



SOUTH FLORIDA WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARD

YOUTH COUNCIL MEETING

**Thursday, December 17, 2009
8:00 A.M.**

Doubletree Miami Mart/Airport Hotel and Exhibition Center
711 NW 72nd Avenue
Salon A
Miami, Florida 33126

AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Introductions
2. Approval of Youth Council Meeting Minutes
 - A. October 15, 2009
3. Discussion – Performance Update
4. Recommendation as to the Approval of Youth Policy for Quality Assurance and Monitoring
5. Information - ARRA 2009 Summer Youth Employment Program Audit Reviews
 - A. Department of Labor – Employment & Training Administration
 - B. Agency for Workforce Innovation
6. Discussion - ARRA 2009 Summer Youth Employment Program
 - A. MDCPS Summer Program
7. Information –ARRA 2009 Summer Youth Employment Program Data
8. Discussion – MDCPS Public Safety Services Academy
9. Presentation – Take Stock in Children
10. Recommendation as to the Approval of the Phoenix Internship Project to Serve Youth with Disabilities



2.

SFWIB - Youth Council

December 17, 2009

**Minutes of SFWIB Youth Council Meeting,
October 15, 2009**

South Florida Workforce Investment Board
Youth Council Meeting
October 15, 2009 at 8:00 A.M.
Doubletree Miami Mart/Airport Hotel & Exhibition Center
711 NW 72nd Avenue, Salon A
Miami, FL 33126

YOUTH COUNCIL MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE	SFWIB STAFF	OTHER ATTENDEES
1. Giles, Regina (Chair) 2. Brown, Clarence 3. Brown, Willie J. 4. Ferradaz, Gilda (Vice-Chair) 5. Scott, Kenneth 6. Talbert, Gregg 7. West, Alvin	Desrameaux, Raphaelle Morgan, Myria Serrano, Teresa	Castillo, Alicia - <i>A.M.O.</i> Diaz, Karin - <i>A.M.O.</i> Dorsett, Deborah – <i>GMSC</i> Farinas, Irene – <i>A.M.O.</i> Heit, David - <i>Youth Co-Op, Inc.</i> Marti, Sergio – <i>Miami-Dade County Public Schools</i> Martin, Marisol - <i>Youth Co-Op, Inc.</i> Milian, Dalia – <i>City of Hialeah</i> Oller, Virama – <i>Transition, Inc.</i> Ramirez, Michelle – <i>Youth Co-Op, Inc.</i> Rodriguez, Maria – <i>Youth Co-Op, Inc.</i> Veliz, Paulina - <i>Youth Co-Op, Inc.</i> Thorpe, Towanda - <i>GMSC</i>
YOUTH COUNCIL MEMBERS NOT IN ATTENDANCE		
8. Jennings, Donna 9. Rodriguez-Roig, Alex		

Note: Agenda items are listed in the order in which they were discussed.

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Ms. Gilda Ferradaz, Council Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:17 am and noted a quorum was achieved.

2. Approval of Youth Council Meeting Minutes of August 20, 2009

The Youth Council Meeting Minutes of August 20, 2009 were approved. (Notes do not indicate who moved or who seconded the motion. The recording of the meeting was started on item 3)

3. Discussion - Youth Balance Scorecard Update

Ms. Ferradaz introduced Ms. Myria Morgan, Youth Programs Director, who presented the item.

Ms. Morgan reminded the members that at the June 18, 2009, Youth Council Meeting, the Council members approved to place Transition, Inc. on a performance watch list for the first quarter of the new program year, July 1, 2009 through September 30, 2009, for failing to achieve state and local required performance standards. In addition, the Council members recommended that Adult Mankind

Organization, Inc. be placed on the performance watch list for six months of the new program year, July 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009.

The Monthly Management Report (MMR) generated by the Agency for Workforce Innovations (AWI) is only reporting performance for the months of July and August 2009. The September performance has not yet been published/released to the public.

Each of the two agencies, Adult Mankind Organization and Transition, Inc. have shown improvement for the two months in the area of program exits for younger and older youth (Obtained Employment, Entered Military, Post-Secondary or Trade School). However, the measure for skill attainment for younger youth who needed to Increase Reading, Math, and Language thru TABE Testing, Occupational or Work Readiness Skills still remains below the standard for July and August combined. Without the September performance, it is difficult to report who is up to par or who is below the standard.

4. Discussion –Youth Programmatic Monitoring

A. SFWIB OCI Quality Assurance Review

Ms. Morgan reported on the outcome of the Quality Assurance Review of the programmatic activities of the Youth Service Providers for their in-school and out-of-school youth programs as requested by a Youth Council member at the last meeting of the Council. Attached for the Council's review is the SFWIB Office of Continuous Improvement Quality Assurance Youth Review Summary for last Program Year 2008-2009 (PY '08- 09).

The Review Summary includes a summary of the high points and low points of the Quality Assurance Review, along with a matrix that breaks down all findings by youth providers and an overall regional error rate of the forty-three areas monitored.

Staff also corrected the name of the agenda item; it was not ARRA Youth Programmatic Monitoring. It is a WIA Program issue not ARRA.

B. Recommendation as to Approval of Youth Policy for Quality Assurance and Monitoring

Ms. Morgan described SFWIB staff recommendation for approval of the draft Youth Policy for Quality Assurance and Monitoring presented within the agenda item.

Based on the monitoring issues raised OCI's Quality Assurance Youth Review, SFWIB staff has developed a Youth Policy for quality assurance and monitoring of youth providers for the Council members review.

The Policy details the quality assurance/monitoring procedures and the corrective action process.

The Council Members had a lengthy discussion on the proposed Policy and the possibility of raising the 3% error rate currently accepted.

Ms. Ferradaz asked for Service Providers' input. The following provided input on the Policy Issue:

Ms. Deborah Dorsett of the Greater Miami Service Corp.
Virama Oller of Transition, Inc.
Irene Farinas of AMO

[Ms. Regina Giles arrived at the meeting. Ms. Giles took the Chair]

After a lengthy discussion the Council requested that the Policy be revised and presented at the next Council meeting. Staff needs to incorporate a training schedule, eliminate the 5% under the non-compliance, but include the consequences for non-compliance findings on the Policy.

Ms. Morgan requested to present Item 7 next. The Council had no objections.

7. Recommendation as to Approval of an Allocation of TANF Surplus Funds

Ms. Morgan described the recommendation of approval to award Miami Dade College an allocation of \$450,000 of TANF Surplus Funds and to waive the competitive procurement process for the Council consideration and recommendation to the Board.

Take Stock in Children (TSIC) and 5,000 Role Models of Excellence are programs that work with youth that are economically disadvantaged at-risk youth. The 5,000 Role Models of Excellence program in particular works with at-risk minority males. The programs work to keep youth in-school and offer scholarships to youth who successfully complete. SFWIB has provided scholarships to both TSIC and 5,000 Role Models of Excellence.

In the best interest of the SFWIB, an allocation of \$450,000 in TANF surplus funds is required to allow Miami-Dade College to purchase scholarships for Take Stock in Children and the 5,000 Role Models of Excellence.

