

Questions on the MVWIB 2016-17 Lower Merrimack Valley Career Center Request for Proposals

Page 8: Re: MVWIB Strategic Plan: Does the MVWIB have an additional strategic plan (beyond 2016) or planning priorities to present? Is the strategic planning process for the 2016 – 2020 currently underway and is there draft information to review?

Please be guided by the 2012-2016 Strategic Plan. The only additions to it so far discussed are 1] a more systematic attempt to use data to inform our training and development efforts, 3] have WIB monitoring that praises or critiques individual performance mentioned (and subsequently commented upon by individual career center staff) included in annually required career center staff performance reports.

Page 14: Re: Interview Rights for Jobs Created by a New Operator: If there is a new operator, does that not necessarily mean that all staff of current operator will be laid-off? As such, are you requiring the new Operator to commit to hiring back a minimum of 70% of the current staff? What are the guarantees of current staff (who have then been laid-off) actually applying to the new Lead Operator? And if the re-designed structure is radically different, with revised job descriptions, education requirements, and/or the innovative use of technology – how can this be required?

If a new operator is selected, every attempt will be made to transition most current staff without a break in pay. In that scenario, new job descriptions and job interviews for them would occur during the transition period so that staff would be hired by the operator effective July 1st. The 'lay-off' period would be from COB June 30th to July 1st or to start of business on July 3rd, whichever is technically or legally appropriate for health and life insurance, or other such separate fringe plans, transitioned to start on July 1st.

Page 14 and Page 16: The RFP outlines (on page 14) the charter (contracting relationship) for the OSCC. Within the charter requirements, it notes performance standards of center. Also delineated (page 15) is the revocation methodology of the Charter. This indicates a performance review – of negotiated Career Center goals and expectations. This seems to indicate a very metrics based review, with some potential for customer satisfaction metrics on a general level. How does this reconcile with the language on page 16, section X, regarding staff performance? Are you suggesting that internal and operational structures around individual (and an individual) staff performance – that the MVWIB will be setting up systems for individual staff performance review of the Operating Entity?

Metrics-based annual operating entity reviews would occur as required by WIOA. Apart from metrics, annual reviews will include mention of noteworthy individual achievements or issues discovered during monitoring. Those individual achievements and issues would be discussed, at least in part, with career center staff before being included in official annual reviews.

Page 15: Incentives and Sanctions: can you provide any historical example of when Incentives and Sanctions have been used in the Merrimack Valley Workforce Development System, or further explanation of how this would be structured?

So far as we know, the only instance of incentive payments occurred over a decade ago and were criticized as being unfairly awarded. More recently, the U.S. Department of Labor released various performance and incentive based programs that we hope to use as models for our regional efforts.

What is the role of the MVWIB Board versus the MVWIB Staff on the charter review and performance assessment of the Lead Operator?

MVWIB staff will not be part of the proposal review team, board and partner members will be. WIB staff will advise reviewers on the content of the RFP and its proposal responses.

Page 22 C. Right to File a Grievance – Local Appeals Process: How do you reconcile the Grievance and Local Appeals process outlined in the RFP with the process set forth in the Massachusetts Policy Issuance, 100 DCS 03.105 issued on 10.06.2016. Specifically, the issuance states that you must follow a formal local policy, or must follow the Issuance policy points. Is the process set forth in the RFP a formal local policy, specifically approved by appropriate committees?

We will follow a formal local policy grounded in the Massachusetts Policy. The MVWIB Executive Committee anticipates that there will be grievances and our timeline accelerates their equitable resolution.

Page 32: On proposed staffing: What is your definition of “principles,” in terms of required resume submission.

The RFP asks for the “Resumes of all principals to be affiliated with the One-Stop Career Center”. We are thus asking for the resumes of persons ‘with the highest authority or most important position in an organization, institution, or group’. This is especially important for organizations submitting consortium proposals.

How should bidders work out a budget or make operational plans with State partner staff when discussions may divulge proposal content?

While asking for conversations to be confidential and private, bidders should discuss and make joint plans with State and other partners as much as reasonably possible.