



# AGENDA

## WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD SPECIAL SESSION

NOVEMBER 3, 2021  
7:00 A.M.

EMPLOYERS'  
TRAINING  
RESOURCE

America's Job Center of California - Bakersfield  
Microsoft Teams Meeting  
Dial In: (831) 296-3241  
Conf. ID: 243 783 106#

America's JobCenter  
of California™

**AGENDA  
KERN, INYO AND MONO  
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD  
SPECIAL SESSION  
NOVEMBER 3, 2021**

**Location:** Microsoft Teams  
**Time:** 7:00 a.m.  
**Dial-in:** (831) 296-3421  
**Access Code:** 243 783 106#

**Page No.**

- I. **Call to Order**
- II. **Introductions**
- III. **Public Comments**

This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons to address the Board on any matter not on this agenda but under the jurisdiction of the Board. Board members may respond briefly to statements made or questions posed. They may ask a question for clarification, make a referral to staff for factual information, or request staff to report back to the Board at a later meeting. Also, the Board may take action to direct the staff to place a matter of business on a future agenda. **SPEAKERS ARE LIMITED TO THREE MINUTES.**
- 1-3 IV. **New Business**
  - A. Revisions To Funding Recommendations Attachment A To Add Relevant Data On Proposed Wages And Revisions To Work Component After Receiving Specific Quotes For Workers' Compensation – **Action Item**
- 4-50 B. Compiled Questions, Answers, And Comments Regarding The Transitional Jobs RFP Process Following The October 6, 2021, Workforce Development Board Meeting
- 51-54 C. Response to Public Comments Regarding ETR Job Readiness RFP Mexican American Opportunity Foundation

Disabled individuals who need special assistance to attend or participate in a meeting of the Workforce Development Board may request assistance at Employers' Training Resource, 1600 East Belle Terrace, Bakersfield, California, or by calling (661) 336-6893. Every effort will be made to reasonably accommodate individuals with disabilities by making meeting materials available in alternative formats. Requests for assistance should be made at least three (3) working days in advance whenever possible.

All agenda item supporting documentation is available for public review at Employers' Training Resource, 1600 East Belle Terrace, Bakersfield, 93307 during regular business hours, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, following the posting of the agenda. Any supporting documentation that relates to an agenda item for an open session of any regular meeting that is distributed after the agenda is posted and prior to the meeting will also be available for review at the same location.

Please remember to turn off all cell phones, pagers, or electronic devices during the meeting.

# EMPLOYERS' TRAINING RESOURCE

November 3, 2021

Kern, Inyo and Mono  
Workforce Development Board  
1600 E. Belle Terrace  
Bakersfield, CA 93307

## **REVISIONS TO FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS ATTACHMENT A TO ADD RELEVANT DATA ON PROPOSED WAGES AND REVISIONS TO WORK COMPONENT AFTER RECEIVING SPECIFIC QUOTES FOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION**

Dear Board Member:

At your meeting on October 6, 2021, ETR provided "Attachment A" to the funding recommendations in the form of a spreadsheet listing agencies, program details, number of proposed participants, estimated cost of the work component for each program, and cost per participant. This spreadsheet has been revised and included as an attachment to this letter. The reasons and changes are as follows:

- 1) A number of columns from the original spreadsheet were cut off and didn't appear on the version included in your October 6, 2021, packet.
- 2) During the October 6, 2021, meeting, issues were raised regarding "Cost per Participant" for the various proposed programs. Reviewers were not asked to score on "Cost per Participant" per se, but on budget justification more comprehensively. An important component for any subsidized work program is not simply the overall cost per participant, but the amount dedicated to the work component (including Workers' Compensation insurance) and the amount in wages it is possible for a participant to earn. Therefore, we revised the spreadsheet to include the percentage of total funding dedicated to the cost of the work component as well as the total gross wages available to be earned by each participant and the number of paid work experience hours per program.
- 3) ETR contacted our third-party HR/payroll provider and obtained more accurate estimates of work component costs using the specific types of jobs to be worked for each program. We added a column for the more accurate work component costs.
- 4) We gave the recommended agencies the opportunity to revise their budget across line items and/or change work hours/planned enrollments in light of the

more accurate estimates. One agency opted to increase in-kind to offset increased Workers' Compensation costs without reducing the number of participants to be served or their hours. Another needed no adjustment. The third was able to increase the number of paid work hours per participant because the specific estimate came in lower than the estimate using an average Workers' Compensation. We created an additional row to display the revised wage information for this program.

There have been no changes to the agencies recommended by the reviewers. The total amount for recommended programs remains \$400,000 with the cost of wages and other third-party Employer of Record/payroll costs to be paid directly by ETR to that third party, as part of separate Agreements. Contracts to recommended agencies will be written for the amount remaining after third-party cost estimates have been subtracted from the \$400,000 total. The funding recommendations appear on the revised Attachment A. Upon approval of these recommendations, appeals, if any, must be filed in writing with ETR no later than close of business on November 10, 2021. Appeals will be decided by your Executive Committee.

Therefore, IT IS RECOMMENDED that your WDB approve the distribution of funds as indicated in Attachment A for contracts beginning January 1, 2022, and ending on March 31, 2023.

Sincerely,



Teresa Hitchcock  
Assistant County Administrative Officer

TH:kb

Attachment

A) Funding Recommendations

**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AWARD  
SHORT-TERM JOB READINESS & TRANSITIONAL JOBS  
JANUARY 1, 2022 through March 31, 2023  
THRESHOLD FOR FUNDING 75%; ALL MET**

*Revised to Add Info on Wages, Career Catalyst Quotes using actual Workers' Comp rates, and adjustments based on Career Catalyst Quotes.*

Agency	Score	Recommended for Funding?	Loc/Area/Pop (All servicing chronically unemployed/inconsistent work history)	Cohort Based or Open Entry/Exit*	Instructor Led or Self-Paced; In-Person/Remote	Job Readiness & Work Sequential Concurrent ?	Total Request	Preliminary Estimate Cost of Work Component	Career Catalyst Quote for Work Component (specific Workers' Comp rates)	% of funding dedicated to Work Component (all Career Catalyst Costs)	Proposed Max Earning Per Participant (excluding FICA, Workers' Comp)	Total Participants to be served	Cost Per Participant	Length of Program	Amount of Paid Work Hours Per Participant	Number of Cohorts	Comments
<b>Bitwise Industries</b>																	
Pre-Apprenticeship Developer (Tech/Tech Adjacent jobs)	85.0	NO	Downtown Bakersfield; Marginalized & Underserved; willing to serve ex-offenders	Cohort	Instructor-Led, currently 100% remote due to Covid-19 precautions	Concurrent	\$400,000	\$160,424	\$163,686	38.4%	\$3,900	30	\$13,333	13 weeks per cohort	260	2	
<b>CityServe</b>																	
Re-Entry Employment Success (Warehouse Worker/Clerk)	94.0	YES	Central Bakersfield; specifically targets ex-offenders	Cohort	Instructor Led, In-Person	Concurrent	\$400,000	\$169,519	\$206,834	51.7%	\$7,800	16	\$25,000	6 months per cohort	520	2	Agency will increase in-kind to offset higher Workers' Comp Costs
<b>Kern High School District</b>																	
Café 1600 Culinary Arts	91.5	YES	Southeast Bakersfield; underserved; willing to serve ex-offenders	Cohort	Instructor Led, In-Person	Concurrent	\$400,000	\$317,847	\$317,847	79.5%	\$7,800	30	\$13,333	6 months per cohort	520	2	
<b>Labors of the Harvest</b>																	
Food Recovery, Distribution, Warehousing, Transportation, Public Health; to act as fiscal agent.	81.5	NO	Taft/West Kern; homeless; ex-offenders and indigenous Oaxacan	Cohort	Instructor Led, In-Person	Concurrent	\$400,000	\$317,847	\$342,066	85.5%	\$7,800	30	\$13,333	6 months per cohort	520	2	
<b>Mexican American Opportunity Foundation</b>																	
Office Occupations/Admin	88.5	NO	Downtown Bakersfield; underserved; willing to serve ex-offenders	Open Entry/Exit	Mix of Self-Paced & Instructor-Led; In-Person with Remote options; provided curriculum	Sequential as all competencies are met	\$400,000	\$203,203	\$194,682	48.7%	\$3,900	38	\$10,528	Not cohort based; 30 hrs/wk classroom until Core Competencies met, then mix of classroom and work for separate host employers.	260	N/A	
<b>Proteus, Inc.</b>																	
General Office Clerk	95.0	YES	Delano/North Kern; underserved in/farm workers; willing to serve ex-offenders	Cohort	Mix of Self-Paced & Instructor-Led; In-Person	Sequential with new cohorts beginning while previous cohorts are working	\$400,000	\$246,511	\$160,778	37.7%	\$4,800	24	\$16,667	6 weeks classroom (195 hours) plus 320 hours of work for separate host employers (8-16 hrs/wk)	320	8	
<b>Proteus, Inc., revised</b>																	
General Office Clerk; revised max work hours because Workers' Comp rates lower than Estimator Tool average							\$400,000		\$160,051	40.0%	\$5,100	24	\$16,667	6 weeks classroom (195 hours) plus 340 hours of work for separate host employers (8-16 hrs/wk)	340	8	Agency increasing work hours to 340 and charging less than approved federal indirect rate to make up average.