The allocation to purchase scholarships for Take Stock in Children and the 5,000 Role Models of Excellence programs is as follows:

- Take Stock in Children \$200,000
- 5,000 Role Models of Excellence \$100,000
- Programmatic and Administrative costs \$150,000

In following the procurement process of Miami-Dade County, Administrative Order No.: 3-38, it is recommended that SFWIB waive the competitive procurement as it is recommended by the Executive Director that this is in the best interest of SFWIB. A two-thirds (2/3) vote of the quorum present is required to waive the competitive procurement process and award to Miami-Dade College an allocation of \$450,000 in TANF surplus funds to purchase the scholarships for TSIC and 5,000 Role Models and administration of the program.

Ms. Giles asked for the exact amount of staff that will work on this program. Ms. Morgan stated from 4-5 staff members and the \$150,000 would be SFWIB contribution towards the Programmatic & Administrative costs whatever those costs are, SFWIB will only provide \$150,000.

The Council had several questions on the amount of scholarships that these funds would cover, as well as other questions. Staff stated it would provide additional information, but there was a deadline to use the funds by June 30, 2010.

After a lengthy discussion Mr. Al West moved approval of the recommendation to the full Board as to approval of an allocation of TANF Surplus Funds. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gilda Ferradaz and the motion carried.

C. ARRA 2009 Summer Program Reviews

Due to lack of time, this item was not discussed. It needs to be presented at the next Council meeting.

5. Summer Youth Employment Program Update

Due to lack of time, this item was not discussed. It needs to be presented at the next Council meeting.

6. Recommendation as to the Approval of SFWIB WIA Two-Year Plan – Youth

Ms. Morgan described the recommendation as to the approval of SFWIB WIA Two-Year Plan – Youth Section to the Youth Council for recommendation to the Board.

The Agency for Workforce Innovation (AWI) has notified all Regional Workforce Investment Boards of the requirement to submit the 2009-2010, Two-Year Workforce Plan. The State in the planning instructions advised the Regions rather than a total rewrite of the local plan, they were requiring the following:

- A modification of the current plan to reflect only those changes the RWB finds necessary to describe any organizational changes, new or modified strategies to respond to changes in the local economy and/or occasioned by the additional ARRA funding.
- Completed Board Membership form as required by law for the certification of RWB membership.
- A “stand-alone” document to be attached as an addendum that responds to the questions outlined in these instructions related to ARRA efforts.

At the August 20, 2009 Youth Council Meeting, the Council requested staff to provide a copy of the responses submitted to the State for the Local Workforce Services Plan 2009-2010 - Two-Year WIA Plan.

The Youth Services part of the Plan was attached for the Council’s review.

Ms. Gilda Ferradaz moved approval of the SFWIB WIA Two-Year Plan – Youth Section as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Clarence Brown and the motion carried.

Ms. Giles thanked the Council members, and the meeting adjourned at 9:27 A.M.



3.

SFWIB – Youth Council

December 17, 2009

**Performance Update for Transition, Inc. and
Adult Mankind Organization**

Discussion Item

BACKGROUND

At the June 18, 2009 Youth Council Meeting, the Council members approved placing Transition, Inc. on a watch list for the first quarter of the new program year, July 1, 2009 through September 30, 2009, for failing to achieve state and local required performance standards. Similarly, Council members recommended that Adult Mankind Organization be put on the performance watch list for six months of the new program year, July 1, 2009 through December 31, 2009.

At the October 15, 2009 Youth Council Meeting, SFWIB staff was unable to report the performance of both Transition, Inc. and Adult Mankind Organization because the Agency for Workforce Innovation's Monthly Management Report only reported performance for July and August 2009. The attached table provides performance information on Transition, Inc. and Adult Mankind Organization for the period of July 1, 2009 to September 30, 2009 as well as performance information covering the start of the program year to present, July 1, 2009 to November 30, 2009 for each of the Youth Service Providers.

Attachment

Youth Performance Report

Report Range: July 1, 2009 - November 30, 2009

	In-School Youth - Who Exit the Program: Obtained Employment, Entered Military, Post-Secondary or Trade School					Out-of-School Youth - Who Exit the Program: Obtained Employment, Entered Military, Post-Secondary or Trade School					Younger Youth - Who Increased Reading, Math, Language thru TABE Test, Occupational or Work Readiness Skills					Younger Youth - Who Exit the Program: Obtained Employment, Entered Military, Post-Secondary or Trade School				
PARTNERS	Performance 7/1/08-6/30/09	Performance 7/1 - 9/30	Performance 7/1 - 11/30	Standard 90%	Current Year Variance	Performance 7/1/08-6/30/09	Performance 7/1 - 9/30	Performance 7/1 - 11/30	Standard 90%	Current Year Variance	Performance 7/1/08-6/30/09	Performance 7/1 - 9/30	Performance 7/1 - 11/30	Standard 80%	Current Year Variance	Performance 7/1/08-6/30/09	Performance 7/1 - 9/30	Performance 7/1 - 11/30	Standard 90%	Current Year Variance
In-School																				
Adult Mankind Organization	82%	100%	100%	90%					90%		32%	59%	79%	80%	-1%	75%	100%	100%	90%	
City of Hialeah	100%	100%	100%	90%			100%	100%	90%		95%	100%	94%	80%		100%	100%	100%	90%	
Cuban American National Council	96%	100%	100%	90%					90%		86%	86%	86%	80%		96%	100%	100%	90%	
Youth Co-Op Monroe	100%	100%	100%	90%					90%		100%	100%	88%	80%		100%	100%	100%	90%	
Unidad Miami Beach	75%	100%	100%	90%		100%			90%		84%	100%	85%	80%		77%	100%	100%	90%	
Youth Co-Op	98%	100%	100%	90%					90%		81%	78%	94%	80%		98%	100%	100%	90%	
Out-of-School																				
Adult Mankind Organization	88%		100%	90%		88%	100%	100%	90%		43%	67%	92%	80%		87%			90%	
Youth Co-Op Monroe	N/A			90%		100%			90%		80%	100%	100%	80%		100%			90%	
Greater Miami Service Corps	100%			90%		67%			90%		97%	67%	70%	80%	-10%	100%			90%	
Hialeah Downtown	100%	100%	100%	90%		100%	100%	100%	90%		95%	84%	85%	80%		100%	100%	100%	90%	
Youth Co-Op Homestead	100%	100%	100%	90%		100%	100%	100%	90%		91%	92%	86%	80%		100%	100%	100%	90%	
Youth Co-Op Little Havana	100%	100%	100%	90%		97%	100%	100%	90%		82%	89%	87%	80%		97%	100%	100%	90%	
Special Population																				
Transition Youth Offender	60%	100%	100%	90%		50%			90%		26%	31%	40%	80%	-40%	38%			90%	
Career Centers																				
Hialeah Gardens	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%		100%			90%		N/A	N/A	N/A	80%		N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	
Hialeah Downtown	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%		100%			90%		N/A	N/A	N/A	180%		N/A	N/A	N/A	190%	
Northside	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%		100%	100%	100%	90%		N/A	N/A	N/A	80%		N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	
Perrine	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%		100%			90%		N/A	N/A	N/A	80%		N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	
North Miami Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%		100%	100%	100%	90%		N/A	N/A	N/A	80%		N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	
Miami Beach	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%		50%	100%	100%	90%		N/A	N/A	N/A	80%		N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	
Homestead	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%		100%	100%	100%	90%		N/A	N/A	N/A	80%		N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	
Little Havana	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%		100%			90%		N/A	N/A	N/A	80%		N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	
Miami Downtown	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%		N/A			90%		N/A	N/A	N/A	80%		N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	
Carol City	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%		100%			90%		N/A	N/A	N/A	80%		N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	
West Dade	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%		N/A	100%	100%	90%		N/A	N/A	N/A	80%		N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	
Monroe County	N/A	N/A	N/A	90%		N/A			90%		N/A	N/A	N/A	80%		N/A	N/A	N/A	90%	
Partners No longer Contracted																				
Cases Closed before January 1, 2009	88%	77%	89%	90%		100%	63%	82%	90%		28%	38%	69%	80%		90%	85%	93%	90%	
TOTAL PERCENTAGES	87%	97%	98%	90%	8%	93%	97%	98%	90%	8%	67%	71%	66%	80%	-14%	85%	97%	98%	90%	8%

