Q: 1) The RFA references a 3 year grant period and 2 rounds of funding. What is the expected grant term (start and end dates) for the project?

A: The grant term will begin upon the dispersal of the first round of funding in April 2019 and conclude two years after the second dispersal of funds in July 2019.

Q: 2) Please advise how the State foresaw regions completing and submitting our Prison to Employment proposals on February 15th but having to publish regional plans for public comment prior to that date to allow for a 30-day comment period, a window to compile feedback into the final regional plan and submit on March 15?

A: In order for CWDB to dispense funding this year, which the CWDB is required to do, contracting must be completed before the end of the fiscal year, which requires CWDB to receive applications within the RFA's timeline. Once a public comment on a region's plan modification is complete—if significant changes must be made prior to execution of Prison to Employment contracts—those may be made. If changes are made after the contract is executed, we will be able to amend the contract. CWDB acknowledges this process includes a degree of complexity and will work with regions on specific issues as they occur; however the application date cannot be modified. CWDB encourages applying regions to focus on conducting the planning around the Prison to Employment aspects of their Regional Plans first in order to facilitate your applications through the RFA process.

Q: 3) Within the new contracting framework guiding use of these funds, how will regions be allowed to move funds to Workforce Development Board partners and subsequently the field?

A: One of the local work development boards will be the fiscal agent—that local board will receive the funds from the State. They will then be responsible for subgranting the funds to other workforce partners and CBOs in the region following local processes. Partner CBOs delivering services would fall under the subrecipient distinction and would not need to be procured. Please see EDD Directive Subrecipient and Contractor Distinctions WSD 18-06 https://www.edd.ca.gov/jobs_and_training/pubs/wsd18-06.pdf

Q: 4) Is it appropriate to place all wage-related costs associated with training in the “earn and learn” grant, and place the staffing and operational costs in the “Direct Service Grant”?

A: The definition of “earn and learn” and “supportive services” are given in the statute in the Unemployment Insurance Code. The language around “earn and learn” in the Unemployment
Insurance Code is extremely permissive. If you have operational costs, those are allowed in both contracts so you don’t have to pick one or the other.

**Q: 5) Please define the data sets needed for consistent comparison between all the regions.**

A: In terms of weighting of the grant amounts, each region’s need (as detailed in the RFA and Regional Planning Guidance) will be determined, in part, by the size of each region’s supervised population. Grant applications should include an assessment of need in the region in terms of the number of eligible participants (i.e. the size of the supervised population in the region). There is information linked from the CWDB’s website that provides data sources for the number of individuals released on probation and parole each year.

**Q: 6) For "earn and learn" grants, must the classroom instruction be concurrent with OJT, or can it sequential? See Pg. 10 of the SFA.**

A: For an activity to qualify as “earn and learn” there has to be some sort of payment for participation in the training activity. If the training activity does not have any kind of payment associated with it then it is a direct service and would fall under the Direct Service grant funds.

**Q: 7) Does the State Board want to see numbers released to PRCS / number released to Parole + Probation / plus released from County Jails?**

A: All of the above. Essentially applicants should provide their best estimate on the number of formerly incarcerated and justice-involved individuals in their region. Data sources linked from the CWDB’s website is intended to provide RPU’s with a baseline estimate; however partnering with local corrections for more detailed information is strongly recommended.

**Q: 8) Can you please clarify whether or not currently incarcerated individuals are part of the justice involved population?**

A: Yes they are included.

**Q: 9) Do we submit one application for both grants?**

A: There are certain parts of the application that will cover both grants e.g. narrative, flow chart, and cover page. The exhibits have to be separate for contracts. So it will be one submission with multiple forms, one narrative, one flow chart, etc. Please see Section VI Required Application Content of the RFA (pg. 12) for a chart.
Q: 10) Must the grant applicant and the fiscal agent be the same entity?
A: Yes.

Q: 11) Will this PPT be available after the Webinar?
A: Yes. See the link in the response to the following question.

Q: 12) Can we get a copy of this PowerPoint?
A: You will be able to download it from our website under the “Prison to Employment Initiative Grant Program” tab on the Corrections-Workforce partnership page of CWDB’s website.

Q: 13) The RPU has no legal status, no board and no elected official. Who is the signing authority?
A: The LWDB selected to sign on as the lead applicant will function as the signing authority.