\*RFP stated programs should be cohort-based rather than Open Entry/Exit but clarified during pre-proposal meeting that these proposing Open Entry/Exit or Self-Paced instruction would not be disqualified.

# EMPLOYERS' TRAINING RESOURCE

November 3, 2021

Kern, Inyo and Mono  
Workforce Development Board  
1600 E. Belle Terrace  
Bakersfield, CA 93307

## **COMPILED QUESTIONS, ANSWERS, AND COMMENTS REGARDING THE TRANSITIONAL JOBS RFP PROCESS FOLLOWING THE OCTOBER 6, 2021 WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD MEETING**

Dear Board Member:

At your meeting on October 6, 2021, attendees were given the opportunity to send questions regarding the Transitional Jobs Request for Proposals (RFP) process to Employers' Training Resource (ETR) staff for answers/clarification. Two questions were received. The questions and ETR's answers appear below:

- 1) Q: "If you can please provide more detail on the scoring proposals that would be helpful to respond to why MAOF scored lower than others."

A: Averaged scores across all six proposals ranged from a high of 96.0 to a low of 81.5. MAOF's score of 88.5 was higher than two other proposals and lower than three. A chart displaying the average score of all proposed programs by criterion, along with a summary of reviewer comments is attached.

- 2) Q: "Is there any place in the scoring process to review previous contract awardee's outcomes? I think this is a very important area to be reviewed."

A: ETR did not provide data to reviewers on previous ETR subgrant recipients' success in meeting enrollment goals or performance outcomes as we might during an RFR under which all applicants are existing subgrantees and we have the same data for all of them.

The section on Capabilities and Demonstrated Ability asked applicants to describe their management capabilities and experience/history of successfully providing the proposed services, ability to manage and track participant activities and expenditures, maintain fiscal integrity and compliance with federal guidelines. This was self-reported information, but applicants were permitted to submit backup documentation.

- 3) Public Comments Regarding ETR Job Readiness RFP Mexican American Opportunity Foundation – Attached

Sincerely,



Teresa Hitchcock  
Assistant County Administrative Officer

TH:kb

Attachments

Scoring by Criterion and Comments Chart  
Reviewer 1 Scores Redacted  
Reviewer 2 Scores Redacted

## SCORING BY CRITERION AND COMMENTS CHART

Agency	Avg Score Per Criterion						TOT
	25 Dem Ability	10 Location Access	30 Prog Design	20 Enrollment Perform	15 Budget	100	
<b>CityServe</b>	25.00	9.00	26.50	20.00	13.50	94.0	Recommended with concerns regarding scheduling issues and transportation if serving participants from outlying areas, amount of soft skills to be provided.
<b>MAOF</b>	22.50	9.50	26.50	16.50	13.50	88.5	Not recommended, low hours of work, not innovative enough given the challenges of the project, appears to rely heavily on referrals, needs more diverse outreach plan.
<b>KHSD</b>	24.00	8.00	29.00	16.50	14.00	91.5	Recommended but would like to see more diverse outreach plan.
<b>Proteus</b>	25.00	9.50	27.50	20.00	14.00	96.0	Recommended but concerned as to whether targeted population will gravitate toward office work; however, agency does show history of engagement in community.
<b>LOTH</b>	22.50	7.50	20.00	17.50	14.00	81.5	Not recommended, but love idea. Agency could use some Technical Assistance to get them ready to be competitive including development of curriculum.
<b>Bitwise</b>	25.00	7.50	27.50	11.50	13.50	85.0	Not recommended. 100% online delivery and tech focus seems out of touch with capacity of transitional jobs target population which would need much more digital literacy to succeed in the program.

Short Term Job Readiness & Transitional Jobs Evaluation

Reviewer # 1

Please make initial ratings in pencil and then go back and make sure the points you've given are consistent with your evaluations of each proposed program's strengths and weaknesses. I recommend going back and looking at the first couple of proposals scored after you've done them all, to make sure you weren't easier or harder on them than on the rest, once you settled into a "groove". The number of points you give each agency on each of the scored questions should be consistent with your sense of how you would rank them relative to one another. Whether you are generous or conservative on the scale is not as important as being consistent in how you apply the scale to each proposal. There will be opportunity to discuss and revise scores.

Proposer Code: A-32 Program Name (if any):

Amount requested for agency: 60,357 Amount to cover 3rd Party HR/Payroll: 317,817 Total: 378,204

Amount/Type of Leveraging if applicable: PLASK staff salaries

Planned # of participants per cohort: 15 Planned # of cohorts: 2 Total to be served: 30

Cost Per Participant: 12,607 70-808 goal

Geographic Area /Community to be served:

Is this rural? Y  N Is this underserved?  Y N Was justification provided sufficient? Y N

Special populations to be targeted:

Able to serve participants with criminal records?  Yes No Limitations/exceptions?

Brief description of program for quick reference:

Industry/Job focus - Cafe 1600 - Culinary Arts

# of Cohorts - 2

Job Readiness Sequential or Concurrent

R1

NOTE: QUESTION #12 is not "missing"; this was an error in numbering. The application moves from question #11 to #13.

				Comments
1.	<p><b>Capabilities &amp; Demonstrated Ability:</b> Has the agency previously demonstrated the management capability and experience to provide the services proposed, including the ability to manage and track participant activities and program expenditures and maintain fiscal integrity and compliance with federal guidelines? Do they have a history of successfully delivering these services and the requisite staff to do so? Are they able to operate on a reimbursement basis?</p>	23	Max 25	
2.	<p><b>Location &amp; Accessibility:</b> To what extent is the training location appropriate for and accessible to the population to be served? Is the location already established and if not, is it likely the applicant will be able to secure an appropriate location before the end of the ramp up period? Are COVID-19 protocols sufficient and to what extent would the described contingency allow the program to continue to operate under various levels of restrictions?</p>	8	Max 10	H.S. Students
3.	<p><b>Program Design &amp; Planned Approach:</b> To what extent does the proposed program meet the objectives of the RFP? Has applicant clearly identified the industry/jobs for which participants are to be prepared and designed a program that is likely to be successful given the challenges of the targeted population, with sufficient instruction, structure and attention to participants' progress? Are competencies clearly described, including how they will be measured, and is at least one industry-recognized certificate available to be earned? Do the Job Readiness and Transitional Jobs components appear to be designed to work together if delivered separately?</p>	28	Max 30	Primary Home 15 of more
4.	<p><b>Enrollment Goals &amp; Program Performance:</b> To what extent do enrollment goals appear to be consistent with/reasonable considering the available funding and the need to deliver quality services to highly barriered participants in a short time frame? Does applicant's recruitment plan seem sufficient to generate at least 80% of planned enrollments? To what extent does the program seem likely to succeed in terms of participants completing activities and being ready for placement in unsubsidized employment when referred back to ETR?</p>	18	Max 20	High Barrier?
5.	<p><b>Budget Summary &amp; Justification:</b> Are proposed costs reasonable and justified considering the services to be provided, the targeted population, and the need to balance wages and other costs associated with Transitional Jobs with the costs associated with Job Readiness components? Did the agency complete the Career Catalyst Cost Estimator Calculations and their own costs correctly or did ETR staff correct them?</p>	13	Max 15	
	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	90	Max 100	

RJ

Do you recommend this program for consideration?

Yes  No  Yes, with concerns

If recommended, do you have any concerns? (Describe):

Increase Outreach beyond high school students

Additional comments if any (may use back):

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature & date \_\_\_\_\_

9/22/21

Short Term Job Readiness & Transitional Jobs Evaluation

Reviewer #

1

Please make initial ratings in pencil and then go back and make sure the points you've given are consistent with your evaluations of each proposed program's strengths and weaknesses. I recommend going back and looking at the first couple of proposals scored after you've done them all, to make sure you weren't easier or harder on them than on the rest, once you settled into a "groove". The number of points you give each agency on each of the scored questions should be consistent with your sense of how you would rank them relative to one another. Whether you are generous or conservative on the scale is not as important as being consistent in how you apply the scale to each proposal. There will be opportunity to discuss and revise scores.

Proposer Code: A-21 Program Name (if any):

Amount requested for agency: 230,481 Amount to cover 3rd Party HR/Payroll: 169,579 Total: 400,000

Amount/Type of Leveraging if applicable: \$112K for facility, equipment, volunteer trainer

Planned # of participants per cohort: 8 Planned # of cohorts: 2 Total to be served: 16

Cost Per Participant: \$ 25,000 808 year

Geographic Area /Community to be served:

Is this rural? \_\_\_ Y \_\_\_ N Is this underserved?  Y \_\_\_ N Was justification provided sufficient? \_\_\_ Y \_\_\_ N

Special populations to be targeted:

Able to serve participants with criminal records?  Yes \_\_\_ No Limitations/exceptions?

Brief description of program for quick reference:

Industry/Job focus - Warehouse worker/cert

# of Cohorts - 16

Job Readiness Sequential or Concurrent

R1

NOTE: QUESTION #12 is not "missing"; this was an error in numbering. The application moves from question #11 to #13.