N/A and blank cells represents data is not due to be calculated for the reporting time frame



4.

SFWIB – Youth Council

December 17, 2009

Recommendation as to the Approval of a Revised Youth Policy for Quality Assurance and Monitoring

RECOMMENDATION

SFWIB staff recommends the approval of the revised draft Youth Policy for Quality Assurance and Monitoring.

BACKGROUND

At the October 15, 2009 Youth Council Meeting, the Council members reviewed and discussed the Quality Assurance Youth Review Summary Report for Program Year 2008-2009 (PY 08-09). The Report detailed programmatic activities of Youth Service Providers' processes for in-school and out-of-school youth programs. Specifically, the Report included a summary of the high points and low points of the Quality Assurance Review, a matrix laying out all findings by Service Provider and an overall regional error rate.

As a result of the Youth Review Summary Report, a Youth Policy for Quality Assurance and Monitoring of Service Providers was developed. The policy lays out the quality assurance/monitoring procedures and the corrective action process.

SFWIB staff amended the Quality Assurance Policy to reflect the concerns of Youth Council members. That Policy is attached to this item. SFWIB staff recommends the approval of the revised Youth Policy for Quality Assurance and Monitoring to Youth Council members.

Attachment



POLICY TRANSMITTAL

SUBJECT:	QUALITY ASSURANCE AND MONITORING	Procedural/Guidance No.:
APPLIES TO:	All Contracted Youth Service Providers	Effective Date:
		Expiration Date: Indefinite
REFERENCE:	Workforce Investment Act (WIA), Code of Federal Regulation - Section 117(d)(4), Title 20 CFR Section 667.410(a), Title 20 CFR Section 667.4(c)(1), Department of Labor-ETA, Office of Management Budget and Local Policy	

OBJECTIVE

It is the policy of the South Florida Workforce Investment Board (SFWIB) to inform all WIA Youth Service Providers of the requirements for performance monitoring and corrective action processes. The purpose of the policy is to establish a comprehensive performance accountability system whereby youth service providers are accountable for the results of their individual youth program(s). This policy promotes continuous improvement because it assesses the effectiveness of youth service delivery.

BACKGROUND

Program oversight is a requirement under the Workforce Investment Act. The language of Section 117(d)(4) instructs Local Boards to conduct oversight of WIA programs. Monitoring and oversight policies must be consistent with the requirements of WIA, the Federal Registers, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circulars as well as other relevant regulations. Title 20 CFR Section 667.4(c)(1) requires continuous monitoring of activities in accordance with applicable uniform administrative requirements. Moreover, Title 20 CFR Section 667.410(a) requires that Local Boards must conduct regular oversight and monitoring of its WIA activities and those of its sub-recipients. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that expenditures meet the programmatic, performance, cost category and cost limitation requirements of WIA and all other applicable laws and regulations.

PROCEDURES

SFWIB Quality Assurance Unit is responsible for conducting programmatic monitoring reviews of the youth programs funded under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) to ensure that administrative policies, practices, standards and systems are operating within established federal and state legislation, regulations and policy directives. The programmatic review is used to evaluate SFWIB contractual quality assurance processes, issue error rates and examine programmatic performance. Each monitoring review results in a formal report which includes all non-compliance issues along with the corresponding reference(s).

After each WIA Youth Program quality assurance monitoring review is completed, all deficiencies will be brought to the attention of the applicable Youth Program Director. Youth Service Providers will be provided the opportunity to discuss and review all findings with SFWIB to ensure the accuracy of deficiencies being reported.

Failure to meet SFWIB's compliance requirements will result in mandatory corrective action activities. When a youth provider's quality assurance monitoring final error rate exceeds three percent (3%), SFWIB will require a Plan of Corrective Action (POCA) be submitted within ten (10) business days of the receipt of the final quality assurance report. The POCA will identify specific processes to be implemented to ensure that discrepancies are correctly addressed and minimized in the future; SFWIB requires following quality control details: the frequency of each control to be implemented, the individual(s) responsible for cited tasks and any applicable documentation used for training and process improvement.

When a youth service provider's quality assurance monitoring final error rate is below three percent (3%), the provider will not be required to submit a POCA to SFWIB. However, the provider should correct the deficiencies noted in the monitoring review.

Compliance deviations that greatly exceed SFWIB's requirements will result in direct placement into a more rigorous remediation process. The following deviations will result in immediate placement on a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP): 1) a quality assurance monitoring review total error rate that exceeds 10%; 2) any individually-reviewed component error percentage that exceeds 10%; 3) failure to submit an acceptable POCA; and 4) failure to comply with previously accepted POCA measures. Placement on a PIP will require the youth provider to submit bi-weekly quality assurance updates to SFWIB staff. The specific content required in these bi-weekly updates will be presented in a formal PIP letter. The PIP will provide SFWIB with confirmation that the provider is making every effort to follow Federal, State and local policies, while minimizing errors and preventing deficiencies.

Two or more non-compliance findings of a similar nature within six months of each other will be deemed to be consecutive for purposes of determining failure to comply with conditions as stated in the Youth Service Provider's Contract, Statement of Work and local policy.

Should a youth service provider fail to meet contractual/programmatic compliance at the end of the current youth program year, non-compliance for the current year will result in disqualification to operate a youth program as a SFWIB Youth Service Provider for the next youth program year funding cycle.

Training and technical assistance is always available to our youth service providers upon request to SFWIB. To ensure that youth service providers receive additional training throughout the program year, quarterly training sessions will be conducted as follows:

DATE	TIME
February 16, 2010	10:00 a.m.
May 17, 2010	10:00 a.m.
August 16, 2010	10:00 a.m.
November 15, 2010	10:00 a.m.



