

TO: Workforce Investment Board (WIB)

DATE: 3/28/02

FROM: Youth Council

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	For Action
<input type="checkbox"/>	For Information
<input type="checkbox"/>	Meeting Notes

SUBJECT: ARBOR, Inc. Contract Renewal Decision

PROPOSED MOTION: That the WIB concur with the Youth Council's recommendation to not renew the ARBOR, Inc. Out-of-School Youth Contract. Further, that ARBOR, Inc. be allowed to enroll participants only through April 30, 2002.

DISCUSSION: ARBOR, Inc. has been providing employment and training services for Merced County WIA eligible older youth since November, 2000. During this time, they have enrolled within the State system 100 youth and exited 53.

ARBOR, Inc. was formally monitored during June/July, 2001, with numerous discrepancies discovered. The visit revealed a lack of knowledge concerning the Workforce Investment Act, the ARBOR Work Statement Narrative, inadequate documentation of required paperwork, low enrollment totals, and poor documentation of expenses. A second monitoring visit occurred in December, 2001, and again revealed a lack of knowledge of the Work Statement Narrative which resulted in a continued pattern of contract non-compliance. The Workforce Investment Board (WIB) has directed continued monitoring of the ARBOR contract to assure contract compliance.

In January, 2002, Mr. Charles Jameson, ARBOR Vice President presented to the WIB, an ARBOR "Older Youth Program Report". A WIB Staff analysis revealed the report had numerous errors; so many, that Mr. Jameson apologized for the report and presented a corrective action plan to fix ARBOR documentation and reporting problems.

In February, 2002, WIB Staff again monitored ARBOR, Inc. Again, ARBOR was found to not be in compliance with critical elements of its Work Statement narrative. What WIB Staff continues to see is a repetitious pattern of ARBOR being monitored, Staff discovering that the Work Statement Narrative is not being followed, and then ARBOR acknowledging the problems and proffering corrective actions. The original monitoring visit clearly highlighted ARBOR Merced's lack of understanding of the Work Statement Narrative. ARBOR's answer was to train. The second monitoring visit re-identified a lack of understanding and knowledge of the Work Statement Narrative. Again, the ARBOR answer was to train. The analysis of the ARBOR "Older Youth Program Report" generated another set of ARBOR corrective actions. The third monitoring visit revealed the same situation. The before noted repetitive pattern continues.

The Youth Council met on March 8, 2002 and voted not to renew the ARBOR contract. Further, they chose to stop all ARBOR client enrollments after April 30, 2002. If the WIB concurs with the recommendation, the last 2 months of the ARBOR contract will be used to do a complete turn over of responsibility to the new Out-of-School Youth Provider for any ARBOR clients enrolled or exited from the program.

ATTACHMENT: 1) Follow-up Monitoring Report, Feb 22, 2002