			Comments
1.	<p><b>Capabilities &amp; Demonstrated Ability:</b> Has the agency previously demonstrated the management capability and experience to provide the services proposed, including the ability to manage and track participant activities and program expenditures and maintain fiscal integrity and compliance with federal guidelines? Do they have a history of successfully delivering these services and the requisite staff to do so? Are they able to operate on a reimbursement basis?</p>	25	Max 25
2.	<p><b>Location &amp; Accessibility:</b> To what extent is the training location appropriate for and accessible to the population to be served? Is the location already established and if not, is it likely the applicant will be able to secure an appropriate location before the end of the ramp up period? Are COVID-19 protocols sufficient and to what extent would the described contingency allow the program to continue to operate under various levels of restrictions?</p>	10	Max 10
3.	<p><b>Program Design &amp; Planned Approach:</b> To what extent does the proposed program meet the objectives of the RFP? Has applicant clearly identified the industry/jobs for which participants are to be prepared and designed a program that is likely to be successful given the challenges of the targeted population, with sufficient instruction, structure and attention to participants' progress? Are competencies clearly described, including how they will be measured, and is at least one industry-recognized certificate available to be earned? Do the Job Readiness and Transitional Jobs components appear to be designed to work together if delivered separately?</p>	25	Max 30 <i>concern w/ self serving nature</i>
4.	<p><b>Enrollment Goals &amp; Program Performance:</b> To what extent do enrollment goals appear to be consistent with/reasonable considering the available funding and the need to deliver quality services to highly barriered participants in a short time frame? Does applicant's recruitment plan seem sufficient to generate at least 80% of planned enrollments? To what extent does the program seem likely to succeed in terms of participants completing activities and being ready for placement in unsubsidized employment when referred back to ETR?</p>	20	Max 20
5.	<p><b>Budget Summary &amp; Justification:</b> Are proposed costs reasonable and justified considering the services to be provided, the targeted population, and the need to balance wages and other costs associated with Transitional Jobs with the costs associated with Job Readiness components? Did the agency complete the Career Catalyst Cost Estimator Calculations and their own costs correctly or did ETR staff correct them?</p>	12	Max 15 <i>True Mgmt Services?</i>
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		97	Max 100

R7

Do you recommend this program for consideration?  Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Yes, with concerns

If recommended, do you have any concerns? (Describe):

- Seems to be self serving
- Will outreach be robust enough for job placement
- Significant costs for True Mgmt Services LLC

Additional comments if any (may use back):

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_ Signature & date: 9/22/21

Short Term Job Readiness & Transitional Jobs Evaluation

Reviewer #

1

Please make initial ratings in pencil and then go back and make sure the points you've given are consistent with your evaluations of each proposed program's strengths and weaknesses. I recommend going back and looking at the first couple of proposals scored after you've done them all, to make sure you weren't easier or harder on them than on the rest, once you settled into a "groove". The number of points you give each agency on each of the scored questions should be consistent with your sense of how you would rank them relative to one another. Whether you are generous or conservative on the scale is not as important as being consistent in how you apply the scale to each proposal. There will be opportunity to discuss and revise scores.

Proposer Code: A37 Program Name (if any):

Amount requested for agency: 246,511 Amount to cover 3rd Party HR/Payroll: 157,402 Total: 403,913

Amount/Type of Leveraging if applicable: \$50,869 in salaries

Planned # of participants per cohort: 8 Planned # of cohorts: 3 Total to be served: 24

Cost Per Participant: 16,830 20 goal

Geographic Area /Community to be served:

Is this rural? X Y N Is this underserved? X Y N Was justification provided sufficient? Y N

Special populations to be targeted:

Able to serve participants with criminal records? X Yes No Limitations/exceptions?

Delano  
McFarland  
Lost Hills  
Shafter  
Wasco

Brief description of program for quick reference:

Industry/Job focus - General Office Clerk Program

# of Cohorts - 3

Job Readiness Sequential or Concurrent

RT

NOTE: QUESTION #12 is not "missing"; this was an error in numbering. The application moves from question #11 to #13.

			Max	Comments
1.	<b>Capabilities &amp; Demonstrated Ability:</b> Has the agency previously demonstrated the management capability and experience to provide the services proposed, including the ability to manage and track participant activities and program expenditures and maintain fiscal integrity and compliance with federal guidelines? Do they have a history of successfully delivering these services and the requisite staff to do so? Are they able to operate on a reimbursement basis?	25	Max 25	
2.	<b>Location &amp; Accessibility:</b> To what extent is the training location appropriate for and accessible to the population to be served? Is the location already established and if not, is it likely the applicant will be able to secure an appropriate location before the end of the ramp up period? Are COVID-19 protocols sufficient and to what extent would the described contingency allow the program to continue to operate under various levels of restrictions?	9	Max 10	
3.	<b>Program Design &amp; Planned Approach:</b> To what extent does the proposed program meet the objectives of the RFP? Has applicant clearly identified the industry/jobs for which participants are to be prepared and designed a program that is likely to be successful given the challenges of the targeted population, with sufficient instruction, structure and attention to participants' progress? Are competencies clearly described, including how they will be measured, and is at least one industry-recognized certificate available to be earned? Do the Job Readiness and Transitional Jobs components appear to be designed to work together if delivered separately?	25	Max 30	
4.	<b>Enrollment Goals &amp; Program Performance:</b> To what extent do enrollment goals appear to be consistent with/reasonable considering the available funding and the need to deliver quality services to highly barriered participants in a short time frame? Does applicant's recruitment plan seem sufficient to generate at least 80% of planned enrollments? To what extent does the program seem likely to succeed in terms of participants completing activities and being ready for placement in unsubsidized employment when referred back to ETR?	20	Max 20	
5.	<b>Budget Summary &amp; Justification:</b> Are proposed costs reasonable and justified considering the services to be provided, the targeted population, and the need to balance wages and other costs associated with Transitional Jobs with the costs associated with Job Readiness components? Did the agency complete the Career Catalyst Cost Estimator Calculations and their own costs correctly or did ETR staff correct them?	13	Max 15	highly reviewed
	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	92	Max 100	

RJ

Do you recommend this program for consideration?  Yes  No  Yes, with concerns

If recommended, do you have any concerns? (Describe):

Concerns about general office skills  $\Rightarrow$  w/ that a viable sector for this population

Additional comments if any (may use back):

15 Print Name \_\_\_\_\_ Signature & date 9/22/21

Short Term Job Readiness & Transitional Jobs Evaluation

Reviewer #

1

Please make initial ratings in pencil and then go back and make sure the points you've given are consistent with your evaluations of each proposed program's strengths and weaknesses. I recommend going back and looking at the first couple of proposals scored after you've done them all, to make sure you weren't easier or harder on them than on the rest, once you settled into a "groove". The number of points you give each agency on each of the scored questions should be consistent with your sense of how you would rank them relative to one another. Whether you are generous or conservative on the scale is not as important as being consistent in how you apply the scale to each proposal. There will be opportunity to discuss and revise scores.

Proposer Code: A-28 Program Name (if any):

Amount requested for agency: 196,950 Amount to cover 3rd Party HR/Payroll: 203,203 Total: \_\_\_\_\_

Amount/Type of Leveraging if applicable: N/A

Planned # of participants per cohort: \_\_\_\_\_ Planned # of cohorts: \_\_\_\_\_ Total to be served: 38  
Cost Per Participant: 10,530 80%

Geographic Area /Community to be served:

Is this rural? \_\_\_ Y \_\_\_ N Is this underserved? \_\_\_ Y \_\_\_ N Was justification provided sufficient? \_\_\_ Y \_\_\_ N

Special populations to be targeted:

Able to serve participants with criminal records?  Yes \_\_\_ No Limitations/exceptions?

Brief description of program for quick reference:

Industry/Job focus - Office Occupations

# of Cohorts -

Job Readiness Sequential or Concurrent

R1

NOTE: QUESTION #12 is not "missing"; this was an error in numbering. The application moves from question #11 to #13.

				Comments
1.	<p><b>Capabilities &amp; Demonstrated Ability:</b> Has the agency previously demonstrated the management capability and experience to provide the services proposed, including the ability to manage and track participant activities and program expenditures and maintain fiscal integrity and compliance with federal guidelines? Do they have a history of successfully delivering these services and the requisite staff to do so? Are they able to operate on a reimbursement basis?</p>	25	Max 25	
2.	<p><b>Location &amp; Accessibility:</b> To what extent is the training location appropriate for and accessible to the population to be served? Is the location already established and if not, is it likely the applicant will be able to secure an appropriate location before the end of the ramp up period? Are COVID-19 protocols sufficient and to what extent would the described contingency allow the program to continue to operate under various levels of restrictions?</p>	9/8	Max 10	
3.	<p><b>Program Design &amp; Planned Approach:</b> To what extent does the proposed program meet the objectives of the RFP? Has applicant clearly identified the industry/jobs for which participants are to be prepared and designed a program that is likely to be successful given the challenges of the targeted population, with sufficient instruction, structure and attention to participants' progress? Are competencies clearly described, including how they will be measured, and is at least one industry-recognized certificate available to be earned? Do the Job Readiness and Transitional Jobs components appear to be designed to work together if delivered separately?</p>	23	Max 30	only 260 hours not out of the box
4.	<p><b>Enrollment Goals &amp; Program Performance:</b> To what extent do enrollment goals appear to be consistent with/reasonable considering the available funding and the need to deliver quality services to highly barriered participants in a short time frame? Does applicant's recruitment plan seem sufficient to generate at least 80% of planned enrollments? To what extent does the program seem likely to succeed in terms of participants completing activities and being ready for placement in unsubsidized employment when referred back to ETR?</p>	15	Max 20	
5.	<p><b>Budget Summary &amp; Justification:</b> Are proposed costs reasonable and justified considering the services to be provided, the targeted population, and the need to balance wages and other costs associated with Transitional Jobs with the costs associated with Job Readiness components? Did the agency complete the Career Catalyst Cost Estimator Calculations and their own costs correctly or did ETR staff correct them?</p>	12	Max 15	
	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	84	Max 100	

R1

Do you recommend this program for consideration?    \_\_\_ Yes     No    \_\_\_ Yes, with concerns

If recommended, do you have any concerns? (Describe):

Additional comments if any (may use back):

<sup>10</sup> Print Name \_\_\_\_\_ Signature & date 9/22/21

Short Term Job Readiness & Transitional Jobs Evaluation

Reviewer #

1

Please make initial ratings in pencil and then go back and make sure the points you've given are consistent with your evaluations of each proposed program's strengths and weaknesses. I recommend going back and looking at the first couple of proposals scored after you've done them all, to make sure you weren't easier or harder on them than on the rest, once you settled into a "groove". The number of points you give each agency on each of the scored questions should be consistent with your sense of how you would rank them relative to one another. Whether you are generous or conservative on the scale is not as important as being consistent in how you apply the scale to each proposal. There will be opportunity to discuss and revise scores.

