not accurate should be 7.65 %.
- Brooks questions if the Director of the Agency is going to be involved for 52 hours with the program as stated on page 32 under “Staff”.  
 Hensgen was unsure if the Director signed off on any of the documents.
- Brooks questions that the Cost Audit list in-kind contributions of \$400,000. The proposal does not state what the in-kind contributions are.
- Brooks had concern over the insurance requirement.
- Hensgen had concern on page 9 where it was written that 20 in-school youth would be exiting and at the time of exit are the youths going to still be in secondary school, which would eliminate a lot of responsibility for follow up.
- Hensgen complimented that the overall follow up activities have been improved and the plan has been strengthen as described on page 18.
- Martin commended Center for Children Services on the data that is provided especially the outcome data is presented well.

**District 118**

**Evaluation Scores:** Chuck Brooks -81    Brian Hensgen - 104    Nancy Hamilton – 80  
 Angela Joy – 105    Peggy Kunze - 110    Sandy Martin - 97    Dee Ann Ryan – 94  
 Amy Streuer – No Score

- Ryan questioned sustainability of the program.
- Hensgen stated that Dist 118 list other programs, which is part of the program and wondered if a portion of the other programs consist of sustainability of the program. This is a new concept and a population that needs to be served.
- Ryan stated that this is a big need, but is concerned how the population is created. The proposal states there are 100 kids already dropped from school, which is very alarming. Ryan had spoke with 2 of those kids that were recently dropped. The kids had informed Ryan that no retention strategies were offered, that the kids were told to go to DACC for their GED. Ryan stated that District 118 needs to do more to keep kids in school.

- Martin stated that except for the classes being offered at DACC and the alternative setting at DACC the design of the program is a CO-OP program. The large amount of the funding was going towards wages and there was not a plan to wean off wages. Martin did not feel that funds should be used to supplementing wages all year.
- Hensgen stated that one of his questions is that OJT can be offered, as long as it is for someone to learn the job, funds cannot be used to supplement the wages.
- Streuer had concern if a youth wanted to finish school and did not want to work and how the school would handle if a youth did not show up for school that day.
- Ryan and Hamilton questioned how County schools were going to receive a diploma granted through District 118 and transportation for students outside city limits.
- Martin and Ryan had concern with getting 40 kids involved in the program.
- Martin had concern over State requirements for academic instruction.
- Brooks had concerns that the budget sheets were not filled out correctly, the students were going to be District 118 employees, the kids were going to have criminal background checks run on them and the concern that this would exclude youths from the program. The number of hours work did not add up correctly, the concern of full time salaries and benefits for part time personnel and the FICA was not figured for students.
- Ryan had concerns that the proposal did not show any collaboration for other schools within the County and that the proposal states that each student would be able to graduate with their own graduating class. Ryan complemented District 118 on the concept, but would like to see schools make a greater effort to keep kids in school that money is already being spent through taxes.
- Martin had concern of why the current alternatives schools could not provide this service.
- Concerns were mentioned on if DACC would be able to provide childcare. DACC cannot provide childcare to kids less than 2 years of age.
- Hensgen commended District 118's willingness to change their program with discussion of WIA Reauthorization and 70% minimum of serving out of school youth and a work component with the out of school youth population with credit from the State on the graduation rate. Hensgen had concerns with the work component and paying the kids for a year, and why is District 118 not a part of the new component out at DACC involving the other County schools.
- Martin stated that the proposal is a solid concept.
- Ryan stated that it would have been nice to see the surveys the kids had filled out stating the reasons the students had dropped out.
- Martin stated that there is no hard data on the outcome of success with the program, but only mentioned that they have a history with the program.
- Hensgen had concerns that District 118 did not discuss all 7-performance measures that could be affected by this program. This is a major concern; this is how Vermilion County stays successful and receives incentive funding.

Brooks stated that there are 4 scores below the 104 and 3 above 104. District 118 will not be invited in for an interview.

Martin stated that DACC is an instrumental player in all 3 proposals and commended DACC.

Motion to invite Center for Children Services in for an interview and not to invite Life Building Institute and District 118 was made by Dee Ann Ryan, seconded by Sandy Martin.

Discussion of Motion:

Martin questioned the purpose of the interview.

Brooks stated the purpose of inviting Center for Children Service for an interview is to review and answer any questions the Committee has on their proposal. After speaking with CCS the Committee will look at the amount of funding available, the number of youth proposing to serve. Depending on the funding the Committee may have to put an alternative proposal together that JTP will present to CCS that they would have to agree with.

Hensgen stated that it was hopeful the State would announce the allocations at April's IWP meeting. In the past 80% has been sub-contracted to the Youth Programs. JTP has used the remaining funds for Individual Training Accounts for those youth that have completed their GED or High school Diploma that are interested in furthering their education and JTP would assist with the training.

There was no more discussion. Motion was approved by a unanimous voice vote. Motion carried.

**Comments:** Ryan stated that the Middle School Alternative Program offered at the Boys and Girls Club will be closing.

Martin suggested that the Youth Council try a 2-prong approach with the RFP and disbursement of funds. There was such a discrepancy between the 3 proposals and their success. It almost seems that there should be a renewal proposals but a small portion of funds set aside for new ideas innovative thinking that proven success is not as important since it would be a new idea.

Brooks informed that those that have submitted a proposal in the past and have not been accepted have been encouraged to come back with a smaller proposal serving a smaller number of youth.

Martin stated that the proposal is really set up for those that have a proven track record. There should be a new point system for new/old projects.

Brooks stated that it is important to meet the performance measures for reasons Hensgen stated earlier.

Hensgen stated that he had met with District 118 individually during the Bidder's Conference. Hensgen had commented to District 118 that it was a solid concept for the out-of-school population and that timelines were not discussed. The performance measures were reviewed at the Bidder's Conference, but still the performance was not mentioned.

Hensgen stated that the Youth Council could discuss 2 separate RFP's. Hensgen mentioned that Springfield submits out 2 RFP's one for in school and one for out-of-school and only sub-contracts 60% of their funds.

Brooks stated that the funds keep decreasing.

Hensgen stated that last year \$280,000 was sub-contracted.

Ryan requested that when Hensgen responds to District 118 that the committee liked the concept, but would have liked to see more evidence of the retention strategies being put in place while the youths are still in school and some of the barriers addressed. Hensgen stated that in the past the entity has been invited in to discuss their proposal if the entity so chooses.

Brewster mentioned that the bidders would need to be contacted within 48 hours of this meeting.

**Next Meeting** – April 13, 2006 at 12:00 p.m. Brewster would inform through email of meeting location.

Brooks asked that Hensgen inform CCS of presentation and that 10 minutes would be allowed for a brief presentation.

Chuck thanked everyone for reviewing the proposals and coming today.

**Adjournment** - Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Nancy Hamilton, seconded by Brian Hensgen. Approved by unanimous voice vote. Motion carried.