Q: 14) This is one regional project. Why are there separate budget and planning forms for each grant? It seems like one set of forms with multiple columns for each grant would help understand the interrelationship between the grants.
A: There are two pots of funding appropriated by the Legislature and we have to account for both. These are two separate contracts with separate work plans. In order for CWDB to do its due diligence with State funding, those funds are required to be tracked appropriately.

Q: 15) Workforce Development Boards are having difficulty securing Workers Compensation for work experience activities. If they do, it is extremely expensive and cost prohibitive. There has been a request to use the State Compensation Insurance Fund (SCIF) Agency in the same manner that the Agency has used to provide Workers Compensation Insurance for CalWORKs recipients involved in Work Experience and Community Service. This request has been made to the State on several occasions. The Governor should provide direction to SCIF to support the Prison to Employment Program in the same manner.
A: We have noted this.
Q: 16) Is it assumed the fiscal lead will be the contracting agent for CBOs in other local areas?
A: Yes

***Revised Answer: If the lead agency subcontracts funds to another Workforce Development Board in the RPU, that WDB is responsible to enter into contracts or subgrants with agencies to run their program.

Q: 17) What is the method for allocation of funding between and within the regions?
A: CWDB will consider the following criteria during application review: the size of the region’s supervised population, the region’s recidivism rate, and the demonstrated readiness of a region to implement strategies that will have the greatest impact on reducing recidivism through employment strategies. More detailed information on the application review process is included in the RFA.

Q: 18) Will the forms expand to add additional information such as more than 9 employers being listed on the Required Partners form?
A: You can add lines to the form.

Q: 19) Is it ok to add attachments to the narrative if necessary (for example, long list of employer partners)?
A: Yes.

Q: 20) Will you accept other data sources re: population needs besides the two you mentioned?
A: Yes, the use of additional data sources that illustrate the size and character of a region’s supervised population encouraged.

Q: 21) And will that impact funding levels?
A: The CWDB encourages applying regions to provide a sound, well-articulated argument about why funding is needed and how it will be used. CWDB will conduct an assessment based on the data provided in the application and the proposed programing that is outlined. CWDB will allot grant funds in a manner that is deemed to most accurately reflect both the need in each of the 14 regions and the preparedness of each region to implement meaningful programming region-wide.
Q: 22) Can you explain the admin cap being limited to 10%, including direct costs?

A: You’re only allowed to have 10% of your total grant go towards admin expenditures, that includes your direct admin costs i.e. your fiscal staff that are processing invoices and your indirect costs (your overhead). Those combined can only add up to a total of 10% of your total grant.

Q: 23) How will the grant be monitored? Through existing regional coordinator structure (quarterly reports via CWDB Gloria Earl) or new structure?

A: Both. Please also note that you are going to be entering all of the participants into the CalJOBS system and we will be periodically pulling reports from the CalJOBS to track how many people are being served, where they’re being served, who’s providing the services, and what types of services those are. There’s going to be a lot of data tracking with this grant program as there’s a lot of interest in the Legislature, and again, unprecedented general fund investment in the workforce system. We need to be able to show that the funding’s being put to good use so we are going to be tracking everything.

Q: 24) What website reference where parolee data is available?

A: Links to parole and probation data can be found under the “Data and Research tab on the Corrections-Workforce partnership page of CWDB’s website.

Q: 25) Can the delegated lead/fiscal Workforce Development Board share/delegate lead/fiscal responsibilities with the other boards in the RPU?

A: No, the delegated lead board is responsible to manage the contract award.

Q: 26) In order to apply was it a requirement to be on the application webinar?

A: No.

Q: 27) Since there will be two contracts for the Prison to Employment Implementation funds, can two different boards be designated to act as the lead/fiscal for each contract?

A: The California Workforce Development Board prefers that one Workforce Development Board acts as the lead/fiscal for both however you can appoint two different Workforce Development Board’s, one for each contract.
Q: 28) On page 5 of the RFA, explain what the signature proof of this agreement means (in regards to delegating one entity as the applicant and fiscal agent for each grant).

A: Each RPU needs to include either a signature page or letter of agreement from each WDB in the region agreeing to have the delegated agency act as the lead/fiscal.

Q: 29) What if all WDB’s in a region do not provide the signature agreement?

A: Majority rules – if the majority of WDB’s provide signature agreement then the application is accepted.

Q: 30) Can a RPU split up and submit two applications?

A: No, the RPU’s are defined in the State Plan and one application from each RPU is allowed.

Q: 31) If the delegated lead/fiscal WDB subcontracts funds to the other WDB’s in a RPU – is that lead/fiscal WDB responsible for those other WDB’s activities, procurement practices, etc….