Proposer Code: A-40 Program Name (if any):

Amount requested for agency: 109,531 Amount to cover 3rd Party HR/Payroll: 317,847 Total: \_\_\_\_\_

Amount/Type of Leveraging if applicable: 15 volunteers (13500\$) and food (100k)

Planned # of participants per cohort: 15 Planned # of cohorts: 2 Total to be served: 30

Cost Per Participant: 14,246 goal = 25

Geographic Area /Community to be served: Taft

Is this rural?  Y  N Is this underserved?  Y  N Was justification provided sufficient?  Y  N

Special populations to be targeted:

Disadvantaged labor force - homeless, people w/ disabilities, ex-offenders, DACAean community

Able to serve participants with criminal records?  Yes  No Limitations/exceptions?

Brief description of program for quick reference:

Industry/Job focus - food distribution & recovery (AB1383)

# of Cohorts - 2

Job Readiness Sequential or Concurrent

RA

NOTE: QUESTION #12 is not "missing"; this was an error in numbering. The application moves from question #11 to #13.

	Comments				
1.	<b>Capabilities &amp; Demonstrated Ability:</b> Has the agency previously demonstrated the management capability and experience to provide the services proposed, including the ability to manage and track participant activities and program expenditures and maintain fiscal integrity and compliance with federal guidelines? Do they have a history of successfully delivering these services and the requisite staff to do so? Are they able to operate on a reimbursement basis?	20	Max 25	primarily volunteer	
2.	<b>Location &amp; Accessibility:</b> To what extent is the training location appropriate for and accessible to the population to be served? Is the location already established and if not, is it likely the applicant will be able to secure an appropriate location before the end of the ramp up period? Are COVID-19 protocols sufficient and to what extent would the described contingency allow the program to continue to operate under various levels of restrictions?	10	Max 10		
3.	<b>Program Design &amp; Planned Approach:</b> To what extent does the proposed program meet the objectives of the RFP? Has applicant clearly identified the industry/jobs for which participants are to be prepared and designed a program that is likely to be successful given the challenges of the targeted population, with sufficient instruction, structure and attention to participants' progress? Are competencies clearly described, including how they will be measured, and is at least one industry-recognized certificate available to be earned? Do the Job Readiness and Transitional Jobs components appear to be designed to work together if delivered separately?	25	Max 30	No subsidy component	
4.	<b>Enrollment Goals &amp; Program Performance:</b> To what extent do enrollment goals appear to be consistent with/reasonable considering the available funding and the need to deliver quality services to highly barriered participants in a short time frame? Does applicant's recruitment plan seem sufficient to generate at least 80% of planned enrollments? To what extent does the program seem likely to succeed in terms of participants completing activities and being ready for placement in unsubsidized employment when referred back to ETR?	20	Max 20		
5.	<b>Budget Summary &amp; Justification:</b> Are proposed costs reasonable and justified considering the services to be provided, the targeted population, and the need to balance wages and other costs associated with Transitional Jobs with the costs associated with Job Readiness components? Did the agency complete the Career Catalyst Cost Estimator Calculations and their own costs correctly or did ETR staff correct them?	13	Max 15		
	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	88	Max 100		

R7

Do you recommend this program for consideration?  Yes  No  Yes, with concerns

If recommended, do you have any concerns? (Describe):

- limited program development
- heavy reliance on volunteers
- need to offer TA & build capacity of organization

Additional comments if any (may use back):

21 Print Name

Signature & date

9/22/21

Short Term Job Readiness & Transitional Jobs Evaluation

Reviewer #

1

Please make initial ratings in pencil and then go back and make sure the points you've given are consistent with your evaluations of each proposed program's strengths and weaknesses. I recommend going back and looking at the first couple of proposals scored after you've done them all, to make sure you weren't easier or harder on them than on the rest, once you settled into a "groove". The number of points you give each agency on each of the scored questions should be consistent with your sense of how you would rank them relative to one another. Whether you are generous or conservative on the scale is not as important as being consistent in how you apply the scale to each proposal. There will be opportunity to discuss and revise scores.

Proposer Code: A-45 Program Name (if any):

Amount requested for agency: 261,610 Amount to cover 3rd Party HR/Payroll: 160,424 Total: \_\_\_\_\_

Amount/Type of Leveraging if applicable: \$207K to cover instructors & TAs

Planned # of participants per cohort: 15 Planned # of cohorts: 2 Total to be served: 30

Cost Per Participant: 14,068 24

Geographic Area /Community to be served:

Is this rural?  Y  N Is this underserved?  Y  N Was justification provided sufficient?  Y  N

Special populations to be targeted: 40% minimum wage 58 (above) 58 (unemployed) 58 comm college or other 58 middle wage

Able to serve participants with criminal records?  Yes  No Limitations/exceptions?

Brief description of program for quick reference: Pre-Apprenticeship Developer, Coding

Industry/Job focus -

# of Cohorts - 2

2 Job Readiness Sequential or Concurrent

RA

NOTE: QUESTION #12 is not "missing"; this was an error in numbering. The application moves from question #11 to #13.

				Comments
1.	<p><b>Capabilities &amp; Demonstrated Ability:</b> Has the agency previously demonstrated the management capability and experience to provide the services proposed, including the ability to manage and track participant activities and program expenditures and maintain fiscal integrity and compliance with federal guidelines? Do they have a history of successfully delivering these services and the requisite staff to do so? Are they able to operate on a reimbursement basis?</p>	25	Max 25	
2.	<p><b>Location &amp; Accessibility:</b> To what extent is the training location appropriate for and accessible to the population to be served? Is the location already established and if not, is it likely the applicant will be able to secure an appropriate location before the end of the ramp up period? Are COVID-19 protocols sufficient and to what extent would the described contingency allow the program to continue to operate under various levels of restrictions?</p>	10	Max 10	
3.	<p><b>Program Design &amp; Planned Approach:</b> To what extent does the proposed program meet the objectives of the RFP? Has applicant clearly identified the industry/jobs for which participants are to be prepared and designed a program that is likely to be successful given the challenges of the targeted population, with sufficient instruction, structure and attention to participants' progress? Are competencies clearly described, including how they will be measured, and is at least one industry-recognized certificate available to be earned? Do the Job Readiness and Transitional Jobs components appear to be designed to work together if delivered separately?</p>	25	Max 30	Outreach is a concern
4.	<p><b>Enrollment Goals &amp; Program Performance:</b> To what extent do enrollment goals appear to be consistent with/reasonable considering the available funding and the need to deliver quality services to highly barriered participants in a short time frame? Does applicant's recruitment plan seem sufficient to generate at least 80% of planned enrollments? To what extent does the program seem likely to succeed in terms of participants completing activities and being ready for placement in unsubsidized employment when referred back to ETR?</p>	18	Max 20	highly barriered?
5.	<p><b>Budget Summary &amp; Justification:</b> Are proposed costs reasonable and justified considering the services to be provided, the targeted population, and the need to balance wages and other costs associated with Transitional Jobs with the costs associated with Job Readiness components? Did the agency complete the Career Catalyst Cost Estimator Calculations and their own costs correctly or did ETR staff correct them?</p>	12	Max 15	not enough for budget
	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	90	Max 100	

R7

Do you recommend this program for consideration?    \_\_\_ Yes     No    \_\_\_ Yes, with concerns

If recommended, do you have any concerns? (Describe):

Additional comments if any (may use back):

Not serving high barrier populations,  
Digital skills gap is not being addressed  
Concerns with entirely virtual delivery

24    Print Name \_\_\_\_\_    Signature & date \_\_\_\_\_ 9/22/21

Short Term Job Readiness & Transitional Jobs Evaluation

Reviewer #

2

Please make initial ratings in pencil and then go back and make sure the points you've given are consistent with your evaluations of each proposed program's strengths and weaknesses. I recommend going back and looking at the first couple of proposals scored after you've done them all, to make sure you weren't easier or harder on them than on the rest, once you settled into a "groove". The number of points you give each agency on each of the scored questions should be consistent with your sense of how you would rank them relative to one another. Whether you are generous or conservative on the scale is not as important as being consistent in how you apply the scale to each proposal. There will be opportunity to discuss and revise scores.

