

**VERMILION COUNTY WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD  
EVALUATION TEAM**

**Minutes of the Meeting, Tuesday, April 10, 2007 at 9:00 AM  
407 N. Franklin St. Danville, IL 61832 Conference Room A & B**

**Present:** Chuck Brooks      Judy Phillippe      Linda Federman  
Cheryl Bradfield      Jonathan Jett      Brian Hensgen  
Lori Brewster

**1. Call to Order**

Chuck Brooks called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

Brooks informed that the goal of today's meeting is to determine the bidders who meet the minimum requirement to come in for an interview. The filled out evaluation forms need to be turned into Lori Brewster before leaving today. There is no right or wrong way to score the proposals, basically it is how each individual feels what is in the proposals based on the review sheet.

There were no questions.

**2. Review Proposals for Year Round Youth Program**

**a. Center for Children Services**

Chuck Brooks – 115      Linda Federman – 120      Jonathan Jett- 119  
Judy Phillippe-124      Brian Hensgen – 123      Cheryl Bradfield- 130

Required Elements 1-5 – Chuck Brooks had a problem with Required Element #4 - The Workforce Investment Board is not listed as additional insured and request that if CCS receives funding this year, that before any contracts are signed that the WIB receives a copy of the Certificate of Insurance, because last year does not have the WIB listed on it either and should have been.

Jonathan Jett commented on the program design the retention strategy using personal vehicles for transportation, copies of insurance needs to be provided to the program in case something would happen when transporting a youth.

Brooks stated that the proposal suggests serving 81 youths and the number of youth for work experience is less than the number of youth the program is serving and questioned if the work experience was for all the number of youths enrolled in the program.

Hensgen responded that this could be a question that is asked, but thought that work experience was based on the youths performance, attendance and GED class, that

youths are invited to attend spring or summer work experience, and it is used as an incentive to follow through with attendance in the GED class.

Brooks questioned on the reimbursement for counseling through Medicaid, which was listed last year, but is not shown this year.

Jonathan Jett questioned that over 100 youths that were tested below an 8<sup>th</sup> grade level and was referred on for services. Jett wondered where the youths were referred to.

Brewster responded that with discussions that were held in the Youth Council the youths were generally referred to DACC – Adult Ed.

Brooks questioned the cost per participant that he did not understand \$7,200 plus the \$709. That there was no line item that states \$7,200 summer work experience.

Brooks questioned if audit services was acceptable to pay for out of grant. Hensgen responded yes.

Brooks stated that there were enough that scored CCS above 104. CCS would be asked in for an interview.

Brooks asked Hensgen to speak to CCS regarding the change on the Certificate of Insurance since it expires in April.

**b. Dist 118**

Chuck Brooks – 108  
Judy Phillippe-85

Linda Federman – 111  
Brian Hensgen – 86

Jonathan Jett- 102  
Cheryl Bradfield- 86

All required were found. Jett pointed out a typo in the narrative part it read \$6.50, but the calculations were correct at \$7.50 per hour. The E/O statement is not listed on the index but can be found on page 22.

Hensgen stated that a major concern is that Dist.118 proposes that will serve students within a certain amount of credit hours, but also mention that will be serving 14 year olds, that is a design flaw. You cannot have a 14 year old within certain amount of credit hours. The goal is to have participant graduate with their classes and list that they are serving 19-21 year olds and those students classes will have already graduated and this leaves a lot of unanswered questions on how students will be served, especially the 14-year olds.

Linda Federman stated that the concept is a good. Hensgen stated yes, if the District would focus on 16-18 years of age. Federman stated that there is a significant number of kids that are right there on the edge and if there was some way you could grab them quick before they fell off and at least get them through high school. This would be a worthwhile project to have something in place to help the students. Federman would

like to see this kind of an idea massaged more. Federman scored the District high enough, because she would like to hear more on the idea and suggested getting back with them and state that the idea is good, but needs some more work before the next round of funding.

Hensgen stated the group could look at offering another RFP if the Youth Council wanted. There is a lot of positive ideas in the proposal and the concept of getting youths there high school diploma is a solid concept. From a program point of view, the District talks about some previous successes and programs that they have run, and does not know if the programs have been successful. Knowing the previous programs under the Workforce Investment Act, currently JTP is working with them to find some of their past participants. In dealing with performance measures regarding retention and follow up, the District's services have dropped off. The performance measures what drives the WIA program and this is how the local area receives incentive dollars. The performance described in the proposal is very weak as far as how the district will evaluate their performance – pg 24 states that a follow up report. A follow up report does not tell you anything. A follow up report has been an email sent to Hensgen, stating that the District has no idea where the youth is. District 118 has not had a program within almost 2 years, JTP is still dealing with their participants and are trying to locate the students. District 118 is not interested in trying to locate the students.

