

Minutes



Executive Committee Special Meeting

4/15/2022

10am

Attendees: Scott Watson, Beth Cicchetti, Kevin Vaughn, Cristina Paredes, Holly Henderson and Tom Eisel

Members Absent: Nina Self

Staff Present: Jim McShane, Matt Salera, Dee Robinson, Trish Yahn and Charlotte Brown,

RECORDING: Patricia McCray

I. I. Welcome – Scott Watson

Chair Watson welcomed everyone to the meeting and called the meeting to order at 2:01 pm. He explained that anyone attending from the public could participate; however, public comment is held to a three (3)-minute limit.

II. II. Action Item I – Meeting Minutes Approval – February 21st, 2022

Chair Watson drew the Committee's attention to the April 15th, 2022, Executive Committee meeting minutes. He asked if anyone had any questions or comments about the minutes, and there were none.

MOTION: Chair Watson entertained a motion to approve the minutes; Kevin made the motion, and Holly seconded it. All in favor, and the motion passes, all approved.

III. III. RFP 2022-02 Workforce Development Services Provider – Action Item II

Chair Watson stated Matt would provide the specific details for this Action Item II. Matt stated that the Executive Committee decided at the last meeting to issue two RFPs. Action Item II is for RFP 2022-02, the Workforce Development Services Provider RFP. And it was advertised for over 30 days. There was a very high interest as soon as it was advertised. There were many questions. There were over eight pages of questions and answers posted. Matt stated that he established deadlines and dozens of attachments, and a lot of additional information was requested, such as job descriptions and performance data.

By the deadline, there were six proposals received. They are listed in the Action Item II documents with the six organizations. We had a team of six raters established before the RFP's release to rate each proposal. Unfortunately, only three of the six raters submitted rating sheets. All of the proposals were received before the deadline. Each proposal was thoroughly reviewed to ensure they were compliant with the RFP and all of them were. Matt drew the Executive Committee's attention to the proposal Scoring Summary. Two proposers had the exact point totals of 264 when the three ratings were totaled, and that was C2 Global Professional Services, LLC, and EDSI, which is Educational Data Systems, Inc. Matt asked if there were any questions?

Kevin stated that we have a tie for the top spot. Is that correct?

Jim stated that the staff is proposing that the two top contenders are given 30 minutes to make a presentation to the Board in the next week, which gives the companies a chance to participate. Also, in further discussions and feedback that we've gotten, the staff is proposing that DWFS, the current provider, be accommodated with a chance to propose why the contract should be continued with them.

Kevin stated, a total of three presentations to the Executive Committee? Jim stated that is correct. Kevin said that sounded like a reasonable way to move forward with a tight situation.

Scott said to give the information that we have based on one of the raters taking another job and could not respond due to making the transition to the new position. And another rater was out of town and unable to respond, and that's how it ended being only three raters responding instead of six.

Scott asked if the presentations would be to the entire Board or the Executive Committee? There would need to be a special meeting to hear the presentations.

Kevin recommended that only the Executive Committee hear the presentations because the full Board has not been involved in the RFP process.

Cristina asked, does the full Board need to approve the final company proposal that the Executive Committee selects?

Jim clarified their questions by stating that the Executive Committee, as stated in the CSCR Bylaws, has the authority to make the decision. Whichever company the Executive Committee chooses will have to be endorsed by the Board at the June 23rd, 2022 meeting. Because of the tight timeframe, CSCR can not wait that long. There will have to be a contract in place hopefully by May 1st. This gives the new provider time to work on a transition. Matt stated that's if a new provider is selected.

Cristina asked, what if we scheduled a meeting for the Executive Committee, as Kevin mentioned, but extend the invitation to the full Board to attend if they were interested?

Jim stated that having Executive Committee and Board members at the meeting would present a quorum issue.

Scott stated that his concern was not having enough Board members to have a quorum.

Tom stated we can still have the Executive Committee meeting, invite the other Board Members and allow them to provide their opinion and not vote, but we can still consider their opinion. In other words, do we want to make it open to them? This way, we don't have a quorum problem.

Scott shared his concern that it doesn't create an issue with a quorum because this will have to be a notice to the public because of this being a public meeting. I'm certainly not trying to exclude the Board from the process, as long as we're sure that that will create an issue for a quorum and move

forward. As Jim said, they need to have ample time to prepare regardless of who is selected. We are in a time crunch to ensure sufficient time to prepare and be ready to move forward with the new program year.