A21

City of Seattle  
Short Term Job Readiness

Proposer Code:

Program Name (if any):

Amount requested for agency: \_\_\_\_\_ Amount to cover 3rd Party HR/Payroll: \_\_\_\_\_ Total: \_\_\_\_\_

Amount/Type of Leveraging if applicable:

Planned # of participants per cohort: \_\_\_\_\_ Planned # of cohorts: \_\_\_\_\_ Total to be served: \_\_\_\_\_

Cost Per Participant: \_\_\_\_\_

Geographic Area /Community to be served:

Is this rural? \_\_\_ Y \_\_\_ N Is this underserved? \_\_\_ Y \_\_\_ N Was justification provided sufficient? \_\_\_ Y \_\_\_ N

Special populations to be targeted:

Able to serve participants with criminal records? \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No Limitations/exceptions?

Brief description of program for quick reference:

Industry/Job focus -

# of Cohorts -

Job Readiness Sequential or Concurrent

NO IDENTITIES  
REMOVED FROM TO  
FRONT &  
BACK

RD

NOTE: QUESTION #12 is not "missing"; this was an error in numbering. The application moves from question #11 to #13.

				Comments
1.	<p><b>Capabilities &amp; Demonstrated Ability:</b> Has the agency previously demonstrated the management capability and experience to provide the services proposed, including the ability to manage and track participant activities and program expenditures and maintain fiscal integrity and compliance with federal guidelines? Do they have a history of successfully delivering these services and the requisite staff to do so? Are they able to operate on a reimbursement basis?</p>	25	25	
2.	<p><b>Location &amp; Accessibility:</b> To what extent is the training location appropriate for and accessible to the population to be served? Is the location already established and if not, is it likely the applicant will be able to secure an appropriate location before the end of the ramp up period? Are COVID-19 protocols sufficient and to what extent would the described contingency allow the program to continue to operate under various levels of restrictions?</p>	10	8	short hours down town
3.	<p><b>Program Design &amp; Planned Approach:</b> To what extent does the proposed program meet the objectives of the RFP? Has applicant clearly identified the industry/jobs for which participants are to be prepared and designed a program that is likely to be successful given the challenges of the targeted population, with sufficient instruction, structure and attention to participants' progress? Are competencies clearly described, including how they will be measured, and is at least one industry-recognized certificate available to be earned? Do the Job Readiness and Transitional Jobs components appear to be designed to work together if delivered separately?</p>	30	28	
4.	<p><b>Enrollment Goals &amp; Program Performance:</b> To what extent do enrollment goals appear to be consistent with/reasonable considering the available funding and the need to deliver quality services to highly barriered participants in a short time frame? Does applicant's recruitment plan seem sufficient to generate at least 80% of planned enrollments? To what extent does the program seem likely to succeed in terms of participants completing activities and being ready for placement in unsubsidized employment when referred back to ETR?</p>	20	20	
5.	<p><b>Budget Summary &amp; Justification:</b> Are proposed costs reasonable and justified considering the services to be provided, the targeted population, and the need to balance wages and other costs associated with Transitional Jobs with the costs associated with Job Readiness components? Did the agency complete the Career Catalyst Cost Estimator Calculations and their own costs correctly or did ETR staff correct them?</p>	15	15	
	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	96	

R2

Do you recommend this program for consideration?

Yes  No  Yes, with concerns

If recommended, do you have any concerns? (Describe):

Program should implement soft skills.  
Location concerns for out going area

Additional comments if any (may use back):

Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature & date

Short Term Job Readiness & Transitional Jobs Evaluation

Reviewer # 2

Please make initial ratings in pencil and then go back and make sure the points you've given are consistent with your evaluations of each proposed program's strengths and weaknesses. I recommend going back and looking at the first couple of proposals scored after you've done them all, to make sure you weren't easier or harder on them than on the rest, once you settled into a "groove". The number of points you give each agency on each of the scored questions should be consistent with your sense of how you would rank them relative to one another. Whether you are generous or conservative on the scale is not as important as being consistent in how you apply the scale to each proposal. There will be opportunity to discuss and revise scores.

*ADP* *Mexican American Opp. Foundation*  
*Job Readiness*

Proposer Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Program Name (if any): \_\_\_\_\_

Amount requested for agency: \_\_\_\_\_ Amount to cover 3<sup>rd</sup> Party HR/Payroll: \_\_\_\_\_ Total: \_\_\_\_\_

Amount/Type of Leveraging if applicable: \_\_\_\_\_

Planned # of participants per cohort: \_\_\_\_\_ Planned # of cohorts: \_\_\_\_\_ Total to be served: \_\_\_\_\_

Cost Per Participant: \_\_\_\_\_

Geographic Area /Community to be served: \_\_\_\_\_

Is this rural?  Y  N Is this underserved?  Y  N Was justification provided sufficient?  Y  N

Special populations to be targeted: \_\_\_\_\_

Able to serve participants with criminal records?  Yes  No Limitations/exceptions? \_\_\_\_\_

Brief description of program for quick reference: \_\_\_\_\_

Industry/Job focus – \_\_\_\_\_

# of Cohorts – \_\_\_\_\_

Job Readiness Sequential or Concurrent \_\_\_\_\_

*REC. FILED*  
*SCANNED & FILED*  
*NO 1 PAGES*

808

12

NOTE: QUESTION #12 is not "missing"; this was an error in numbering. The application moves from question #11 to #13.

				Comments
1.	<b>Capabilities &amp; Demonstrated Ability:</b> Has the agency previously demonstrated the management capability and experience to provide the services proposed, including the ability to manage and track participant activities and program expenditures and maintain fiscal integrity and compliance with federal guidelines? Do they have a history of successfully delivering these services and the requisite staff to do so? Are they able to operate on a reimbursement basis?	20	Max 25	
2.	<b>Location &amp; Accessibility:</b> To what extent is the training location appropriate for and accessible to the population to be served? Is the location already established and if not, is it likely the applicant will be able to secure an appropriate location before the end of the ramp up period? Are COVID-19 protocols sufficient and to what extent would the described contingency allow the program to continue to operate under various levels of restrictions?	10	Max 10	
3.	<b>Program Design &amp; Planned Approach:</b> To what extent does the proposed program meet the objectives of the RFP? Has applicant clearly identified the industry/jobs for which participants are to be prepared and designed a program that is likely to be successful given the challenges of the targeted population, with sufficient instruction, structure and attention to participants' progress? Are competencies clearly described, including how they will be measured, and is at least one industry-recognized certificate available to be earned? Do the Job Readiness and Transitional Jobs components appear to be designed to work together if delivered separately?	30	Max 30	
4.	<b>Enrollment Goals &amp; Program Performance:</b> To what extent do enrollment goals appear to be consistent with/reasonable considering the available funding and the need to deliver quality services to highly barriered participants in a short time frame? Does applicant's recruitment plan seem sufficient to generate at least 80% of planned enrollments? To what extent does the program seem likely to succeed in terms of participants completing activities and being ready for placement in unsubsidized employment when referred back to ETR?	15	Max 20	
5.	<b>Budget Summary &amp; Justification:</b> Are proposed costs reasonable and justified considering the services to be provided, the targeted population, and the need to balance wages and other costs associated with Transitional Jobs with the costs associated with Job Readiness components? Did the agency complete the Career Catalyst Cost Estimator Calculations and their own costs correctly or did ETR staff correct them?	15	Max 15	
	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	90	Max 100	

22

Do you recommend this program for consideration?  Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Yes, with concerns

If recommended, do you have any concerns? (Describe):

Needs to be more innovative  
- a more diverse ~~but~~ reach plan  
History of only being referred to  
Population demographics?

Additional comments if any (may use back):

30 Print Name \_

Signature &

Short Term Job Readiness & Transitional Jobs Evaluation

Reviewer # 2

Please make initial ratings in pencil and then go back and make sure the points you've given are consistent with your evaluations of each proposed program's strengths and weaknesses. I recommend going back and looking at the first couple of proposals scored after you've done them all, to make sure you weren't easier or harder on them than on the rest, once you settled into a "groove". The number of points you give each agency on each of the scored questions should be consistent with your sense of how you would rank them relative to one another. Whether you are generous or conservative on the scale is not as important as being consistent in how you apply the scale to each proposal. There will be opportunity to discuss and revise scores.

Proposer Code: A3D Program Name (if any): Cape 1000 Culinary Labs

Amount requested for agency: \_\_\_\_\_ Amount to cover 3<sup>rd</sup> Party HR/Payroll: The Blue Room - Springs Total: \_\_\_\_\_

Amount/Type of Leveraging if applicable: \_\_\_\_\_

Planned # of participants per cohort: \_\_\_\_\_ Planned # of cohorts: \_\_\_\_\_ Total to be served: \_\_\_\_\_

Cost Per Participant: \_\_\_\_\_

Geographic Area /Community to be served: \_\_\_\_\_

Is this rural? Y  Is this underserved?  Y  N Was justification provided sufficient? Y  N

Special populations to be targeted: \_\_\_\_\_

Able to serve participants with criminal records?  Yes  No Limitations/exceptions? \_\_\_\_\_

*Beepers up  
out reach!*

Brief description of program for quick reference: \_\_\_\_\_

Industry/Job focus - \_\_\_\_\_

# of Cohorts - \_\_\_\_\_

Job Readiness Sequential or Concurrent \_\_\_\_\_

No IDENTITIES  
RECORDED PER  
TO SCORING  
FURTHER

22

NOTE: QUESTION #12 is not "missing"; this was an error in numbering. The application moves from question #11 to #13.