5.

SFWIB – Youth Council

December 17, 2009

**ARRA 2009 Summer Youth Employment
Program Audit Reviews**

Informational

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration conducted an on-site monitoring review of SFWIB Summer Youth Employment Program on July 31, 2009. The purpose of the review was to ensure that all necessary programmatic components were in place to operate a successful summer youth program. The review was limited to reviewing summer program activities funded with Recovery Act dollars.

In addition, the Agency for Workforce Innovation (AWI) conducted an on-site monitoring review of SFWIB Summer Youth Employment Program during the week of August 24-28, 2009. The monitoring consisted of two categories of review: (1) quality assurance for information contained in the youth files and (2) summer worksite visits. A total of fifty youth files were reviewed and four worksites visited.

The AWI auditors allowed SFWIB youth staff to provide any missing information from the participant files, update and correct the State's reporting system with the appropriate documentation as proof of the update and collect any hard copy documentation missing from the youth files that was discovered during the audit review. The auditing process made it easier for the summer program to reach its goal of no findings. However, there was one finding in the report, which SFWIB youth staff corrected before the exit interview occurred. There were nine systemic issues detailed in the attached report.

Attachments

South Florida Workforce Investment Board

Region 23

ARRA WIA Summer Youth Employment Program

Quick facts	
<p>Review dates: July 31, 2009</p> <p>ARRA WIA youth allocation: \$7,282,783 (Plans to spend 100% on SYEP in 2009)</p> <p>Service area: Miami-Dade and Monroe Counties</p> <p>SYEP start date: May 1, 2009 (Work readiness training started June 26; placements at worksites started July 2, 2009)</p> <p>Scheduled end date: September 30, 2009</p> <p>Total SYEP participants (as of July 31): 2,288 (Goal is 3,382)</p> <p>Target group(s): Foster care youth, veterans, spouses of veterans, disabled youth, youth offenders, migrant youth, youth who are children of one or more incarcerated parents, and youth with 1 or more other barriers to gainful employment</p> <p>Priority of service: Priority was given to target groups listed above; others were randomly selected to be served using a lottery method</p> <p>SYEP design: Three contractors were used to deliver services; all youth received 20 hours of classroom-based work readiness skills training prior to placements at worksites for work experiences</p>	<p>Worksite workplaces: Private sector, public sector and non-profit employers</p> <p>Total worksites: 571</p> <p>Worksite selection criteria: Each worksite must 1) provide participants with career-oriented work, 2) be willing to mentor or teach youth work readiness skills, 3) provide a safe and appropriate work environment, 4) provide youth with adequate materials/equipment and working space, and 5) ensure no more than 10 youth are supervised by 1 manager.</p> <p>Payments to participants: Younger youth were paid \$8.00 an hour, while older youth were paid \$10.00 per hour; all youth in Monroe County were paid \$10.00 an hour; all youth were paid for participation orientation sessions as well as for work experience activities; work experience hours for younger youth were capped at 120 and the work experience hours for older youth were capped at 140</p> <p>Classroom activities: All youth were required to participate in 20 hours (5 days, 4 hours each day) of work readiness skills training developed by the Miami-Dade school system</p> <p>Supportive payment(s): None</p>

Overall assessment

The local area designed a very effective summer youth employment program (SYEP) throughout its major metropolitan service area in South Florida. The focus of the SYEP aligned with Congressional intent to provide youth with meaningful paid work experiences during the summer months. Youth were provided opportunities to explore business operations in the private sector as well as the public and non-profit sectors, while learning valuable work readiness and maturity skills in pre-placement workshops and from workplace supervisors. With limited exceptions, the South Florida Workforce local workforce investment area (LWIA) had excellent administrative and oversight controls in place to successfully manage the SYEP.

The following areas of concern requiring follow-up action were shared with the LWIA during the onsite review:

1. While LWIA's monitoring staff randomly reviewed worksites for compliance with worksite agreements, the LWIA had not monitored its SYEP contracts for compliance with agreements at the time of the review. The South Florida Workforce Office of Continuous Improvement staff developed appropriate monitoring tools for its SYEP, but had not formally monitored its contracts yet. Contract monitoring was set to start in August. Ideally, monitoring of SYEP contracts should occur frequently during the SYEP to ensure the delivery of quality services to youth.
2. During the review of a small sample of files, Regional Office staff found:

- The Individual Service Strategy (ISS) to be missing for each participant file reviewed; and
- The additional barrier information (to be eligible for the SYEP) missing from that majority of files reviewed.

Selected notes from the review

- The LWIA contracted with Miami-Dade public schools, Florida Keys Community College, and Youth Cooperative, Inc., to provide SYEP services. Miami-Dade public schools also developed the work readiness curriculum used during the 5 half day pre-placement training sessions. Each contract contained performance measures and goals.
- The SYEP recruitment, intake and eligibility determination process generated an adequate pool of applicants. The LWIA received over 18,000 applications and determined 4,902 to be eligible for services. Of the 4,902, the LWIA enrolled 2,288 into its SYEP as of the date of the review. All 10 of the participant files reviewed by Regional Office staff contained proper documentation to determine income eligibility for program services. However, the majority of the reviewed files failed to properly document the additional barrier for eligibility purposes. The ISS was also missing in each participant file reviewed by the Regional Office.
- The LWIA adopted an elaborate priority of service approach for its SYEP. The LWIA focused on serving the most-in-need of the “hardest-to-serve” youth applicants. Other youth were served on a first-come, first-serve basis.
- The work readiness assessment instrument and process met ETA guidance. The LWIA administered work readiness skills pre-tests during the before receiving work readiness skills training and administered the post-test at the conclusion of the 20 hours of work readiness skills training.
- The area recruited a sufficient number of worksites for its SYEP.
- Participants and worksite employers were oriented to the SYEP. SYEP participants received orientation prior to the start of classroom activities. The purpose of the SYEP, rules of conduct, classroom expectations, attendance and incentive payment procedures, and disciplinary procedures were discussed during the sessions.
- Youth were to be placed in worksite positions commensurate with their educational backgrounds, skills and occupational interests. In placing youth at worksites, the contractor was to emphasize career exploration to the extent possible (i.e., worksite types are limited). Youth career interests were used by contractor’s worksite counselors to provide more detailed occupational information and education information to these youth for future use. If in the event the LWIA runs a SYEP next year, it is recommended the LWIA allow participants to meet and interview with prospective employers to allow both participants and employers an opportunity to provide input into the matching process.
- There was a good range of employment activities or jobs for summer youth. The work experiences exposed youth to business operations and afforded them opportunities to develop work readiness and work maturity skills.
- Contractor staff provided counseling to youth who were experiencing adjustment issues at worksites.
- The LWIA did not provide supportive service payments to youth. In the event the LWIA operates a SYEP next year, it is recommended the LWIA consider making supportive payments for transportation, childcare, and uniform/equipment needs or pay a stipend of \$50-\$100 to all youth participants during orientation or during the first week so youth have money to pay for needed services or materials before receiving the first paycheck.
- Contractor staff had contact with each worksite at least once a week to ensure effective work experiences for youth, meeting and working with both supervisors and participants at the worksites.