Jim asked if the Executive Committee wanted him to check with the attorney to clarify having the Executive Committee meeting and inviting the Board members as optional with no voting privileges? Jim stated he would contact CSCR's Attorney and ask her. However, the Executive Committee does have the authority to make the selection with a motion.

Tom stated that he wouldn't want to cause legal fees and didn't think CSCR needed to get an attorney involved. Scott and Kevin agreed with Tom. Kevin stated that RFPs are famous for being questioned, particularly by those who do not get the project. Therefore, we must follow the process the way it's set up.

Beth asked, why are we giving Dynamic Workforce Solutions a chance to present when we voted not to extend their contract for one additional year as their contract allowed? Why would we go against our original vote?

Jim stated that was a good question, but he did not have an answer.

Scott stated that he's not opposed to that, but we should go back to the minutes and review the Board's decision. And if it's in the meeting minutes, I concur with you.

Cristina agreed with Beth, stating why give Dynamic Workforce Solutions a chance to present when they voted not to extend their contract for one additional year.

Kevin asked if Dynamic Workforce Solutions had submitted an RFP? Jim stated that they did not submit an RFP.

Matt stated that he did send Dynamic Workforce Solutions an RFP directly to them to provide a proposal, and he received no response.

Jim informed Scott that in the agenda packet, the February 21st minutes, Item II – One-Stop & Workforce Services Contract, there was a discussion to issue an RFP for a new Workforce Services Provider with an approved motion to issue the RFP for a Workforce Services Provider.

Kevin stated that since Dynamic Workforce Solutions didn't respond to the RFP, we will not be able to extend them an invitation to present an oral presentation because we might be violating our process. If they responded, then we would have to allow them to present. Kevin said I don't think that we would be in a position to extend them an invitation to present.

Jim stated that the Executive Committee would need to make a motion to approve presentations for the two tied proposals.

Motion: Tom made the motion only to allow the presentations by the two tied proposals, Educational Data Systems, Inc. and G2 Global Professional Services LLC. And Beth seconded the motion. All in favor, and the motion passes, all approved.

Matt drew the attention of the Executive Committee to the February 21st minutes regarding the sentence to reference what was discussed in this meeting, "this meeting was called to allow for the Executive Committee to be informed and determined if the Board wishes to issue a contract with renewal with Dynamic Workforce Solutions or issue an RFP". And then, the motion is to issue an RFP.

Scott informed the Executive Committee that the whole reason that we're even having a conversation is that in our discussions in previous meetings, staff advised Dynamic Workforce Solutions was not meeting the deliverables. We don't seem to be getting the responses that lead us to believe that there's going to be a significant improvement in getting them back in line with the requirements of our program.

Holly stated that she agreed with all the comments that had been made. If Dynamic Workforce Solutions was interested, they should have responded, and it should have been made clear by communicating with a response to the RFP. It confuses the issue if we invite them to do a presentation. It should only be the two tied proposals that do the presentations.

Matt confirmed again to the Executive Committee that he had not received any responses or questions from Dynamic Workforce Solutions. He sent the RFP directly to Dynamic Workforce Solutions.

Tom stated that we should provide Dynamic Workforce Solutions with the formal notification as required in the current contract within the specified timeframe since the contract expires on June 30th.

Scott said that he did not know if there was a period of notification required to notify them that the contract was not going to be renewed or issue them notice of non-renewal, and it doesn't have to be done within a specific timeframe before expiration.

Jim stated that he would notify them as soon as the Board took action.

Holly stated that she's not sure what the contract stats about the notifications, but when we notify Dynamic Workforce Solutions of the non-renewal of their contract, we expect them to provide support during the transition period.

Beth mentioned that it's her understanding that it's preferred that the One-Stop provider and the Workforce Services Provider be different companies. And we have two exact scores on the Service Providers. And one of those two scores was the only response to the One-Stop provider. Is it a natural conclusion that EDSI would be our choice for the One-Stop Provider and the other company would be our choice for Service Provider, and we can move forward? Are we still trying to make some decisions by having presentations?

Jim stated that if EDSI is chosen for the Service Provider, their bid for the One-Stop Operator would not be accepted. There would be another RFP advertised for a One-Stop Operator, and this would not be focused on the June 29th or June 30th deadline. We can do that. And I do think we'll get a couple more responses if we go out again.