				Comments
1.	<p><b>Capabilities &amp; Demonstrated Ability:</b> Has the agency previously demonstrated the management capability and experience to provide the services proposed, including the ability to manage and track participant activities and program expenditures and maintain fiscal integrity and compliance with federal guidelines? Do they have a history of successfully delivering these services and the requisite staff to do so? Are they able to operate on a reimbursement basis?</p>	25	25	
2.	<p><b>Location &amp; Accessibility:</b> To what extent is the training location appropriate for and accessible to the population to be served? Is the location already established and if not, is it likely the applicant will be able to secure an appropriate location before the end of the ramp up period? Are COVID-19 protocols sufficient and to what extent would the described contingency allow the program to continue to operate under various levels of restrictions?</p>	10	8	lack of information
3.	<p><b>Program Design &amp; Planned Approach:</b> To what extent does the proposed program meet the objectives of the RFP? Has applicant clearly identified the industry/jobs for which participants are to be prepared and designed a program that is likely to be successful given the challenges of the targeted population, with sufficient instruction, structure and attention to participants' progress? Are competencies clearly described, including how they will be measured, and is at least one industry-recognized certificate available to be earned? Do the Job Readiness and Transitional Jobs components appear to be designed to work together if delivered separately?</p>	30	30	
4.	<p><b>Enrollment Goals &amp; Program Performance:</b> To what extent do enrollment goals appear to be consistent with/reasonable considering the available funding and the need to deliver quality services to highly barriered participants in a short time frame? Does applicant's recruitment plan seem sufficient to generate at least 80% of planned enrollments? To what extent does the program seem likely to succeed in terms of participants completing activities and being ready for placement in unsubsidized employment when referred back to ETR?</p>	20	15	need to see more info
5.	<p><b>Budget Summary &amp; Justification:</b> Are proposed costs reasonable and justified considering the services to be provided, the targeted population, and the need to balance wages and other costs associated with Transitional Jobs with the costs associated with Job Readiness components? Did the agency complete the Career Catalyst Cost Estimator Calculations and their own costs correctly or did ETR staff correct them?</p>	15	15	
				<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>
				100

R2

Do you recommend this program for consideration?

Yes  No  Yes, with concerns

If recommended, do you have any concerns? (Describe):

elim concerned about their recruitment. Not to serve the same co-hort + reach the population this is intended for

Additional comments if any (may use back):

Partner w/ CBOs for recruitment w/ custom link

Print Name

Signature & c

Short Term Job Readiness & Transitional Jobs Evaluation

Reviewer #

2

Please make initial ratings in pencil and then go back and make sure the points you've given are consistent with your evaluations of each proposed program's strengths and weaknesses. I recommend going back and looking at the first couple of proposals scored after you've done them all, to make sure you weren't easier or harder on them than on the rest, once you settled into a "groove". The number of points you give each agency on each of the scored questions should be consistent with your sense of how you would rank them relative to one another. Whether you are generous or conservative on the scale is not as important as being consistent in how you apply the scale to each proposal. There will be opportunity to discuss and revise scores.

A-37

KEOTF US Bank Program  
General Office Clerk Program

Proposer Code:

Program Name (if any):

Amount requested for agency: \_\_\_\_\_ Amount to cover 3rd Party HR/Payroll: \_\_\_\_\_ Total: \_\_\_\_\_

Amount/Type of Leveraging if applicable:

Planned # of participants per cohort: \_\_\_\_\_ Planned # of cohorts: \_\_\_\_\_ Total to be served: \_\_\_\_\_

Cost Per Participant: \_\_\_\_\_

Geographic Area/Community to be served:

Is this rural?  Y  N Is this underserved?  Y  N Was justification provided sufficient?  Y  N

Special populations to be targeted:

Able to serve participants with criminal records?  Yes  No Limitations/exceptions?

Brief description of program for quick reference:

Industry/Job focus -

# of Cohorts -

Job Readiness Sequential or Concurrent

NO IDENTITIES  
REVEALED FROM  
SCANNING  
FIRM MET  
KTB

RD

NOTE: QUESTION #12 is not "missing"; this was an error in numbering. The application moves from question #11 to #13.

			Max	Comments
1.	<p><b>Capabilities &amp; Demonstrated Ability:</b> Has the agency previously demonstrated the management capability and experience to provide the services proposed, including the ability to manage and track participant activities and program expenditures and maintain fiscal integrity and compliance with federal guidelines? Do they have a history of successfully delivering these services and the requisite staff to do so? Are they able to operate on a reimbursement basis?</p>	25	Max 25	
2.	<p><b>Location &amp; Accessibility:</b> To what extent is the training location appropriate for and accessible to the population to be served? Is the location already established and if not, is it likely the applicant will be able to secure an appropriate location before the end of the ramp up period? Are COVID-19 protocols sufficient and to what extent would the described contingency allow the program to continue to operate under various levels of restrictions?</p>	10	Max 10	
3.	<p><b>Program Design &amp; Planned Approach:</b> To what extent does the proposed program meet the objectives of the RFP? Has applicant clearly identified the industry/jobs for which participants are to be prepared and designed a program that is likely to be successful given the challenges of the targeted population, with sufficient instruction, structure and attention to participants' progress? Are competencies clearly described, including how they will be measured, and is at least one industry-recognized certificate available to be earned? Do the Job Readiness and Transitional Jobs components appear to be designed to work together if delivered separately?</p>	30	Max 30	
4.	<p><b>Enrollment Goals &amp; Program Performance:</b> To what extent do enrollment goals appear to be consistent with/reasonable considering the available funding and the need to deliver quality services to highly barriered participants in a short time frame? Does applicant's recruitment plan seem sufficient to generate at least 80% of planned enrollments? To what extent does the program seem likely to succeed in terms of participants completing activities and being ready for placement in unsubsidized employment when referred back to ETR?</p>	20	Max 20	
5.	<p><b>Budget Summary &amp; Justification:</b> Are proposed costs reasonable and justified considering the services to be provided, the targeted population, and the need to balance wages and other costs associated with Transitional Jobs with the costs associated with Job Readiness components? Did the agency complete the Career Catalyst Cost Estimator Calculations and their own costs correctly or did ETR staff correct them?</p>	15	Max 15	
	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	100	Max 100	

22

Do you recommend this program for consideration?

Yes  No  Yes, with concerns

If recommended, do you have any concerns? (Describe):

*Audience served is not diversified*

Additional comments if any (may use back):

36 Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature & date \_\_\_\_\_

Short Term Job Readiness & Transitional Jobs Evaluation

Reviewer # 2

Please make initial ratings in pencil and then go back and make sure the points you've given are consistent with your evaluations of each proposed program's strengths and weaknesses. I recommend going back and looking at the first couple of proposals scored after you've done them all, to make sure you weren't easier or harder on them than on the rest, once you settled into a "groove". The number of points you give each agency on each of the scored questions should be consistent with your sense of how you would rank them relative to one another. Whether you are generous or conservative on the scale is not as important as being consistent in how you apply the scale to each proposal. There will be opportunity to discuss and revise scores.

Proposer Code: A40 Program Name (if any): Laborers of The threatened Rural Food Recovery Sub Skils...

Amount requested for agency: 109531 Amount to cover 3rd Party HR/Payroll: \_\_\_\_\_ Total: \_\_\_\_\_

Amount/Type of Leveraging if applicable: \_\_\_\_\_

Planned # of participants per cohort: \_\_\_\_\_ Planned # of cohorts: \_\_\_\_\_ Total to be served: 30

Cost Per Participant: \_\_\_\_\_

Geographic Area /Community to be served: \_\_\_\_\_

Is this rural? Y N Is this underserved? Y N Was justification provided sufficient? Y N

Special populations to be targeted: \_\_\_\_\_

Able to serve participants with criminal records? Y Yes N No Limitations/exceptions? \_\_\_\_\_

Brief description of program for quick reference: \_\_\_\_\_

Industry/Job focus - \_\_\_\_\_

# of Cohorts - \_\_\_\_\_

Job Readiness Sequential or Concurrent \_\_\_\_\_

NO IDENTITIES DERIVED FROM THIS DOCUMENT

A40

RD

QUESTION #12 is not "missing"; this was an error in numbering. The application moves from question #11 to #13.