- The South Florida Workforce LWIA had not started its contract monitoring and oversight process at the time of the review. LWIA staff, however, did review a sample of worksites each week.
- Youth received paychecks weekly and bi-weekly, depending on the contractor. One contractor used direct deposits and debit cards to pay its youth biweekly, while the other two contractors issued checks weekly to the worksites.
- The LWIA established and implemented proper controls to ensure the accuracy of participant paychecks and to discourage fraudulent activities. Time and attendance is verified. Participants are required to sign a register when they receive their checks. Each participant signature is verified using a signature in the participant file. Supervisor signatures on timesheets are compared to signatures on the worksite agreement.
- The SYEP was used to recruit youth for other WIA year-round programs and to move youth into permanent employment or apprenticeships. No numeric goals were set.



Charlie Crist
Governor
Cynthia R. Lorenzo
Director

November 24, 2009

Mr. Roderick Beasley, Executive Director
South Florida Workforce Board
Miami Airport Corporate Center
7300 NW Corporate Center Drive, Suite 500
Miami, Florida 33126

Dear Mr. Beasley:

Enclosed is the quality assurance report detailing the outcome of the monitoring review conducted August 24-28, 2009 of the South Florida Workforce Board's Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP).

The review of your workforce program did not disclose any reportable findings; therefore, a response to the report is not required. Consequently, this correspondence closes the quality assurance review process for the 2009 SYEP monitoring review period.

The Agency for Workforce Innovation would like to thank you and your staff for providing summer employment opportunities to youth in your region. If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Fay Malone at (850) 245-7420 or via e-mail at Fay.Malone@flaawi.com or Ken Williams at (850) 245-7457 or via e-mail at Kenneth.Williams2@flaawi.com.

Sincerely,

Lois A. Scott, Program Manager
One-Stop and Program Support

LAS/obwm

Enclosure

cc: Steve Urguhart Charles Williams Kevin Neal Fay Malone

Agency for Workforce Innovation

The Caldwell Building, Suite 100•107 East Madison Street•Tallahassee, Florida•32399-4120
Telephone (850) 245-7105•Fax (850) 921-3223•TTY/TDD 1-800-955-8771-Voice 1-800-955-8770
www.floridajobs.org

An equal opportunity employer/program. Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities. All voice telephone numbers on this document may be reached by persons using TTY/TDD equipment via the Florida Relay Service at 711.

REGION 23

Miami-Dade, Monroe



South Florida Workforce Board

SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM QUALITY ASSURANCE REPORT



PREPARED BY THE AGENCY
FOR WORKFORCE INNOVATION

NOVEMBER 24, 2009

An equal opportunity employer/program. Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to individuals with disabilities. All voice telephone numbers on this document may be reached by persons using TTY/TDD equipment via the Florida Relay Service at 711.

**SOUTH FLORIDA WORKFORCE BOARD
SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM
QUALITY ASSURANCE REPORT
REGION 23**

INTRODUCTION

The following report was prepared as a result of an on-site quality assurance review conducted August 24 through August 27, 2009 of the South Florida Workforce Board's (SFWB) Summer Youth Employment Program (SYEP).

The review team consisted of Bettye McGlockton and Danielle McNeil.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

The purpose of the review was to provide an assessment of whether the summer youth program funded by SFWB operated in compliance with federal and state guidance, rules and regulations, and the Board's local summer youth plan.

The scope of the review included an entrance conference, participant case file reviews, worksite and classroom site visits, and an exit conference. In performing the review, the team conducted interviews with program staff, worksite supervisors, as well as the summer youth participants to gather information about program practices, processes, service delivery strategies, and program successes. The Agency for Workforce Innovation's (AWI) monitoring review tools were used to conduct the review. The tools are designed to provide a comprehensive review of the processes and procedures used by Board staff to operate and manage the program.

The reviewers also provided updates to program staff in an effort to keep them informed of the team's progress, to allow Board and/or service provider staff the opportunity to provide supporting documentation to resolve any outstanding issues which may have been observed, and to highlight any notable observations and/or practices that may have been implemented by the Board. Members of the review team also provided technical assistance during the on-site visit.

REVIEW EXPECTATIONS

The AWI quality assurance review included, but was not limited to, a review of the following SYEP operating procedures and program expectations:

- ✓ The participation information entered into the State Management Information System (MIS) was recorded correctly.
- ✓ The process used to select service providers including a review to ensure that community-based and faith-based organizations had the opportunity to participate.

- ✓ The administrative and operational procedures used in the SYEP including participant outreach and recruitment procedures.
- ✓ The process for determining and documenting participant eligibility for the SYEP including low income status, barriers, priority of service, etc.
- ✓ The types of allowable youth services and activities that were provided in the SYEP.
- ✓ The process used to conduct an Objective Assessment and develop an Individual Service Strategy for SYEP youth.
- ✓ The Work readiness goal that was established and tool(s) used to determine if a measurable gain had been achieved.
- ✓ The worksite development process including the selection of appropriate sites, the assignment of youth to worksites, the provision of staff support to worksite supervisors and youth assigned to the worksites.
- ✓ The process used to monitor the worksites.

Sample Size/Selection Methodology

The participant case file review sample size was compiled from the total population of youth planned to be served by SFWB. The final sample size number was randomly selected from participants entered into the MIS with a minimum of ten and a maximum of 45 participant case files selected.

Entrance Conference

An entrance conference was conducted on August 24, 2009 with the following SFWB staff: Rick Beasley, Myra Morgan, Raphaelle Desrameaux, and Patricia Shorter. The purpose of the entrance conference was to introduce the members of the AWI team performing the review, identify SFWB's contact person(s) with whom the reviewers would communicate, discuss both AWT's and SFWB's expectations, schedule site visits and interviews, and identify/obtain documents requested in the on-site notification letter.

Exit Conference

An exit conference was conducted on August 27, 2009 with the following SFWB staff: Rick Beasley, Myra Morgan, Raphaelle Desrameaux, and Patricia Shorter. During the exit conference, Board representatives received a written exit report that included a summary of issues that were identified and discussed during the daily briefings.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

The South Florida Workforce Board's SYEP is designed to provide all eligible youth participants 14-24 years of age with work readiness and work experience activities. At the time of the visit, all work experience activities funded under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) had been completed and many of the younger youth had returned to school.

Outreach and recruitment activities were done through partnerships with local government, schools, the Department of Children and Families, the Department of Juvenile Justice, and other social and human service agencies. All eligible youth selected for the SYEP were assigned to work activity sites based on skill sets, preference, and space availability. Selected participants were required to spend

20 hours in classroom training learning work readiness skills prior to placement at a worksite. The work readiness component was geared towards educating youth about employment skills such as interview techniques, resume writing, and workplace behaviors. All participants were paid wages. Younger youth (14-17) earned \$8.00 per hour and older youth (18-24) earned \$10.00 per hour. At the time of the review, SFWB had developed 223 worksites that provided 3,105 work experience positions for 2,837 eligible youth assigned to the sites.

