

Updated October 2021  
Version 1.0

# WIOA TITLE I MONITORING GUIDE: YOUTH SERVICE PROCUREMENT



This monitoring guide provides an overview of data collection and analysis processes related to New Jersey Department of Labor (NJ DOL) oversight and monitoring processes of WIOA (Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act) Title I Youth program procurement.

## Overview of Procurement Document and Data Collection

As part of NJDOL’s WIOA Title I monitoring, we are requesting that your local Workforce Development Board (WDB) provide us with specific documents and details related to your service delivery procurement processes. We are requesting that you submit a series of documents, answer a set of questions, and provide additional information outlined in this form. If you have any questions about this process, please reach out to your local monitor for support.

### Step 1: Please submit the following documents related to youth service procurement.

- Any documents providing policy and/or process overview of procurement procedures
- All requests for proposal related to procurement of youth services
- Notice of availability of request for proposal published in a newspaper for the submission of proposals NJSA40A:11-4.5(a) 29CFR 97-36
- A written code of standards and conduct governing the performance of employees engaged in the award and administration of contracts. 29 CFR 97.36 (b) (3)
- Signed conflict of interest statements from each person evaluating proposals. NJAC 5:34-4.3
- Cost/Price Analysis of each proposal 29 CFR 97.36 (f) (1); FAR 15.404
- Report evaluating and recommending the award of a contract or contracts, including information about all prospective vendors and submitted proposals NJSA40A:11-4.5
- Formal resolution of governing body approving the award of contracts
- Public record of contract awards
- Contracts related to procured youth services
- Any change orders from procured youth contracts executed since PY19

Step 2: Please indicate in what years you engaged in service delivery procurement processes to secure contracts. This includes providing information about procurement of (1) WIOA Title I Youth Services, (2) One-Stop-Operators, and (3) Work First New Jersey (WFNJ) vendors. Additional rows are left blank for entering any additional service delivery procurement processes.

| Procurement Description  | PY18<br>(Y/N) | PY19<br>(Y/N) | PY20<br>(Y/N) | PY21<br>(Y/N) |
|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>WFNJ vendors</b>      |               |               |               |               |
| <b>One-Stop Operator</b> |               |               |               |               |
| <b>Youth Providers</b>   |               |               |               |               |
|                          |               |               |               |               |
|                          |               |               |               |               |

**Step 3: Please fill out specific information related to your last youth program procurement process. If you ran more than one procurement process for different youth services, please fill out this information for each procurement process.**

| Area                     | Questions  | Procurement Details |
|--------------------------|--|---------------------|
| General Procurement Info | What youth services (program elements) did you procure for?  |                     |
|                          | In what year and quarters did you procure these youth services?  |                     |
|                          | When did the contract for the procured service begin?  |                     |
|                          | Was this procured through a single source or competitive process?  |                     |
|                          | If single source, what was the justification for conducting a single source process?   |                     |
| Request for Proposals    | Did the RFP include reference to use of federal WIOA funds? (Stevens amendment)  |                     |
|                          | Did the RFP include questions that assessed <sup>1</sup> :   |                     |
|                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program experience delivering proposed services</li> </ul>  |                     |
|                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project management and staffing capacity to execute proposed services</li> </ul>  |                     |
|                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear service delivery plan and model that aligns with WIOA expectations</li> </ul>   |                     |
|                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear and appropriate budget details</li> </ul>   |                     |
|                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fiscal capacity and stability of organization submitting proposal</li> <li>• Physical infrastructure and staffing to support diverse participant needs – e.g., on-site building accessibility, diverse languages</li> </ul> |                     |

<sup>1</sup> See Model Evaluation Criteria (NJAC 5:34-4.2)

| Area                        | Questions   | Procurement Details   |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| Bidding<br>Process/Timeline | When was the RFP posted/shared?   |   |
|                             | What steps were taken to share information about the RFP?   |   |
|                             | Where was the RFP advertised?   |   |
|                             | When was the RFP advertised?  |   |
|                             | Was a bidder's conference conducted?  |   |
|                             | When was a bidder's conference conducted?   |   |
|                             | What was the deadline for proposal submission?  |   |
|                             |   | How many proposals were submitted/received?                       |
| Evaluation/Selection        | Who was on the evaluation committee?  |   |
|                             | Do you have a signed conflict of interest statement from each one, signed and dated before the evaluation?  |   |
|                             | How was the past performance of vendors incorporated into the evaluation process?                           |   |
|                             | When were selections finalized?   |   |
|                             | What was the outcome of the process? (I.e., Was a selection made? Who was selected?)                        |   |
|                             | Did the selected proposal include all of the information required in the RFP?                               |   |
|                             | How were vendors notified of awards/results?  |   |
|                             |   | When were vendors notified of awards/results?                     |
| Contracting                 | When was a contract executed for this work?   |   |
|                             | Does the scope of work included in the contract align with the elements outlined in the proposal?           |   |
|                             | Does the amount of the contract align with the proposal amount?   |   |
|                             | Are specific performance expectations included in the contract to support evaluation of vendor performance? |   |
|                             | Is the contract signed and dated by all required parties?   |   |
|                             | How long was the contract period? (Including information about potential renewal)                           |   |
|                             |   | Was the contract approved by the WDB and made publicly available? |