Matt stated that Action Item IV, RFP 2022-03 One-Stop Operator, is a Board decision.

Tom asked Matt which contract was the most important for CSCR, the Service Provider or the One-Stop Operator?

Matt stated it's \$3 million for the Service Provider versus \$100 thousand for the One-Stop Operator. It's the Service Provider.

Scott said that there has been an excellent discussion regarding the Service Provider proposals and asked if there is any more discussion needed at this time?

Kevin stated we completed a motion to accept the oral presentations – "**Motion:** *Tom made the motion to only allow the presentations by the two tied proposals, Educational Data Systems, Inc. and G2 Global Professional Services LLC. And Beth seconded the motion. All in favor, and the motion passes, all approved.*"

Scott asked if this motion is still aligned with the Executive Committee to consider these two presentations?

Tom stated that we discussed the other options that would cause legal problems, and he's fine with the Executive Committee reviewing the two proposals.

Scott stated that this is a modification to the motion. He asked Beth if she would still accept this modification to the motion to have the Executive Committee review the oral presentations by Educational Data Systems, Inc. and G2 Global Professional Services LLC and decide on the selection of the Workforce Services Provider.

Motion Modified: Tom made the motion only to allow the presentations by the two tied proposals, Educational Data Systems, Inc. and G2 Global Professional Services LLC. The Executive Committee will review the oral presentations by Educational Data Systems, Inc. and G2 Global Professional Services LLC and decide on the selection of the Workforce Services Provider. Beth seconded the motion. All in favor, and the motion passes, all approved.

Cristina asked when the next Executive Committee meeting would be held to hear the presentations.

Jim stated that it would have to be before the end of April via Zoom and probably two hours. Scott stated that there would have to be a poll to decide when to have the meeting.

Scott said, let's move on to Item IV, the RFP 2022-03 One-Stop Operator -Action Item III.

IV. RFP 2022-03 One-Stop Operator – Action Item II

There was only one proposal. Matt stated that this is for the One-Stop Operator, and there was only one proposal submitted by Educational Data Systems, Inc., which also submitted a proposal for the Workforce Services Provider. Therefore, we did not establish a six-person rating team. A staff person reviewed and provided a rating, and it was deemed responsive. It received a score of

eighty from the rater. The proposed cost was \$83,344 for one year would be a fair price for one full-time staff person. And as Beth previously asked, this is the same organization rated highly as the other RFP. Will we be able to contract with them if they are awarded the other RFP? That could present a conflict of interest. So that is something to consider before making a motion. Matt asked if anyone had questions.

Jim said that he would recommend to the Executive Committee to consider a motion that they would accept this RFP if indeed they are not chosen as the Service Provider and that if they are chosen as the Service Provider, staff will go out for an RFP one more time.

Matt said, or we can release an RFQ. These two functions, Service Provider and the One-Stop Operator, are now separated. RFPs are required only if over a quarter-million dollars or more. The RFQ process would be far simpler and not require putting together a team and doing ratings. There is one proposer, and now we have an idea of the cost, and it's far under.

Scott asked Matt if EDSI is not chosen as the Service Provider, do we want them to be the One-Stop Operator. Matt stated that nothing prohibits that, and we are not required to have a second RFP. Is there any issue with only having one response to the One-Stop Operator RFP?

Scott asked if we could accept the RFP response and not act until we have the presentations and make a selection for the Service Provider RFP before we decide on the One-Stop Operator because the decision of the first one is going to impact the second RFP proposal. Scott asked if any more discussions would need to be entertained for Action Item III?

Scott said that hearing no further discussion, and there should be a motion for Action Items III.

Motion: Kevin made the motion to accept the RFP 2022-03 One-Stop Operator subject to the outcome results for the Workforce Service Provider oral presentations. If there's a conflict being that if EDSI is chosen as the Workforce Service Provider, staff will advertise with an RFQ instead of an RFP for a One-Stop Service Provider. Tom seconded the motion. All in favor, and the motion passes, all approved.

Scott asked everyone to be able to respond as quickly as possible to a meeting before the end of April to hear the two presentations.

Jim stated that staff would create questions for the two Workforce Service Providers.

Scott stated that unless there is further discussion on the action items or other items, he will entertain a motion to adjourn.

V. Adjourn

Scott thanked everyone for their attendance and participation. He then adjourned the meeting.