The reviewers visited four worksites in Miami-Dade County: (1) Villa Maria Nursing and Rehabilitation Center, (2) Inner City Youth of South Florida, (3) Holsen, Inc., and (4) Miami Parks and Recreation Department. Interviews were conducted with three supervisors and seven youth. Supervisor interviews revealed that at least two of the youth have been offered permanent positions at their worksites. The youth were very appreciative and grateful for the summer youth program, and indicated that they may not have been able to otherwise become employed if not for the SYEP. They were thrilled about meeting new individuals at their respective worksites and being exposed to new training and work environments. The supervisors were grateful for the opportunity to lead and guide the youth throughout their work experiences. Several supervisors considered their roles more as mentors to the youth than supervisors. The youth were given great opportunities to learn new skills and the money earned was very useful.

PARTICIPANT CASE FILE REVIEW

Forty-eight summer youth participant case files were reviewed. With the exception of the issues identified below, the case files reviewed contained documentation of eligibility and other case management elements such as an objective assessment, individual service strategy, a work readiness goal and other goals as applicable, and pre and post-assessment results supporting the work readiness goal attainment. Additionally, MIS participant data was reviewed and determined to have been correctly entered into the State MIS; and the accuracy and timeliness of completing and processing participant time sheets were determined to have been done appropriately.

NOTE: It should be noted that two findings were observed during the review of participant case files. One case file contained an incomplete and unsigned application, and several case files did not contain sufficient documentation to support the RWB barriers which were identified in the SYEP Plan. In 44 of 48 participant files sampled in the State MIS, SFWB used the term “RWB Barrier” as its youth barrier, but the barrier used was not defined in each case file nor was there any supporting documentation in the participant’s hard copy case file. These issues were brought to SFWB’s attention during the daily briefings and the case files found out of compliance were subsequently corrected while the reviewers were onsite.

Although these issues were corrected while the reviewers were onsite, it was recommended that SFWB staff ensure that each applicant completes all required areas of the WIA application. Since an incomplete application deals directly with eligibility, participants should not be accepted into the SYEP without a completed application and supporting documentation. It was also recommended that SFWB staff review all SYEP case files where the RWB barrier was used as the selected barrier, and ensure that the specific RWB barrier is identified and documented in the hard copy file and the State MIS.

Other issues noted during the review included the following.

OBSERVATIONS

- There were no signed grievance forms in five participant case files. Although a grievance form was present in these files, there was no participant signature indicating receipt and understanding of the information.

Suggestion: In the future, program staff should ensure that all grievance/complaint information has been explained to the participant and acknowledged by their signature on the form. The fully signed form should be retained in the participant's hard copy file.

- There were a number of participant case files that had several barriers, but the documentation only supported one of identified barriers.

Suggestion: Program staff should ensure that appropriate documentation is included in each participant's case file to support all identified barriers. The documentation used to support the barrier(s) should be entered in the State MIS.

- It was noted during the case file review that income information was calculated incorrectly and supported by partial documentation for one participant. Program staff was able to recalculate the participant's income information while the reviewer's were on site. The participant was eligible based on the recalculation.

Suggestion: SFWB should ensure that new employees and/or contracted providers have proper training on eligibility determinations and are able to correctly calculate income information.

- In two participant case files, income documentation was supported by Supplemental Social Security information, but the documentation was written completely in Spanish.

Suggestion: SFWD should have eligibility documentation translated into English or, at a minimum, have the amounts and dates of the source elements translated to English for eligibility identification and verification purposes.

- It was noted in several case files that pre/post work readiness information was not graded, properly identified, or dated far enough apart to show work readiness gains. The local summer youth plan indicated at least 20 hours of work readiness training would be provided to each participant prior to placement on a worksite. The review of this service noted that several youth received less than the specified number of work readiness training hours. It also appears that all areas of work readiness may not have been provided to these youth.

Suggestion: Program staff should ensure that all youth receive the stipulated hours of training and that pre and post-work readiness tests are given to participants according to the local plan guidelines. Staff should also ensure that tests are properly dated and scored to show the work readiness gains.

- It was stated during a supervisor's interview that he and staff were not provided SYEP orientation. It was presumed that since the supervisor runs a regular summer youth program, another orientation would not be necessary. SFWB subsequently provided the supervisor with written SYEP orientation material and also initiated a meeting with the school district to provide formal training for staff.

Suggestion: In the future, SFWB or its contracted service providers should ensure that summer youth program orientation is provided to all site supervisors/instructors.

- Two youth participants indicated that they had not been paid since participating in the program, and many times those who were paid had delayed checks. Staff was able to provide documentation showing the youth were to receive their paychecks at the end of the week.

Suggestion: In the future, SFWB staff should ensure that youth are properly paid in a timely manner.

- At the time of the review, program staff had monitored several worksites. SFWB's SYEP staff had visited several worksites to verify that assigned youth were engaged in work activities stipulated in the worksite agreements. Written summaries of these reviews were prepared and corrective actions were recommended to correct any deficiencies. However, the reviewers noted that SFWB staff had not conducted a review of any SYEP participant case files to ensure that eligibility and other activities were appropriately documented. The SFWB's SYEP comprehensive quality assurance (QA) plan indicated that QA staff would visit each service provider to review the operation and management of their contract and participant case files to ensure that deliverables and expectations are achieved. The QA reviews were scheduled to be conducted at the end of the summer program.

Suggestion: Should SFWB implement a SYEP in the future, it should ensure that contracts, participant records, and worksites are formally monitored at the beginning and continuing throughout the course of the SYEP. The case file reviews should coincide with worksite visits and should occur while youth are still participating in the program. This will not only ensure that the program is operating as effectively and efficiently as possible, but will also allow the program to recognize concerns and correct them as soon as possible.

NOTABLE OBSERVATIONS

- Youth, who were children of Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers from the Homestead area, were placed at the Miami-Dade County Parks and Recreation Department Women's Park worksite. Youth were assigned to this worksite as interviewers and writers and had responsibility for creating biographies about extraordinary women and their "firsts" in the local community, as well as the impact they had nationally. The projects, which are on display in the art gallery, were part of the focus on Women's Equity Day observance. Additionally, the youth received a notable honor when they were informed that they will be co-authors in a book called Beyond Julia's Doors. The event received media coverage. A video documentary of the summer youth experience at the Women's Park in the Roxcy O'Neal Bolton Women's History Gallery is a great idea. The reviewers suggested that the program be shared with AWI and other RWBs.