## NJDOT Procurement Analysis Rubric

| Monitoring Area   | 1-Model  | 2-Some Promising Practice   | 3-Needs Improvement  |
|---|--|---|--|
| <b>Process supported engagement of multiple prospective vendors</b>                                     | The process included outreach to and resulted in engagement of more than one vendor.   | The process resulted in engagement of only one vendor, but demonstrated evidence of outreach to multiple vendors.   | The process resulted in engagement of only one vendor, and limited evidence of outreach to other vendors.  |
| <b>Request for proposal (RFP) offered clear and comprehensive information and expectations</b>          | The RFP included specific questions and details about the (1) vendor's proposed service delivery, (2) vendor's experience and performance delivering proposed services, (3) proposed budget, and (4) staff and organizational capacity to deliver proposed services. | The RFP includes questions and details about the vendor's proposed service delivery and budget. However, questions and details about vendor experience and performance, and staff and organization capacity are more limited. | The RFP includes limited questions and details about the vendor's proposed service delivery and/or budget.   |
| <b>Request for proposal (RFP) included reference to federal funding through WIOA</b>                    | The RFP makes specific reference to federal support and funding through WIOA.  |   | The RFP makes no reference to federal support and funding through WIOA.  |
| <b>Solicitation of proposals included public dissemination of and equal opportunity for information</b> | RFP was advertised through newspaper ad and other mediums, including social media and/or a bidder's conference, to reach a broad audience; information was available equally to all interested vendors.  | RFP was advertised through a newspaper ad but evidence of other outreach efforts limited; limited information was available equally to all interested vendors.  | RFP was not advertised through a newspaper ad; and/or evidence that information was made available to some vendors and not others.                                 |
| <b>Process included fair and rigorous evaluation of proposals</b>                                       | Evaluation processes included multiple evaluators, signed conflict of interest statement from each evaluator, evidence of clear selection criteria inclusive of full range of RFP elements, and a clear analysis leading to vendor selection.                        | Evaluation processes included multiple evaluators and signed conflict of interest statements from each evaluator; however, evidence of selection criteria and clear analysis process more limited.                            | Evaluation processed did not include multiple evaluators or clear conflict of interest processes.  |
| <b>Selection and award of contract included appropriate approval and dissemination procedures</b>       | Vendor selection and contract award included formal resolution of governing body, as well as public dissemination of information about award.  | Vendor selection and award of contract included evidence of formal resolution of governing body or public dissemination of information about the award, but not both.   | Limited evidence that vendor selection and award of contract include formal resolution of a governing body or public dissemination of information about the award. |
| <b>Contract with vendor included an appropriate scope of work aligned with RFP and proposal</b>         | Scope of work and budget included in the contract aligned with vendor's proposed scope and budget.   | Scope of work and budget included in the contract showed some dissimilarities with vendor's proposed scope and budget, but details or justification offered.  | Scope of work and budget included in contract showed dissimilarities with vendor's proposed scope and budget, but no details or justification offered.             |

## NJDOl Procurement Analysis Worksheet

| Local Workforce Development Board                |                    |                  |
|--|--------------------|------------------|
| <b>Type of Procurement</b>                       |                    |                  |
| <b>Start and End Date of Procurement Process</b> | <b>Start Date:</b> | <b>End Date:</b> |
| <b>Reviewer/Monitor</b>                          |                    |                  |

| Monitoring Areas   | Score | Evidence |
|--|-------|----------|
| Process supported engagement of multiple prospective vendors                                     |       |          |
| Request for proposal (RFP) offered clear and comprehensive information and expectations          |       |          |
| Request for proposal (RFP) included reference to federal funding through WIOA                    |       |          |
| Solicitation of proposals included public dissemination of and equal opportunity for information |       |          |
| Process included fair and rigorous evaluation of proposals                                       |       |          |
| Selection and award of contract included appropriate approval and dissemination procedures       |       |          |
| Contract with vendor included an appropriate scope of work aligned with RFP and proposal         |       |          |
| <b>TOTAL SCORE</b>   |       |          |

Additional Notes and Details: