County of Santa Clara

Social Services Agency

:

1725 Technology Drive San Jose, California 95110-1360



Prepared by	reer
Reviewed by	Kim Chi Trieu
Submitted by	Ofelia Armenta
_	Alette Lundeberg

May 19, 1997

TO: Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors

FROM: Yolanda Lenier Rinaldo, Director

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF FUNDING RECOMMENDATION FOR A REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT CENTER UTILIZING UNEXPENDED REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES (RESS) FUNDS

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended that the Board of Supervisors take the following action:

- Approve the attached funding recommendation for Catholic Charities to provide a Refugee Employment Support Center utilizing unexpended Refugee Employment Social Services (RESS) funds in the amount of \$277,971. The service period is July 1, 1997 through June 30, 1998.
- Authorize the Chairperson to execute a contract with Catholic Charities for the aforementioned services in June 1997.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

There is no impact on the General Fund, as the RESS program is 100 percent federally funded.

ъяде 2 Мау 19, 1997

ĩ

EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES (RESS) FUNDS CONFINED EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT CENTER UTILIZING UNEXPENDED REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES (RESS) FUNDS CONFINUED EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES (RESS) FUNDS CONFINED REFUGEE

CONTRACT HISTORY

Catholic Charities is the recommended contractor resulting from the Request for Proposals (RFP) process conducted to solicit bidders for providing a pilot project Refugee Employment Support Center. Catholic Charities has had previous contract history with the County since 1984. This agency has an excellent track record and strong administrative and fiscal capabilities.

BACKGROUND/REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

On April 1, 1997, the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors approved the Request for Proposals (RFP) to fund one bidder to provide employment retention services for refugees living in the U.S. sixty months or less. Prospective bidders had one month to respond to the RFP. The Agency received five (5) proposals.

The envisioned Center will provide a variety of innovative employment retention services for refugees. This Center is one of the new models the Agency is launching as a part of the Santa Clara Valley Employment Support Initiative (ESI).

Employment Retention Task Force members, Agency staff, and representatives from the United Way and the Social Services Advisory Commission were invited to participate on the evaluation committee. The proposals were evaluated utilizing pre-established prospective bidder was scheduled to give a fifteen-minute oral presentation which was followed by questions from the evaluation committee. The successful bidder was recommended based on the evaluation May 19, 1997 Page 3

1

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF FUNDING RECOMMENDATION FOR A REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT CENTER UTILIZING UNEXPENDED REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES (RESS) FUNDS continued

Program design, successful past performance in employment services delivery, and administrative/fiscal capability were key evaluation points. A 30% match in funds was also required. The evaluation committee reviewed the source(s) of the match and considered whether the prospective bidder could continue the project with funding from other sources after the proposed service period expired.

After careful review, preliminary funding recommendations were hand-delivered to all bidders on May 12, 1997. On Friday May 16, 1997, bidders dissatisfied with the preliminary funding recommendations were offered the opportunity to schedule an appeal to the evaluation committee. Two bidders requested an appeal The evaluation committee reviewed the additional input hearing. provided at the appeal hearings and then finalized the recommendations. The attached final recommendation (Attachment A) is to fund Catholic Charities in the amount of \$277,971 to operate the Refugee Employment Support Center in Santa Clara County.

CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION

If the RFP is not approved, the Agency will be unable to utilize the unexpended RESS funds to provide the proposed services for refugees.

STEPS FOLLOWING APPROVAL

Upon receiving Board approval, the Agency will negotiate the contract with the recommended service provider, submit it to County Counsel for approval as to form and legality, and then forward it to the Chairperson for signature.

ATTACHMENT A

1.0

REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT CENTER FFY 1996 REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES FUND

Total funds available: \$277,971

Proposal #	Agency Name	Amount Requested	Amount Recommended	Score	Rationale
1	Southeast Asian Community Center	\$277,971	\$O	67.25	Program design is not very clear. It does not fully address the retention and skills upgrade components which are critical to the success of this project. The agency has experienced a high turn over of administrative officers. The agency's current contracts are on probation with Santa Clara County; in light of the situation, the agency is not in a good position to undertake another major project.
3	Catholic Charities of Santa Clara	\$277,971	\$277,971	93.75	Program design addresses all critical aspects of the Refugee employment Support center as stated in the RFP guidelines. Currently operating a similar project. Agency has excellent track record. Agency has sufficient financial resource to deliver all the required services. Good linkages with other service providers will enable the project to provide needed support services to clients. Agency can provide 30% matching funds.
6	Vietnamese Voluntary Foundation	\$277,971	\$0	85.5	Proposal is responsive to RFP guidelines; however, plans for specific components are not yet fully in place. For example, plan for staff is not very clear and the facility has not yet been secured. Retention component does not fully address the entire needs of under-employed refugees. Very good oral presentation. This program may be considered if future funding becomes available.

Proposal #	Agency Name	Amount Requested	Amount Recommended	Score	. Rationale
12	Crosscultural Community Services Center	\$277,971	\$0 <u>.</u>	56	Proposal does not show a thorough understanding of the target group or the requirements stated in the RFP guidelines. Proposer has limited experience with refugee clients. Proposed program does not include strategies to assist under-employed refugees. Budget is weak and does not specify source of matching funds.
18	Indochinese Resettlement & Cultural Center	\$277,971	\$O_	71	Proposal does not have much substance to make this project different from the existing ES/VESL program. Proposed program design does not fully address the retention component of the project. No new, innovative strategies to assist under-employed refugees. Plan for computer lab is very vague and under- developed. Source of matching funds is unclear.

<u>REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES</u> <u>FFY 1996 FUNDS</u> <u>COMPONENT: REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT CENTER</u>

Proposal #___1___

AGENCY NAME: _	Southeast Asian Community Center
ADDRESS:	1415 Koll Circle, Suite 108, San Jose, CA
CONTACT PERSON:	Philip Nguyen TELEPHONE: (415) 885-2743
AMOUNT OF I	RECOMMENDATION: \$0

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: 175

UNIT COST:

2

Ì

[] Fund entire program design as requested.

[] Fund part of program design as indicated.

[] Fund if further funds become available, with specified changes in program.

٠.

[X] Not recommended.

RATIONALE:

Composite RFP Score (100 points maximum): 67.25

<u>\$1,588</u>

Program design is not very clear. It does not fully address the retention and skills upgrade components which are critical to the success of this project. The agency has experienced a high turn over of administrative officers. The agency's current contracts are on probation with Santa Clara County; in light of the situation, the agency is not in a good position to undertake another major project.

<u>REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES</u> <u>FFY 1996 FUNDS</u> <u>COMPONENT: REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT CENTER</u>

Proposal #_3_

Catholic Charities		
2625 Zanker Road	, San Jose, CA 951.	34
Coleen Culbraa	TELEPHONE:	<u>944-0284 x159</u>
	2625 Zanker Road	2625 Zanker Road, San Jose, CA 951

AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATION:	\$277,971
NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS:	200
<u>UNIT COST:</u>	\$1,389.86

- [X] Fund entire program design as requested.
- [] Fund part of program design as indicated.
- [] Fund if further funds become available, with specified changes in program.
- [] Not recommended.

RATIONALE: Composite RFP Score (100 points maximum): 93.75

Program design addresses all critical aspects of the Refugee employment Support center as stated in the RFP guidelines. Currently operating a similar project. Agency has excellent track record. Agency has sufficient financial resource to deliver all the required services. Good linkages with other service providers will enable the project to provide needed support services to clients. Agency can provide 30% matching funds.

5

)

REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES <u>FFY 1996 FUNDS</u> <u>COMPONENT: REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT CENTER</u>

Proposal #<u>6</u>

Vietnamese Voluntary	/ Foundation
180 E. Gish Road #A	, San Jose, CA 95112
Trang Nguyen	TELEPHONE: <u>453-3363</u>
	<u> </u>

AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATION:	\$0
NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS:	170
UNIT COST:	<u>\$1,635</u>

[] Fund entire program design as requested.

[] Fund part of program design as indicated.

[X] Fund if further funds become available.

[] Not recommended.

RATIONALE:

Composite RFP Score (100 points maximum): 85.5

.

Proposal is responsive to RFP guidelines; however, plans for specific components are not yet fully in place. For example, plan for staff is not very clear and the facility has not yet been secured. Retention component does not fully address the entire needs of under-employed refugees. Very good oral presentation. This program may be considered if future funding becomes available.

resc

2

)

۰.

REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES <u>FFY 1996 FUNDS</u> <u>COMPONENT: REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT CENTER</u>

Proposal #12

AGENCY NAME:	Crosscultural Commu	unity Services Center
ADDRESS:	2268 A Quimby Road	1, San Jose, CA 95122
CONTACT PERSON:	Ray Valencia	TELEPHONE: _223-6628

AMOUNT OF RECOMMENDATION:	\$0
NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS:	150
UNIT COST:	\$1,853

[] Fund entire program design as requested.

[] Fund part of program design as indicated.

[] Fund if further funds become available, with specified changes in program.

[X] Not recommended.

RATIONALE:

Composite RFP Score (100 points maximum): 56

Proposal does not show a thorough understanding of the target group or the requirements stated in the RFP guidelines. Proposer has limited experience with refugee clients. Proposed program does not include strategies to assist under-employed refugees. Budget is weak and does not specify source of matching funds.