- The owner of Holsen, Inc., a clothing manufacturer, and youth assigned to this worksite participated in an in-house event every Monday called “Money Mondays”. Youth would dress in business and professional attire and discuss politics and the mechanics of small business operations as they relate to money management. After observing the way youth were paid from the school district, the supervisor felt it was his personal responsibility to teach the youth how to maximize their income using various budgeting tools. Mr. Holsen indicated that he wants to train and employ some of the youth over 18 years of age through the WIA program. After he described how he wanted to proceed with the training and resulting employment, the reviewer suggested he contact SFWB about on-the-job training or customized training opportunities that may be available. Additionally, Mr. Holsen wants to continue as a worksite for WIA youth in the year-round and summer months. He has already hired two summer youth participants and plans to provide employment to youth during the fall and spring breaks.
- Youth assigned to the Villa Maria Rehabilitation Center and Hospital received a very positive experience. At the time of the onsite visit, the activities had ended but some youth were still working as unpaid volunteers. The facility manager stated that she had included positions in her budget to hire two of the youth. Staff and patients felt personally responsible to ensure that youth learned life and work skills that will qualify them for jobs in the community.

The SFWB’s summer youth program appears to have met the intent of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act by providing meaningful work experiences and opportunities to eligible youth ages 14-24 years old. It also appears to have had a positive impact on youth in terms of helping them financially; exposing them to meaningful work experiences; and helping them to grow in self-confidence, initiative, and acceptance of responsibility. In addition, work and training site supervisors/instructors were highly complimentary of the design, organization and management of the summer youth program. They appreciate and take seriously the opportunity to teach and positively impact lives in ways to make them desirable employees.

CONCLUSION

The results of the review of SFWB’s program processes, service delivery systems, and participant case file data indicated that its SYEP appeared “generally” to be in compliance with established federal and State laws, guidance, policies, and procedures. However, some issues were identified. The reviewers have provided recommendations and suggestions in an effort to enhance SFWB’s SYEP operational practices in the future.



6.

SFWIB – Youth Council

December 17, 2009

**ARRA 2009 Summer Youth Employment
Program Update**

Informational

BACKGROUND

SFWIB staff will review the attached chart, which lays out information regarding the ARRA 2009 Summer Youth Employment Program.

Attachment

2009 ARRA SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

DESCRIPTIONS	MIAMI DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS	FLORIDA KEYS COMMUNITY COLLEGE	YOUTH CO-OP MONROE COUNTY	CUMULATIVE
Youth contracted to be served	3250	110	72	3432
Younger youth	1550	0	72	1622
Older youth	1700	110	0	1810
Number of youth receiving services (work readiness/work served	2776	70	29	2875
Younger youth	1782		29	1811
Older youth	989	70		1059
Unknown	5			5
Youth hired by summer employers after summer program	8	5	0	13
Youth transferred to year round WIA programs	68	16	4	88
Youth assigned to public/non-profit worksites	2143	70	19	2232
Youth assigned to for profit worksites	392	0	4	396
Youth assigned to faith based worksites	158	0	5	163
Youth attended work readiness classes only (no work activities)	83	0	0	83

DESCRIPTION OF OCCUPATIONS & JOB TYPES

CATEGORY OF OCCUPATIONS	JOB TYPES	# of YOUTH
ARCHITECTURE & ENGINEERING	Drafter Assistants, Landscape Architect Aides, Engineer Assistant, Aircraft Mechanic Assistants	13
ARTS, DESIGN, ENTERTAINMENT, SPORTS & MEDIA	Camera and Video Operators, Painters, Performers, Graphic Designer, Public Relation Aides, Media and Communication Workers, Event Planner Assistants, Multimedia Aides, Coach Assistants, Recreation Aides, Fitness Aides, Fashion Designer Assistants, Graphic Designer Aides, Camp Counselors	579
BUILDING, GROUNDS & MAINTENANCE	Landscapers, Ground Maintenance, Building Cleaners, Building Maintenance	204
BUSINESS & FINANCIAL OPERATIONS	Accountant Assistants, Financial Assistants, Credit Counselor Aides, Payroll/Benefits Specialists	8
COMMUNITY & SOCIAL SERVICES	Counselor Aides, Social Worker Aides, Counselors: Peer, Guidance, Vocational and Behavior, Community Workers, Community Researchers, Archivist Assistant	148
COMPUTERS	Website Developer Assistants, Data Entry Clerks, Computer Programmer Assistants, Operation Research Aides, Computer Support	11
EDUCATION	Preschool, Kindergarten and Special Education Teacher Aides, Librarian Assistants, Librarian 1 Trainee, Instructional Coordinator Aides	133
FARMING	Agricultural Workers	14
FOOD PREPARATION & SERVICES	Food Servers, Cook Assistants, Cafeteria Aides, Food Concession Helpers, Counter Attendants	15
HEALTHCARE	Orthopedic Assistant, Medical Records Clerks, Veterinary Assistants, Medical Assistants, Laboratory Animal Caretakers, Health Information Technicians	11
INSTALLATION & REPAIR	Maintenance Repair Aides, Installation Aides	3
LEGAL	Legal Support Aides, Paralegal Aides	14
LIFE, PHYSICAL & SOCIAL SCIENCES	Environmental Aides, Chemist Aides, Biological Service Aides, Gardening, Green Jobs	16
MANAGEMENT	Public Relations, Fundraising, Manager Assistant	3
OFFICE & ADMINISTRATION	File Clerks, Administrative Assistants, Record Clerks, Bookkeeper Assistants, Order Fillers, Data Entry, Word Processors, Procurement Clerks, Typist, Eligibility Interviewers, Office Support Staff, Customer Service Representatives, Receptionists, Couriers, Secretaries, Stock Clerks, desk clerks, Information Clerks, Human Resource Assistants, Desk Clerks	614
PERSONAL CARE & SERVICES	Nurse Aides, Childcare Workers, Senior Citizen Aides, Patient Care Workers	5
PROTECTIVE SERVICES	Protective Service Aides, Criminal Investigator Aides, Probation Officer Assistants	25
SALES	Sales Clerks, Cashiers, Customer Service Representatives, Advertising Assistants, Stock/Inventory Clerks	156
TRANSPORTATION	Boat Repair Mechanic Assistants, Transport Attendants, Cleaners, Automotive Attendants, Automotive Cleaners, Bus Maintenance	291
Reasons for not reporting to job tasks/assignments: Youth assigned to worksites, only attended work readiness Youth assigned to worksites, did not pass background screening Youth terminated from worksites, can not report job types Job types can not be reported due to conflicting information		83 252 28 152

TOTAL

2778



7.

SFWIB – Youth Council

December 17, 2009

**Issues Encountered with 2009 ARRA MDCPS
Summer Youth Employment Program**

Informational

BACKGROUND

On November 18, 2009, SFWIB staff met with Miami-Dade County Public School (MDCPS) staff to discuss issues encountered with the 2009 ARRA Summer Youth Employment Program. The attached report outlines the invoicing, quality assurance and programmatic issues that were discussed.

As a result of the meeting, MDCPS received a no-cost extension to their summer contract. SFWIB staff will work with MDCPS staff to resolve outstanding issues. A follow-up report will be presented by SFWIB staff after the resolution of individual issues.

Attachment

Issues Encountered with 2009 ARRA Summer Youth Employment Program

INVOICING -- GENERAL

The support for the monthly invoices has not been submitted in a satisfactory manner. Original timesheets with corresponding signatures were not always submitted. Timesheets have been disorganized, and not submitted in the proper time period.

MDCPS has not been able to provide Payroll Registers for some of the staff billed in June.

GL amounts did not always coincide with amounts billed.

Budget lines items that have been exhausted and are being billed.

INVOICING -- SPECIFIC ISSUES.

June Invoice Re-submittal: MDCPS cannot supply a payroll register for staff entered in the second invoice submission. They have other support (pay roster) which we will accept if re-billed, however this support can not substantiate the fringes billed and unless they submit some other type of support we cannot pay the fringes.

Also they billed for participant costs without supporting timesheets and payroll registers. Subsequently, we were informed that these “participant costs” were actually staff salaries and fringes. If this expenditure is re-billed with proper supporting documentation, we will reimburse.

Invoice Total= \$545,014 Amount Paid= \$100,648

July Invoice: Indirect costs disallowed due to it not being recorded in the GL. Participant costs disallowed due to various reasons -- no timesheets, photo copies (not originals), missing signatures on timesheets of participant or worksite supervisor, and no signatures on orientation timesheet.

Invoice Total= \$1,213,618 Amount Paid= \$1,142,752

August Invoice: Staff fringes disallowed due to expenditures exceeding budgeted amount. Amount billed for supplies exceeded amount reflected in the GL. Indirect costs disallowed due to no GL entry support, participant costs disallowed due to timesheets issues -- photo copies (not originals), missing signatures on timesheets of participant or worksite supervisor, and no signatures on orientation timesheets. A 10% late fee penalty charged.

Invoice Total= \$1,829,703 Amount Paid= \$1,320,174

September Invoice: Staff fringes disallowed due to expenditures exceeding budgeted amount. Indirect costs disallowed due to a negative GL entry. Participant costs disallowed due to no timesheets -- photo copies (not originals), missing signatures on timesheets of participant or worksite supervisor.

Invoice Total= \$156,451 Amount Paid= \$203,406 Reason= Billed negative amount for Indirect Costs.

October Invoice: Submitted last week. Currently under review.

QUALITY ASSURANCE ISSUES.

QA staff reviewed 144 participants enrolled in the M-DCPS 2009 Summer Youth Employment Program.

- Of the 144 participants, 61 were never appropriately deemed eligible for the program- **42.4%**
- Of the 144 participants, 113 files could easily be considered disallowable due to documentation that was incomplete (most importantly unsigned)- **78.5%**

PROGRAMMATIC ISSUES

Concerns from programmatic perspective are:

1. Incorrect data entered in state reporting system can result in disallowed costs (family income versus family size, guardianship)
2. Lack of proper backup documentation in youth files can result in disallowed costs (incorrect social security numbers, income criteria missing, forms incomplete)
3. Youth who worked in the summer program information was not entered in the state reporting system. No record of youth recorded.
4. Files do not contain required program documents (Individual Service Strategy, Work Readiness and Work Maturity Forms, I-9 Forms)
5. Youth who worked in the summer program and reside in other counties will result in a disallowed cost



8.

SFWIB – Youth Council

December 17, 2009

Youth Program Funds for MDCPS Public Safety Services Academy

Discussion Item

BACKGROUND

At the June 18, 2009 Youth Council Meeting, the Council approved and recommended to the Board the approval to allocate youth program funding in the amount not to exceed \$168,000 for the period of July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010 to Miami-Dade County Public Schools (MDCPS).

The Public Safety Services Academy is scheduled to commence in Program Year 2009-2010. The pilot program will target a total of 70 ninth graders, 35 at Miami Southridge Senior High School (in the Cutler Bay area) and 35 at William H. Turner Technical Arts High School (in the central Miami area). The goal of the program is to facilitate a ready entry-level workforce for positions as public service aides, fire fighter cadets and correction service aides.

Miami-Dade County will partner with SFWIB to support the pilot program by contributing an estimated \$262,000.

The Public Safety Services Academy will partner with Miami-Dade Police Department, Miami-Dade County Department of Corrections and Miami-Dade County Fire Rescue Department to provide an enhanced curriculum (over four years) that will include: creating a school-to-work program that is a combination of education and training; implementing a curriculum that meets departmental academy requirements; providing a learning environment to meet the needs of the workplace, including internships; and establishing a community-based employment feeder program from school-to-work (entry level) to careers (law enforcement/corrections).

On November 12, 2009, SFWIB staff notified MDCPS staff involved in coordinating the Public Safety Services Academy Project that SFWIB is not ready to begin the contract process for the Public Safety Services Academy Project. Due to the financial, quality assurance, and programmatic concerns described in Youth Council Agenda Item 7, Issues Encountered with 2009 ARRA MDCPS Summer Youth Employment Program, SFWIB staff is requesting guidance from the Youth Council as to whether SFWIB ought to proceed with partnering with MDCPS on this Project.



9.

SFWIB – Youth Council

December 17, 2009

Presentation – Take Stock in Children

Informational

BACKGROUND

At the October 15, 2009, Youth Council meeting, Council members approved the allocation of \$450,000 in TANF funds to support MDC's Take Stock in Children (TSIC) and Five Thousand Role Models of Excellence programs

A presentation will be provided by a representative from MDC's Wolfson Campus on both the TSIC and Five Thousand Role Models of Excellence programs.



10.

Youth Council

December 17, 2009

**Approval of Allocation of Youth Program
Funds for the Phoenix Internship Project to
Serve Youth with Disabilities**

RECOMMENDATION

SFWIB staff recommends that the Youth Council approve to allocate youth funds in the amount not to exceed \$135,461 for the period of January 1, 2010 to June 30, 2010 to Youth Co-Op, Inc. to support the Phoenix Internship Project, which will serve young adults with disabilities as a pilot project.

BACKGROUND

Miami-Dade County in partnership with Florida International University (FIU) developed the Phoenix Project, an internship pipeline for young adult workers with disabilities. The internship project will provide professional work experience for young adults with disabilities. The project will assist young adults with disabilities between the ages of 18-21 gain employment skills and an understanding of the workplace. The young adults will be placed within various participating Miami-Dade County Departments.

Miami-Dade County and FIU will partner with SFWIB and Youth Co-Op, Inc. to support the pilot project. The partnerships will provide meaningful, structured work experience to young adults with disabilities and develop sustainable employment opportunities while providing valuable work readiness skills and tangible workplace experience.

The Phoenix Project is scheduled to begin in January 2010 and will target 10 to 15 young adults with disabilities. To participate in the project, a young adult must be a qualified individual with a disability (as defined by the ADA), register with the university's Disabilities Resource Center, be between the ages of 18-21, have completed a minimum of 60 credit hours (graduate students of FIU are encouraged to apply), be eligible to work in the United States, must comply with all County employment requirements, must register with SFWIB/Youth Co-Op, Inc., and must meet family and income eligibility requirements.

Qualified applicants may earn up to \$12.00 per hour and must be able to commit to 25 hours per week for one semester (approximately 16 weeks).