				Comments
1.	<p><b>Capabilities &amp; Demonstrated Ability:</b> Has the agency previously demonstrated the management capability and experience to provide the services proposed, including the ability to manage and track participant activities and program expenditures and maintain fiscal integrity and compliance with federal guidelines? Do they have a history of successfully delivering these services and the requisite staff to do so? Are they able to operate on a reimbursement basis?</p>	5	Max 25	
2.	<p><b>Location &amp; Accessibility:</b> To what extent is the training location appropriate for and accessible to the population to be served? Is the location already established and if not, is it likely the applicant will be able to secure an appropriate location before the end of the ramp up period? Are COVID-19 protocols sufficient and to what extent would the described contingency allow the program to continue to operate under various levels of restrictions?</p>	5	Max 10	
3.	<p><b>Program Design &amp; Planned Approach:</b> To what extent does the proposed program meet the objectives of the RFP? Has applicant clearly identified the industry/jobs for which participants are to be prepared and designed a program that is likely to be successful given the challenges of the targeted population, with sufficient instruction, structure and attention to participants' progress? Are competencies clearly described, including how they will be measured, and is at least one industry-recognized certificate available to be earned? Do the Job Readiness and Transitional Jobs components appear to be designed to work together if delivered separately?</p>	5	Max 30	
4.	<p><b>Enrollment Goals &amp; Program Performance:</b> To what extent do enrollment goals appear to be consistent with/reasonable considering the available funding and the need to deliver quality services to highly barriered participants in a short time frame? Does applicant's recruitment plan seem sufficient to generate at least 80% of planned enrollments? To what extent does the program seem likely to succeed in terms of participants completing activities and being ready for placement in unsubsidized employment when referred back to ETR?</p>	5	Max 20	
5.	<p><b>Budget Summary &amp; Justification:</b> Are proposed costs reasonable and justified considering the services to be provided, the targeted population, and the need to balance wages and other costs associated with Transitional Jobs with the costs associated with Job Readiness components? Did the agency complete the Career Catalyst Cost Estimator Calculations and their own costs correctly or did ETR staff correct them?</p>	5	Max 15	
	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	5	Max 100	

22

Do you recommend this program for consideration? Yes  No  Yes, with concerns

If recommended, do you have any concerns? (Describe):

The program seems more community less job readiness

Additional comments if any (may use back):

Program needs training on TIA on putting a program together

39 Print Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature & date \_\_\_\_\_

Short Term Job Readiness & Transitional Jobs Evaluation

Reviewer #

2

Please make initial ratings in pencil and then go back and make sure the points you've given are consistent with your evaluations of each proposed program's strengths and weaknesses. I recommend going back and looking at the first couple of proposals scored after you've done them all, to make sure you weren't easier or harder on them than on the rest, once you settled into a "groove". The number of points you give each agency on each of the scored questions should be consistent with your sense of how you would rank them relative to one another. Whether you are generous or conservative on the scale is not as important as being consistent in how you apply the scale to each proposal. There will be opportunity to discuss and revise scores.

Proposer Code:

045

Program Name (if any):

BTWAS Pre-Apprenticeship Development

Amount requested for agency: \_\_\_\_\_ Amount to cover 3rd Party HR/Payroll: \_\_\_\_\_ Total: 160404

Amount/Type of Leveraging if applicable:

Planned # of participants per cohort: \_\_\_\_\_ Planned # of cohorts: \_\_\_\_\_ Total to be served: \_\_\_\_\_

Cost Per Participant: \_\_\_\_\_

Geographic Area /Community to be served:

Is this rural? Y N Is this underserved? Y N Was justification provided sufficient? Y N

Special populations to be targeted:

Able to serve participants with criminal records? Y Yes N No Limitations/exceptions?

Brief description of program for quick reference:

Industry/Job focus -

# of Cohorts -

Job Readiness Sequential or Concurrent

NO MEMBERS  
REVIEWED W/CMR TA  
SCANNING & FINAL REC.

RD

NOTE: QUESTION #12 is not "missing"; this was an error in numbering. The application moves from question #11 to #13.

				Comments
1.	<p><b>Capabilities &amp; Demonstrated Ability:</b> Has the agency previously demonstrated the management capability and experience to provide the services proposed, including the ability to manage and track participant activities and program expenditures and maintain fiscal integrity and compliance with federal guidelines? Do they have a history of successfully delivering these services and the requisite staff to do so? Are they able to operate on a reimbursement basis?</p>	25	25	yes
2.	<p><b>Location &amp; Accessibility:</b> To what extent is the training location appropriate for and accessible to the population to be served? Is the location already established and if not, is it likely the applicant will be able to secure an appropriate location before the end of the ramp up period? Are COVID-19 protocols sufficient and to what extent would the described contingency allow the program to continue to operate under various levels of restrictions?</p>	10	5	All virtual location not accessible
3.	<p><b>Program Design &amp; Planned Approach:</b> To what extent does the proposed program meet the objectives of the RFP? Has applicant clearly identified the industry/jobs for which participants are to be prepared and designed a program that is likely to be successful given the challenges of the targeted population, with sufficient instruction, structure and attention to participants' progress? Are competencies clearly described, including how they will be measured, and is at least one industry-recognized certificate available to be earned? Do the Job Readiness and Transitional Jobs components appear to be designed to work together if delivered separately?</p>	30	30	yes
4.	<p><b>Enrollment Goals &amp; Program Performance:</b> To what extent do enrollment goals appear to be consistent with/reasonable considering the available funding and the need to deliver quality services to highly barriered participants in a short time frame? Does applicant's recruitment plan seem sufficient to generate at least 80% of planned enrollments? To what extent does the program seem likely to succeed in terms of participants completing activities and being ready for placement in unsubsidized employment when referred back to ETR?</p>	20	5	not started not addressed
5.	<p><b>Budget Summary &amp; Justification:</b> Are proposed costs reasonable and justified considering the services to be provided, the targeted population, and the need to balance wages and other costs associated with Transitional Jobs with the costs associated with Job Readiness components? Did the agency complete the Career Catalyst Cost Estimator Calculations and their own costs correctly or did ETR staff correct them?</p>	15	15	yes
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>				
		<b>Max 100</b>	80	



### Cohort Training:

Cohort training: The RFP stated the proposal should use the cohort training model. The RFP did not stipulate the training had to be delivered using the cohort model. MAOF operates our programs using the open entry/open exit model. When we informed ETR we would continue to use our current training delivery model, MAOF was told, “you better be ready to lose some points.” The RFP should have been clear on exactly how many points were to be lost for not using the Cohort model if in fact this was a condition.

There was a lack of clarity in that agencies were not given the opportunity to explain their rationale in preferring one training delivery model over another. Additionally, due to this lack of clarity ETR is unable to say whether MAOF lost points for preferring to use the Open Entry/Open Exit training delivery model.

Cohort training does not work for many in the populations to be served under this RFP. If made to wait too long potential clients are easily distracted. Due to the high volume of paperwork and testing ETR is required to obtain, the eligibility determination process at ETR normally takes 6 to 8 weeks. We know this as we follow up and track the referrals we make to ETR. We contact participants weekly to keep them engaged as they go through the eligibility determination process.

Of the last 24 people we sent over the shortest time from application to beginning training was three weeks. This was one person out of 24. 11 of the 24 referrals took over two- and one-half months for the paperwork to be completed and the client referred to us for training. To be clear we understand the voluminous amount of paperwork and testing that ETR is required to obtain to determine eligibility for training. Many times, a client must request copies of required documents which take time. Other times a client may not have the testing scores needed to enter a training program. The client is given the opportunity to study a few days and return to retake the test.

### Costs

ETR in formulating their funding recommendations must look at the necessity and reasonableness of costs. It was this “due diligence” that was cause for ETR not to

recommend the funding for an agency for the 19/20 fiscal year. Despite this agency training in the one of the highest demand occupations in Kern County that are office occupations, despite this agencies niche in serving the targeted populations listed in the current RFP, and despite ETR's own statement that performance from this agency was not the issue, ETR felt they could not justify to the Workforce Development Board the "high cost per enrollment." The Workforce Development Board agreed with ETR and voted to deny the funding.

For the fiscal year 18/19 that ETR used as its basis for not recommending funding, the agency served a total of 49 people (ETR numbers). The average cost per enrollment that year was \$10,204.

In the current recommendations apparently ETR's aspirations for due diligence has gone out the window. ETR is recommending funding for an agency whose cost per enrollment is \$25,000. This is more than double (\$14,796.) the amount ETR's due diligence would not allow them to recommend for an agency who is consistently without performance issues.

Additionally, the agency pointed out they worked with persons with multiple barriers to employment. ETR responded everyone that is enrolled in training has multiple barriers to employment.

### Demand for Training

This same agency proposes to train the formally incarcerated in Warehouse work and upon completion the client will receive an industry recognized certificate which is the Forklift Certification. The goal of the program is that it will create a pathway into entry level permanent employment in the warehouse industry.

The problem is there is already a pathway for the formally incarcerated to enter employment into warehousing without it costing the taxpayer a dime. This pathway is "common knowledge" in the world of those who work with the formally incarcerated. Working for a staffing agency is recommended for those who need to build or rebuild their work history and is routinely recommended by programs that offer re-entry services. Many of the local staffing agencies will hire the formally incarcerated and place them to work in warehousing with little or no experience being required.

Attached please find a brief poll we recently conducted with local staffing agencies to confirm warehousing work is readily available without any experience being

required. We asked if they hired the formally incarcerated, if they placed the formally incarcerated in warehousing jobs, and if the warehouse provided the entry level training onsite once a person was placed with them.

We found several local staffing agencies do hire the formally incarcerated and reported many of the employers they contracted with trained for the warehouse work onsite and did not require previous warehousing experience.

Additionally, the one industry recognized certificate which is the forklift certification offered by this agency can be obtained by attending a three-hour course at Westec at the cost of \$35.00. Please see attached information on Westec. There are also other programs that offer Forklift Certification.

### **Concern**

The agencies applying for this funding were instructed not to identify themselves in the grant. The stated intent was for the reviewers not to know whose proposal they were reading. We do not know if this is some trendy new thing in the world of grant writing but how prevalent of a practice is this and who brought this idea forward in relation to this grant? We have been informed the readers for the grant were members of the B3K collaborative. One of the agencies being recommended for funding, is a prominent member of the B3K collaborative. Is it not possible, if not probable, the reviewers could have recognized the work of one of its active collaborative members?

If the reviewers recognized the work of one of its prominent member agencies, at the very least a potential or perceived conflict of interest benefitting this organization is created. Potential or perceived conflicts of interest should have been disclosed. The reviewers should have been asked to affirm they did not recognize any of the agencies whose grants they read.