Jett mentions that the goal and expected outcomes took the biggest hit, and he had trouble deciphering. On page 24 regarding the youth retention states the youth would be employed in the second quarter, which is incorrect and should be the third quarter. The proposal does not mention anything on the Youth Earnings Change and Youth Credential Attainment Rate which is required under WIA.

Federman understood that the District was trying to reach out to the sophomore and junior that are shaky but are hanging in there and some intervention would help them to finish.

Phillippe stated that a student cannot have a criminal record, which could eliminate a large population. Brewster clarified that the students would be employed by District 118 and therefore cannot have a criminal record, this is the District's policy.

Federman stated that there is a group of students that need to be served that is close to graduation.

Hensgen agreed with Federman that the concept is a strong one. Looking back at the opportunities that District 118 had to come in and talk to JTP regarding the program. District 118 did not attend the youth bidder's conference or call to set up a one on one meeting regarding the concept. If this had been done, the District could have "fine tuned" their proposal to be a program that could have received funding.

Federman stated again that District 118 should be contacted and informed that the concept is there, but need you to work with the WIA program to make it a workable

program. Obviously there is a history in follow up and meeting the WIA performance that would have to be adjusted before working with the District again.

Bradfield mentioned that there is an alternative school and the Fair Oaks program that help those that are close to graduating.

Hensgen stated concerns that students identified and show attendance at a certain rate will be able to move into the work experience which comes to 18 days of work experience and 30 days of pre-requisite, which is 48 days of program. What about the rest of the year in working with the students to keep them involved or spreading out the work experience. Within 60 days of the beginning of the program the student is done with the work experience and probation period and could lose the students.

Hensgen had concerns on page 9 that the proposal mentions that it would be a small group that the District would be working with and can guarantee students success, but further down on the page it mentions that these are students that have fallen seriously behind and questioned how can success be guaranteed.

Hensgen had concerns with what was mentioned on page 18, working with Child Care Resource Center, there is not guarantee that any of these students would be found eligible for Child Care Resources Center. There is a work component with the eligibility and someone is only employed for 18 days as work experience will lose their eligibility for Child Care Resource Center and then there will be an issue with child care again, so what is the District's solution.

Brooks informed that District 118 did not meet the minimum scores required to be asked in for an interview.

### **3. Comments**

Hensgen requested if there is some youth money rolling over into the next year and there is incentive dollars coming in (approximately \$14,000), potentially looking at working with District 118 to fine tune this proposal. There could be another RFP specifying this type of population. Right now the way the proposal is written and presented, there are too many flaws. Hensgen agreed with Federman that this is a population that is being left behind.

Brooks stated that the Youth Council did talk in the past about doing a smaller program and a pilot RFP and the idea was shot down. Brooks stated that the Youth Council could review the idea again. Brooks stated that this is the only way that he believed that you were going to get new ideas started, but until it is a priority of the Youth Council he did not see this happening.

Phillippe stated that if she remembered right, it came down to the lack of funding appropriated had dwindled each year. Brooks stated that then the Youth Council is looking at the wrong issue, the Youth Council should be looking at what best benefits

the community and then worry about what the money is there for. It appears that the Youth Council is saying there is only this block of money and we should only do this RFP and should not try to expand. Jett commented that it was trying to serve the most youths; you could have one program that serve 80 youths or get 2 programs one serving 20 youths and another serving 30 youths. Brooks stated that depending on who the 20 or 30 youths it is whatever better serves the community the best. It is great to always fund a program that you know will be successful and will meet the performance measures, but does not always know that is the best benefit for the community and the students out there.

Hensgen stated that he wished that District 118 would have attended the bidder's conference or set up an individual meeting to discuss their concepts. The proposal as it is, there are too many loose ideas that leave it open for failure.

Brooks questioned outside the \$14,000 what is available to do a smaller proposal. Hensgen guessed that 20% would be carried over that is estimated between \$25,000 and \$40,000. Brooks stated would it make sense to go back to the Youth Council to address the needs that are there. Hensgen stated there are a lot of ideas that he has for the money. A certain pool of money could be used to go to employers for retention issues and skills that the employers need (incumbent worker training). The direction of the WIA program is moving towards more employer services.

Phillippe asked is there any funds available to better educate service providers on what the state of the art is, what program works and to better educate in ways to be helpful to the youth. Hensgen stated that Technical Assistance dollars could be used for this. Phillippe stated that the social management case worker background described in the proposal is pathetic. The District seems to be sort of clueless to provide the back up support that is needed for these students to succeed.

Brewster mentioned that there was a training provided to the schools for working with students living in poverty – Ruby Payne.

Brooks stated that there needs to be some guidance through the Youth Council regarding this population.

#### **4. Next Meeting**

Due to the unavailability of several members for the RFP calendar meeting times, the next meeting was set for April 24, 2007 at 1:00 p.m. at the IETC.

#### **5. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn was made by Linda Federman, seconded by Brian Hensgen and approved by a unanimous voice vote. Motion carried.