A: When subcontracting funds to another agency, there must be a legal document outlining the scope of work, term, allowable uses of funds. This document should include a requirement that the subcontracted agency (in this case a workforce development board) comply with the requirements of WIOA (procurement practices, etc), and a process for handling corrective action/monitoring findings.

Q: 32) Is there a requirement that the two rounds of funding be spent on the same group of participants? In other words, could Direct Services funds be applied to some participants, and not others? Or vice versa with Earn and Learn?

A: Grant funds may be spent in any combination needed to provide services to individual participants. Given the different grant sums (i.e. more funding has been allotted toward Supportive Services/Earn and Learn grants than Implementation/Direct Service grants), it is expected that regions will have participants who receive services funded through only one of this RFA’s grants as well as participants who receive services funded through a combination of both grants.
Q: 33) Since the grant discusses the ability to expand existing and proven successful models, are we as a region permitted to use P2E to fund currently contracted providers (under Uniform Guidance sole source requirements), or must all P2E funds be competitively bid out?

A: Local procurement policies must be followed. It is recommended you review the Uniform Guidance with your legal counsel with the current contracts to make a determination.

Q: 34) Most of the contact information provided was for a generic email address (e.g.: info@____.org) that most organizations don’t check. As such, we've heard and keep hearing from stakeholders that we didn't reach out to invite them to our public input process.

A: Information on potential partner CBOs is provided as a resource for workforce stakeholders to begin developing connections to local organizations that specialize in serving formerly incarcerated individuals. Information on CBOs provided by the CWDB does not represent a complete list of potential CBO partners, and applying regions are encouraged to pursue a range of outreach strategies to potential CBO partners.

For suggested best practices on community outreach to CBOs, please see this short guide available on the CWDB, and for direct download here:

In order to increase participation of small CBOs with limited staff and resources, it may be necessary to offer subsidies for their time and travel expenses, as well as evening or weekend meeting time accommodations.

Q: 35) In terms of access to that info and website ease of use/efficiency, there does not appear to be a way to gather info on multiple contacts at the same time. Staff has had to hover over individual pins to copy contact info from the pop-ups and paste into spreadsheets. Seems like an option to select multiple sites to generate a table should be a basic function. As is, it's a very time consuming activity which, per above, was largely for naught

A: CWDB staff are available to provide technical assistance on specific questions related to best practices on contacting potential partners and to respond to requests for developing resources tailored to the needs of the state’s workforce community.

Unfortunately, the interactive map does not allow for the capture of a region-specific spreadsheet of contacts. Upon request, CWDB staff has provided the full statewide contacts list in excel form by email. Since others may have similar interest, this information will soon be made available via the online Regional Plan Implementation portal here: https://cwdb.ca.gov/regional-plan-implementation/
Q: 36) Q: The two questions below are related to questions #16, #31 and #33 of this Q&A page. We need additional clarification:

1. If the lead WDB contracts with the other WDB’s are they able to provide the services themselves through their associated AJCC’s without conducting a bid for P2E services?

2. If the lead WDB contracts with the other WDB’s are they able to subcontract the services through their associated AJCC’s (who have already been competitively procured) without conducting a bid for P2E services?

A: In both instances, all procurement policies must be followed including local policies. Refer to the EDD directive WSD18-06, Subrecipient and Contractor Distinctions - https://www.edd.ca.gov/Jobs_and_Training/pubs/wsd18-06.pdf Per this directive procurement is required for contractors. Local policies may still require procurement for subrecipients. Use this directive to determine which you are referring to regarding P2E services. Additionally, it is recommended to review any previous RFP’s and the associated contracts or subgrants to make the determination as to whether P2E services can be included in existing scopes of work.

Q: 37) P2E form 4: Participant Plan. The form requests program participant data for 12 quarters, however, P2E implementation funding is only for 8 quarters. Please clarify and specify how regions should complete this form.

A: There are two rounds of funds being distributed: 1) first round in 2018-2019 that would expire in March of 2021 (established under an initial contract); 2) second round in 2019-2020 which would be added to the contract and extend it to March of 2022. There would be 12 quarters total.

Q: 38) Can you clarify the answer for question 37 on this Q&A sheet – does this mean it is a two or three year program?

A: Since there are two rounds of funds that fall into two fiscal years – that makes the grant period roughly 2 years and 9 months (give or take) – this is an estimate based on the period of June 2019 to March 2022.