# Contacts for Warehouse Jobs

<b>BUSINESS</b>	<b>ADDRESS</b>	<b>PHONE (HOME)</b>	<b>NOTES</b>
Hire Up Staffing Services	5000 California Ave #204, Bakersfield, CA 93309	661-379-8807	Depends on convictions. Does hire for warehouse. Some employers they contract with will provide entry level warehouse training.
Ready Work	200 New Stine Rd Ste. 222, Bakersfield, CA 93309	661-847-9866	Does hire for warehouse. Some employers they contract with will provide entry level warehouse training.
Rand Employment Solutions	5016 California Ave #5, Bakersfield, CA 93309	661-399-7000	Does hire for warehouse. Some employers they contract with will provide entry level warehouse training.

# Contacts for Warehouse Jobs Sports Club

<b>BUSINESS</b>	<b>ADDRESS</b>	<b>PHONE (HOME)</b>	<b>NOTES</b>
United Staffing Associates	1401 Airport Drive, Bakersfield, CA 93308	661-393-4146	Does hire for warehouse. Some employers they contract with will provide entry level warehouse training.
Employers Depot	5701 Truxtun Ave STE 220, Bakersfield, CA 93309	661-325-0200	Does hire for warehouse. Some employers they contract with will provide entry level warehouse training.
Express Employment Solutions	1400 Chester Ave Suite H, Bakersfield, CA 93301	661-395-0395	Hires for entry level warehouse jobs. Some employers they contract with will provide entry level warehouse training. Dependent on conviction.





# FORKLIFT TRAINING-IN PERSON EVERY THURSDAY & FRIDAY!



**ALL SALES ARE FINAL. ABSOLUTELY NO REFUNDS ON ANY TRANSACTIONS**

**WHAT: FORKLIFT IN PERSON**

**WHEN: THURSDAY & FRIDAY (WALK-IN OKAY)**

**IN SPANISH: SATURDAY OCTOBER 23**

**TIME: 8:00 A.M. (FOR SPANISH CLASSES CALL 661 387-1055)**

<https://westec.org/forklift>



**COST: \$35 PER PERSON (NO CASH OR CREDIT CARD REFUNDS)**

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CALL (661) 387-1055**

**Due to safety and health considerations, space is limited. You must wear a mask and your temperature will be taken before class begins. NO REFUNDS**

**Must park in Student Parking Lot, then walk over to the Gym (look for the sign "ALL MORNING SAFETY CLASSES START HERE") for a temperature check, payment, and directions to your classroom.**

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION AND PATIENCE. LET'S KEEP EACH OTHER SAFE**

**FOR MORE INFORMATION, CALL**

**PETER MARTINEZ AT (661) 387-1055 OR**

**RIGO ENCISO AT (661) 316-7749**

**EMAIL: [rigowestec05@gmail.com](mailto:rigowestec05@gmail.com)**

## **WESTEC**

WESTEC P.O. Box 1210 5801 E. Lerdo Hwy, Shafter, CA 93263 US VEA EL MAPA EN LA  
PAGINA PRINCIPAL

(661) 387-1055

Copyright © 2020 WESTEC

Powered by GoDaddy Website Builder



Cohort Training:

Cohort training: The RFP stated the proposal should use the cohort training model. The RFP did not stipulate the training had to be delivered using the cohort model. MAOF operates our programs using the open entry/open exit model. When we informed ETR we would continue to use our current training delivery model, MAOF was told, “you better be ready to lose some points.” The RFP should have been clear on exactly how many points were to be lost for not using the Cohort model if in fact this was a condition.

**Response:**

***There is no indication from either reviewer that any points were deducted for MAOF’s open entry/open exit model. Reviewers noted the low work experience hours and lack of innovation for the program. Please see the reviewer’s comments for this program.***

There was a lack of clarity in that agencies were not given the opportunity to explain their rationale in preferring one training delivery model over another. Additionally, due to this lack of clarity ETR is unable to say whether MAOF lost points for preferring to use the Open Entry/Open Exit training delivery model.

**Response:**

***Proposers should have explained their training delivery model in the “Program Design & Planned Approach” section. There was no page limit for the RFP.***

Cohort training does not work for many in the populations to be served under this RFP. If made to wait too long potential clients are easily distracted. Due to the high volume of paperwork and testing ETR is required to obtain, the eligibility determination process at ETR normally takes 6 to 8 weeks. We know this as we follow up and track the referrals we make to ETR. We contact participants weekly to keep them engaged as they go through the eligibility determination process.

Of the last 24 people we sent over the shortest time from application to beginning training was three weeks. This was one person out of 24. 11 of the 24 referrals took over two- and one-half months for the paperwork to be completed and the client referred to us for training. To be clear we understand the voluminous

amount of paperwork and testing that ETR is required to obtain to determine eligibility for training. Many times, a client must request copies of required documents which take time. Other times a client may not have the testing scores needed to enter a training program. The client is given the opportunity to study a few days and return to retake the test.

Costs

ETR in formulating their funding recommendations must look at the necessity and reasonableness of costs. It was this “due diligence” that was cause for ETR not to recommend the funding for an agency for the 19/20 fiscal year. Despite this agency training in the one of the highest demand occupations in Kern County that are office occupations, despite this agencies niche in serving the targeted populations listed in the current RFP, and despite ETR’s own statement that performance from this agency was not the issue, ETR felt they could not justify to the Workforce Development Board the “high cost per enrollment.” The Workforce Development Board agreed with ETR and voted to deny the funding.

For the fiscal year 18/19 that ETR used as its basis for not recommending funding, the agency served a total of 49 people (ETR numbers). The average cost per enrollment that year was \$10,204.

**Response:**

***ETR worked with MAOF to implement a pilot program similar to what is in the proposal. The results of the pilot program is included in the chart below.***

Agency/Program	Funding	Planned		Actual	Dropouts	Net	Cost Per	Cost Per Net
		Enrollments	Participant					
MAOF Office Work- Readiness & Trans. Jobs	\$160,000	20	\$8,000	5	2	3	\$32,000	\$53,333
Nobody actually completed the Core Competencies and went to work experience								

In the current recommendations apparently ETR’s aspirations for due diligence has gone out the window. ETR is recommending funding for an agency whose cost per enrollment is \$25,000. This is more than double (\$14,796.) the amount ETR’s due diligence would not allow them to recommend for an agency who is consistently without performance issues.

Additionally, the agency pointed out they worked with persons with multiple barriers to employment. ETR responded everyone that is enrolled in training has multiple barriers to employment.

### Demand for Training

This same agency proposes to train the formally incarcerated in Warehouse work and upon completion the client will receive an industry recognized certificate which is the Forklift Certification. The goal of the program is that it will create a pathway into entry level permanent employment in the warehouse industry.

The problem is there is already a pathway for the formally incarcerated to enter employment into warehousing without it costing the taxpayer a dime. This pathway is “common knowledge” in the world of those who work with the formally incarcerated. Working for a staffing agency is recommended for those who need to build or rebuild their work history and is routinely recommended by programs that offer re-entry services. Many of the local staffing agencies will hire the formally incarcerated and place them to work in warehousing with little or no experience being required.

### Response:

***While some participants with brief incarceration histories may be successful with a direct placement we have found many with longer histories of incarceration to have difficulty integrating into a work setting. They often require substantial work readiness interventions in order to succeed in the workplace.***

Attached please find a brief poll we recently conducted with local staffing agencies to confirm warehousing work is readily available without any experience being required. We asked if they hired the formally incarcerated, if they placed the formally incarcerated in warehousing jobs, and if the warehouse provided the entry level training onsite once a person was placed with them.

We found several local staffing agencies do hire the formally incarcerated and reported many of the employers they contracted with trained for the warehouse work onsite and did not require previous warehousing experience.

Additionally, the one industry recognized certificate which is the forklift certification offered by this agency can be obtained by attending a three-hour

course at Westec at the cost of \$35.00. Please see attached information on Westec. There are also other programs that offer Forklift Certification.

**Response:**

***ETR sends many participants through WESTEC annually for a variety of industrial certifications. WESTEC is very beneficial for participants who simply need a certificate.***

**Concern**

The agencies applying for this funding were instructed not to identify themselves in the grant. The stated intent was for the reviewers not to know whose proposal they were reading. We do not know if this is some trendy new thing in the world of grant writing but how prevalent of a practice is this and who brought this idea forward in relation to this grant? We have been informed the readers for the grant were members of the B3K collaborative. One of the agencies being recommended for funding, is a prominent member of the B3K collaborative. Is it not possible, if not probable, the reviewers could have recognized the work of one of its active collaborative members?

**Response:**

***The blind review process was put into place to ensure that there was no bias in the process. MAOF has mentioned to ETR just as they did at the last WDB meeting that they feel that ETR has been biased against their agency. The blind application process was to eliminate bias in the process. Outside reviewers were selected so that there was less opportunity for them to identify applicants. Reviewers indicated that they did not know who the proposers were until they were revealed after the ratings were concluded.***

If the reviewers recognized the work of one of its prominent member agencies, at the very least a potential or perceived conflict of interest benefitting this organization is created. Potential or perceived conflicts of interest should have been disclosed. The reviewers should have been asked to affirm they did not recognize any of the agencies whose grants they read.

**Response:**

***After the proposers were revealed County Counsel reviewed the proposers the reviewers and determined that there was no conflict of interest. Both reviewers filled out the County's standard conflict of interest form for reviewers.***