

Workforce Investment Board

Request for Proposal (RFP) Review Committee

February 24, 2011 – 8:00 a.m.

Rio Nuevo ONESTOP Center
340 North Commerce Park Loop, Lab 1
Tucson, AZ

MEETING SUMMARY

Members Present:

Noreen Nelson
Duane Bock
Gregg Johnson
Liz Russo-Clyde
Roger Forrester
Vaughn Croft
Wilette Diggs
Christine Hazen-Molina

Staff, Partners, & Guests:

Dana Katbah
Charles Casey
Maiola Coleman
Arnold Palacios
Mike Gutierrez
Colleen March
Georgine Woodley
Ernest Urias
Cheri Alcoverde
Daphanie Conner
Liz Gulick
Kathleen Bibby
Risé Hart

- I. **Call to Order** – at 8:09 a.m. Noreen Nelson chaired the meeting.
- II. **Conflicts of Interest** – Forms were distributed and signed.
- III. **Score Sheet Review** – Provided in packet for reviewers and used to score each proposer.
- IV. **Discussions: Proposer Submissions**
Proposals: CATEGORY I - Basic Education Instruction Technical Proposal: Summer and After School, CATEGORY II – Work Experience Technical Proposal: Summer and After School, and CATEGORY III - Summer Subsidized Work Experience Combined with Summer Basic Education (“Combo” or “50/50”) Technical Proposal.
Each reviewer provided their total score for each proposal they reviewed.
Reviewers were: Noreen Nelson, Duane Bock, Gregg Johnson, Liz Russo-Clyde, Roger Forrester, Vaughn Croft, Wilette Diggs, Chris Hazen-Molina, and Maiola Coleman.

Reviewers provided suggestions for improvement in the RFP Process:

- Give full descriptions not brief descriptions or samples
- Provide information only on the targeted industries in the career ladder section
- Follow the format as outlined in the RFP
- Focus worksites on the business community versus city/state, especially in light of government cutbacks.
- Provide information about youth only -- not dislocated workers or adults
- Ensure budgets are correct and easy to understand
- Understanding of employer needs seemed to be weak

V. Action Item: Formulate Recommendations

Several vendors will be selected in each category. Funding will be allocated to vendors in each category following vendor rankings, until funds are exhausted. Allocations will include specific rural as well as urban activities.

Scores were calculated and rankings assigned. Most categories had proposals that were fundable, and one that was not. In Category III - Three were immediately fundable, two were contingent on allocations, and one was not. The committee directed staff to work with successful proposers to make sure the needs identified by unsuccessful rural proposers will be addressed.

The recommendations will be reviewed and approved by the Workforce Investment Board (WIB) Executive Committee and the full WIB at their upcoming meetings in March.

VI. Adjournment – 9:16 a.m.