Ì

<u>REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES</u> <u>FFY 1996 FUNDS</u> <u>COMPONENT: REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT CENTER</u>

Proposal #_18__

AGENCY NAME:	Indochinese Resettlement & Cultural Center			
ADDRESS:	399 W. San Carlos S	Street, San Jose, CA	95110	
CONTACT PERSON:	Loc Vu	TELEPHONE:	971-7857	-
AMOUNT OF REC	COMMENDATION:	\$0		
NUMBER OF PAR	TICIPANTS:	300		

<u>UNIT COST:</u>	\$927

[] Fund entire program design as requested.

[] Fund part of program design as indicated.

[] Fund if further funds become available, with specified changes in program.

[X] Not recommended.

RATIONALE:

Composite RFP Score (100 points maximum): 71

Proposal does not have much substance to make this project different from the existing ES/VESL program. Proposed program design does not fully address the retention component of the project. No new, innovative strategies to assist under-employed refugees. Plan for computer lab is very vague and under-developed. Source of matching funds is unclear.

1

Date Prepared 5/9/97

REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SUPPORT CENTER REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES FFY 1996 FUNDS RFP EVALUATION

COMPOSITE OF COMMITTEE SCORES

, i

AGENCY: <u>SEACC</u>

PROPOSAL NO: ____1

EVALUATORS	ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL CAPABILITY PASS/FAIL	PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE 20 POINTS	KNOWLEDGE OF TARGET POPULATION NEEDS <u>20</u> POINTS	PROGRAM DESIGN <u>50</u> POINTS	BUDGET & COST EFFECTIVENESS <u>10</u> POINTS	TOTAL 100
1	Р	15	15	25	5	60
2	Р	15	15	45	6	81
3	Р	14	14	45	5	78
4						
5	?/P	10	10	25	5	50

AVERAGE SCORES _____67.25

•

••

REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES FFY 1996 FUNDS

RFP EVALUATION

COMPOSITE OF COMMITTEE SCORES

AGENCY: <u>Catholic Charities</u>

PROPOSAL NO: ____3

EVALUATORS	ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL CAPABILITY PASS/FAIL	PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE 20 POINTS	KNOWLEDGE OF TARGET POPULATION NEEDS 20_ POINTS	PROGRAM DESIGN <u>50</u> POINTS	BUDGET & COST EFFECTIVENESS <u>10</u> POINTS	TOTAL 100
1	Р	20	18	48	9	95
2	Р	15	18	50	9	92
3	Р	19	19	48	9	95
4						
5	Р	18	18	47	10	93

TOTALS

_____375____

AVERAGE SCORES 93.75

.

REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES FFY 1996 FUNDS RFP EVALUATION COMPOSITE OF COMMITTEE SCORES AGENCY: <u>VIVO</u> PROPOSAL NO: <u>6</u>

EVALUATORS	ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL CAPABILITY PASS/FAIL	PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE 20 POINTS	KNOWLEDGE OF TARGET POPULATION NEEDS 20_ POINTS	PROGRAM DESIGN <u>50</u> POINTS	BUDGET & COST EFFECTIVENESS <u>10</u> POINTS	TOTAL 100
1	Р	18	18	['] 35	8	79
2	Р	15	17	48	8	88
3	Р	17	18	49	8	92
4						
5	Р	15	17	42	9	83

TOTALS <u>342</u>

AVERAGE SCORES 85.5

•

REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES FFY 1996 FUNDS RFP EVALUATION COMPOSITE OF COMMITTEE SCORES AGENCY: <u>Crosscultural Community Services Center</u>

PROPOSAL NO: 12

EVALUATORS	ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL CAPABILITY PASS/FAIL	PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE 20 POINTS	KNOWLEDGE OF TARGET POPULATION NEEDS 20_ POINTS	PROGRAM DESIGN <u>50</u> POINTS	BUDGET & COST EFFECTIVENESS <u>10</u> POINTS	TOTAL 100
1	Р	15	18	35	5	73
2	Р	10	10	35	5	60
3	Р	9	10	32	6	57
4						
5	Р	3	7	20	4	34

TOTALS <u>224</u>

AVERAGE SCORES 56

.

REFUGEE EMPLOYMENT SOCIAL SERVICES FFY 1996 FUNDS RFP EVALUATION COMPOSITE OF COMMITTEE SCORES AGENCY: <u>IRCC</u>

PROPOSAL NO: 18

EVALUATORS	ADMINISTRATIVE & FISCAL CAPABILITY PASS/FAIL	PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE 20 POINTS	KNOWLEDGE OF TARGET POPULATION NEEDS <u>20</u> POINTS	PROGRAM DESIGN <u>50</u> POINTS	BUDGET & COST EFFECTIVENESS <u>10</u> POINTS	TOTAL 100
1	Р	15	15	35	8	73
2	Р	15	15	40	6	76
3	Р	16	15	39	6	76
4						
5	Р	15	13	25	6	59

. ,

TOTALS _____284____

AVERAGE SCORES _____71