The first round of funds will be distributed in FY 2018-2019 and term out March of 2021 and the second round of funds will be distributed in FY 2019-2020 and will term out in March of 2022.

With the second round being added to the original contract the contract term will then change to March 2022. You should plan to utilize funds for this period.

Q: 39) Are individuals in pre-trial diversion eligible for P2E funded services?

A: Yes
Q: 40) Will the state be taking into consideration the self-report limitations of the workforce data for the justice involved population? The "offender" status category in CalJobs isn't defined in the same manner as the state defines "justice involved" for the grant, so those numbers are likely very under-representative of who local boards are actually serving from this population.

A: Yes, changes will be made to the CalJOBS system to accommodate expanded data entry options specific to the Prison to Employment Initiative. The CWDB expects to release a directive covering these changes within the next two weeks. That directive will be posted to the CWDB’s website.

Q: 41) When the P2E allocations are made will there be a grant code that can be used to track and monitor individuals who participate in services funded by the P2E?

A: Yes

Q: 42) For the section II requirement to describe "each community-based organization’s capacity to provide services to relevant target populations and provide evidence of this capacity," is it possible to provide an inventory of providers as an attachment? We anticipate that this section will be long if we need to address each provider and are concerned about how having multiple CBO partners will impact the ability to meet the page limit requirements.

A: Form 3A in the forms packet (a link to the packet is provided on the Corrections-Workforce partnership page), provides space to list each proposed CBO partner and their proposed roles and responsibilities. Applicants are encouraged to add additional rows to the Excel document to capture all proposed CBO partners. Further, RPUs may attach an addendum to Form 3A that provides additional information about each CBO partner’s capacity to provide services to the justice-involved population and reference this addendum and/or information provided in form 3A in the narrative in lieu of including this information within the narrative itself. Form 3A and any addendum to Form 3A will not count toward the narrative’s page limit.

Q: 43) For the section III requirement to “describe the provision of an education and training assessment for each individual...” is that assessment intended to be a diagnostic assessment? What is the state’s vision for what that assessment should entail?

A: Based on your program design and the variety of assessment tests and tools available and the possible need to use more than one type on a client – you would need to determine the type of assessment tools that you will use to effectively serve clients. The assessment should be used to develop a plan to best serve the client and support them in education, training and work.

Q: 44) May subcontractor on “Form 8 Bidders Declaration” be listed as TBD?

A: Yes.
Q: 45) What is the largest grant that a region can receive for Direct Service and Supportive Service “Earn and Learn” grants? Is funding based on percentages received for the P to E Planning Grant submissions?

A: CWDB has not established a maximum award amount. As was the case with the planning grant awards, the size of a region’s justice-involved and formerly incarcerated populations will be one of several criteria used to determine each region’s funding allotment.

Q: 46) Regarding the P2E Participant Plan forms #4. If clients are receiving both types of services, Direct and Supportive, it stands to reason they would be included on both worksheets. In that case, the total participants served (cells P5) would include overlap across the two grants such that the total number served would actually be less than the aggregate of the two grants combined. Please confirm.

A: While the CWDB expects that some participants will receive services funded through both grants, Forms #4 are asking for the number of participants served per grant – not an aggregate total of individuals served under both grants.

Q: 47) May [applicants] include an addendum to Section I Statement of Need with a table of more detailed demographics data?

A: Applicants may include supplemental demographic information as an addendum; however this addendum should not replace the required discussion of regional demographics in the narrative as described in the RFA.

Q: 48) Are the partners to be listed on the Cover Page the same as those included in Form 3A?

A: Yes

Q: 49) Will the State Board consider assigning a funding allotment, as you did in the planning grant RFA, for direct and supportive service grants based on the level of need as determined by the size of the P2E population in the region?

A: The grants’ funding allotments will be determined as described on page 4 of the RFA. The size of each region’s post-release population will be one of the criteria considered during the review process.

Each RPU should provide a needs analysis with plans to respond to that assessed need with a commensurate set of service offerings. As this population typically requires intensive services to attain positive labor market outcomes (an outcome evaluation of AB 2060 grantees showed a cost of roughly $14,000 per job placement), the CWDB expects the grants’ funding to serve roughly two- to three-thousand individuals statewide. Funding allotments for this RFA’s grants are not
predetermined; however the CWDB understands that different areas of the state have higher CDCR releases and higher probation caseloads, and that will be one of the criteria used to determine final funding allotments.