

PRIVATE INDUSTRY TRAINING DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP MONITORING REPORT

Date: February 22, 2002

Contractor: ARBOR, Inc. (17-21 Year Round Youth Program)

Date (s) Monitored: February 22, 2002

Monitor(s): David C. Davis

Authority: Workforce Investment Act (WIA), Section 117

Purpose: To ensure programmatic compliance with the current ARBOR, Inc. Year-Round contract.

Please note that the outcome of this monitoring review is based on an examination of only a sample of ARBOR, Inc.'s contract, and is, therefore, only an indicator of total compliance.

This review (February 22, 2002) is conducted on behalf of the Workforce Investment Board (WIB) of Merced County . An initial monitoring review of ARBOR, Inc. was conducted by the Monitoring Unit Private Industry Training Department (PITD) on June 27, 2001. A second monitoring review was conducted December 19, 2001 by WIB Staff. This current review evaluated the corrective actions taken by ARBOR, Inc. in response to the December 19, 2001 monitoring report.

MONITORING PROCESS: A monitoring checklist developed from the Workforce Investment Act and Amendment #1 to the ARBOR, Inc. Youth Contract was utilized in the performance of this review.

ENTRANCE CONFERENCE: An entrance conference was held with Ms. Pat Newby, Assistant, Director, ARBOR, Inc., Merced. The scope and purpose of the review were discussed. An informal outbrief was presented immediately after the visit.

PROGRAM GENERAL REQUIREMENTS:

In January 2002, ARBOR, Inc., presented a paper to the Workforce Investment Board highlighting the accomplishments of the Merced ARBOR program. A subsequent analysis of the report by WIB Staff, presented to the Youth Council February 6, 2002, revealed many discrepancies and inaccuracies in the report. As a result, ARBOR, Inc., Merced, PA constructed a corrective action program for the Merced ARBOR. Those corrective actions are presently in progress and consuming most of Merced ARBOR's available man-hours.

In the last WIB Staff monitoring report (December 19, 2001), there were discrepancies noted concerning the use of the Career Advancement Plan, the Work Success Assessment, and mentoring. Investigation of those findings reveal:

1. The Career Advancement Plan is now being used.

2. The Work Success Assessment is being reworked by ARBOR. They are still refining paperwork. As such, the Work Success Assessment is not being used .

3. The mentoring plan is still more of a paperwork plan than an actuality. Two new booklets concerning mentoring have been created, training from the State of California is being requested, and a room is being talked of (planned) to have remodeled so that mentor and mentee can meet Saturdays at ARBOR in a non-confrontational atmosphere. However, no new documentation exists to show that mentors and mentees are meeting once a month to discuss the mentee's needs, as the contract requires.

The following areas were also inspected:

1. With the addition of 17-18 year olds to ARBOR's contract, the attendance of participants at alternative schools will be a part of contract compliance. Staff noted that no participants are yet enrolled, but did ascertain that ARBOR staff had identified the County's alternative schools. This was the extent of the monitoring review.

2. Post TABE testing prior to exit: The contract reads that all participants will receive testing upon entry into the ARBOR workforce development program, and that the participant will be retested prior to exit. This testing is a major program feedback factor. At this point, ARBOR has exited 53 clients. No documentation exists concerning post testing of clients prior to exit. This is a new discrepancy, not noted in any monitoring review to date.

3. ARBOR has had little success in increasing its rate of enrollment. As of December 19, 2001, the number of clients enrolled was 86. As of February 22, 2002, the number has risen to 96. With a goal of 175 enrollees by June 30, 2002, it continues to be doubtful that ARBOR will meet their target enrollment.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION:

Overall, the shortfalls/errors noted in this review have primarily stemmed from ARBOR's non-compliance with their Work Statement Narrative. This was the same finding in the previous two monitoring visits.

SUMMARY (FINDINGS)

1. ARBOR is not in compliance with critical elements of its Work Statement Narrative; i.e., the mentoring program and post assessment testing prior to a client's program exit.

2. ARBOR program target enrollment continues in jeopardy. The program is now in its 16th month and has enrolled 96 clients. To meet target enrollment, an additional 79 clients must be enrolled in the last 4 months of the contract.