

**AP/ DW Career Planner and 1 Stop/Resource Room Bidder's Conference
2/21/2018 – Oshkosh Job Center**

Attending: Kim Lemieux and AL Hesse, FVWDB; Bob Kallio, ADVOCAP; Cindy Kiesling (phone) and Donna Janda, LETC

The session began at 0900 in the Turner Room presided by Ms. Lemieux. She started off by asking if everyone was aware of the late change to the combined 1 Stop/Resource Room/OSO RFP. A brief explanation was given as to why this occurred (DWD had some questions about the structure). FVWDB discussed internally yesterday and determined it made more sense to split out the OSO portion and create a separate RFP. Essentially, anything related to the OSO was removed from the combined RFP.

Additionally, Mr. Hesse stated that after some internal discussion, the OSO Contract would be an 'all or nothing' proposition. In other words, a bidder could not selectively chose the counties they're interested in serving. This is in part due to the small dollar amount of the contract and the fact that it's a coordination/oversight type role; no direct services are involved.

1 Stop / Resource Room RFP

Q1. Mr. Kallio asked about the 0.1 FTE position in the RFP. If the contract is split between multiple vendors, is that position split as well?

A. Ms. Lemieux said that would be the case.

Q2. Ms. Kiesling asked if the 1 Stop / Resource Room RFP would be reduced by the amount of the OSO RFP.

A. Ms. Lemieux said that it would. The OSO RFP is at \$18,211.

Q3. Mr. Kallio asked if the contract was awarded to multiple vendors, would the 0.5 FTE (floater) position also be split. Also had some concerns with hiring that 0.5 FTE.

A. Ms. Lemieux stated yes that was the case and that the position was added to give bidders some flexibility for being able to provide adequate coverage for the centers.

Q4. Ms. Kiesling asked for clarification of the 0.5 FTE positions at Berlin and Waupaca while Wautoma remained at 1.0 FTE.

A. Ms. Lemieux stated that there were a number of reasons for allocating the FTE amounts: 1) reduced funding over the past three years has made an impact, 2) the lower number of visits to the centers, and 3) the desire to see if there are some creative solutions out there (e.g. partnering with other community resources).

Follow-up note, discussed after the bidders conference: FVWDB wants to reiterate the fact that there's an intent to keep the centers open outside of the reduced staffing hours; that during those time periods, the centers could provide limited self-service resources to the general public if feasible.

Q5. Ms. Kiesling asked if bidders must follow (exactly) all of the FTE requirements in the RFP.

A. Mr. Hesse stated bidders must live within the parameters (e.g. funding, service) of the RFP. Ms. Lemieux followed up with that if there's a creative solution that FVWDB would be willing to consider.

Follow-up note, discussed after bidders conference: The partial FTE allocations indicate the 'minimum' amount of staff time that must be committed to the centers.

Q6. Ms. Janda noted that on page 13 the usage of 'Salesforce Chatter' is listed. Given that the tool may no longer be used at that time (statewide), does that mean FVWDB wants to continue using it?

A. Ms. Lemieux stated that no, that wasn't necessarily the case. It's there as an example as something that 'may' be required.

Q7. Ms. Kiesling asked if paragraph E., Individual Career Services Overview, was a statement or a question that needed to be answered.

A. Ms. Lemieux stated that bidders should respond with a general description of the population they intended to serve.

Follow-up note, discussed after bidders conference: The description should refer to 'Basic' not 'Individualized' Career Services.

Q8. Ms. Kiesling asked if the budget must be broken out by county.

A. Ms. Lemieux stated that wasn't necessary. A total budget that reflects the total number of counties a bidder is competing for is all that is needed.

Adult / Dislocated Career Planner

Q9. Mr. Kallio asked for clarification on the total number to be served and average caseload. He felt that 90 was pretty high. He was especially concerned with an upcoming layoff in his service area that impacts over 100 workers and it's thought that roughly half do not have a high school diploma. These individuals may require more intensive services.

A. Ms. Lemieux laid out the rationale for the number to be served and the average caseload. DWD had done some analysis and indicated our current numbers were too low.

FVWDB agreed and after taking a further look internally, realized that current target numbers are in danger of not being met and more action was required.

Addressing Mr. Kallio's concern about the upcoming layoff, Ms. Lemieux stated that when the time comes, FVWDB would look into pursuing additional funding for Dislocated Worker Services if required. *Ms. Janda had a similar concern with the average caseload number. She acknowledged that while we may have had a hiring maximum of 130 in the past, the amount of required data entry has also gone up.*

Q10. Ms. Kiesling asked if support services for those in a 'job search' (vice only training) would still be available (pg 15).

A. Ms. Lemieux stated that they would; the policy hadn't changed. The statement in the RFP was more geared towards those in training; however, FVWDB policy does currently allow for an individual who is in 'job search' status to receive support services if warranted and available.

Q11. Ms. Kiesling asked if 'Work Keys' is specifically required (pg 14).

A. Ms. Lemieux responded that it is there as a reference of something that 'could' or 'must be' used.

Q12. Ms. Kiesling asked if the budget templates were available yet.

A. Mr. Hesse responded that they would be published very soon. The 1 Stop template will be a simple aggregate amount because we do not have current time study data to break out the allocation between the WIOA funds. The AP/DW Career Planner budget will be split 50/50 between the two WIOA programs.

The Q&A session wrapped up at approximately 0929. Mr. Hesse and Ms. Lemieux remained until approximately 1005 in case there were any late comers for the conference. No one else came during that open period.

Post Bidders' Conference Q&A

2/21/18

Q13. AP/DW RFP: Do follow-up participants count as part of the 'active' caseload of 90?

A. No they do not.

2/23/18

Q14. AP/DW RFP: Does 2.5 FTE mean we can only use 2.5 individuals?

- A. No. So long as the total FTE equals to 2.5 AND the average caseload is 90 (for the FTEs combined) AND a minimum of 225 participants are served. See the sample below:

<u>Average Caseload</u>			
Goal	FTE	Caseload	
Staff 1	0.10		9.0
Staff 2	0.40		36.0
Staff 3	0.25		22.5
Staff 4	0.50		45.0
Staff 5	0.50		45.0
Staff 6	0.25		22.5
Staff 7	0.50		45.0
Total FTE	2.50	225.0	Total Caseload

Tot Caseload	225.0
Avg FTE	0.3571
# staff	7.00
Avg Caseload	90.0

The tables above are used to provide an example. Proposers do NOT have to use 7 staff in the manner shown above. Any number of staff may be used so long as the total amount of their FTE is 2.5 or less. All of the staff are required to provide direct service to eligible participants.

3/1/18

Q15. AP/DW RFP: Could you clarify ‘caseload’?

- A. ‘Caseload’ is the number of active clients a career planner has served in a given time period; it’s a measure of the number of enrolled participants that received a direct service. Example: A CP has 60 active clients at the beginning of a PY. During that first month, the CP added two (2) new clients and had five (5) exits. At the end of the month, that CP would have served 62 clients (60 + 2) while now having 57 ‘active’ clients (62 – 5). Please note, it is not necessary for a CP to ‘see’ all active clients each month. The need for contact is driven by the services being given. A client in a ‘training’ service requires less contact while in school versus somebody who is in an active job search mode.