## State of Maine Master Score Sheet

### Peer Workforce Navigator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidder Name:</th>
<th>AFL-CIO</th>
<th>MEIRS</th>
<th>Mid Coast Youth</th>
<th>ME Prisoner Re-Entry Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Cost:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,102,304</strong> ($184/individual)</td>
<td><strong>$422,340</strong> ($1,407/individual)</td>
<td><strong>$240,000</strong> ($2,000/individual)</td>
<td><strong>$60,000</strong> ($1,200/individual)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>AFL-CIO</th>
<th>MEIRS</th>
<th>Mid Coast Youth</th>
<th>ME Prisoner Re-Entry Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Eligibility</td>
<td>Pass/ Fail</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Applicant Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bidder Name: Tree Street Youth, Northern Light Health, Strengthen LA, ACAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidder Name:</th>
<th>Tree Street Youth</th>
<th>Northern Light Health</th>
<th>Strengthen LA</th>
<th>ACAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Cost:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$120,000</strong> ($2,000/individual)</td>
<td><strong>$462,766</strong> ($1,543/individual)</td>
<td><strong>$200,000</strong> ($2,000/individual)</td>
<td><strong>$200,000</strong> ($2,000/individual)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scoring Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Tree Street Youth</th>
<th>Northern Light Health</th>
<th>Strengthen LA</th>
<th>ACAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Eligibility</td>
<td>Pass/ Fail</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Applicant Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring Sections</td>
<td>Points Available</td>
<td>Bidder Name:</td>
<td>Scoring Sections</td>
<td>Points Available</td>
<td>Bidder Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>AK Health</td>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>AK Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Award Justification Statement
RFA# 202112198 Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot

I. Summary
The Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot program is a two-year pilot program from the Maine Department of Labor that will engage with organizations that work closely with underserved populations who have been disproportionately impacted by the pandemic to connect them to employment, skills development, and resources for needs such as child care and transportation. Underserved populations may include immigrants, individuals with limited English proficiency, inexperienced and untrained individuals, low-income and homeless individuals, individuals who have been out of the workforce for an extended period, or individuals with low literacy and individuals with disabilities.

Core elements of the program include 1) Hiring, training and onboarding of peer navigators; 2) Conducting outreach and educational activities to raise awareness of workforce and other resources; 3) Connecting individuals to jobs, benefits, and workforce programs; and 4) Capturing data on program participants to track outcomes.

II. Evaluation Process
The evaluation process comprised of an individual review, followed by consensus scoring by a group of reviewers. The reviewers rated each proposal according to the scoring guidelines included in the RFA. Reviewers were DOL staff members with expertise in re-employment services, worker navigator programs, strategic planning, equitable program design and program reporting.

III. Qualifications & Experience
I. Expansive and trusted reach: Each partner has an extensive network and reaches different communities across Maine. AFL-CIO has a membership base of 40,000 workers across Maine with a local presence through its 160 unions. Maine Equal Justice has statewide presence and provides direct legal support to over 700 low-income households each year. Both Gateway Community Services and Prosperity Maine have deep local networks and presence among the immigrant, refugee and asylum-seeker communities in the Greater Portland and Lewiston/Auburn areas. Lastly, Food AND Medicine is a grassroots organization based in Eastern Maine with a network of over 6,000 affected individuals in the region.

II. Experience with navigator programs: The selected proposal identified wide-ranging expertise to successfully implement this program—including implementing peer support worker programs in communities of disconnected workers, developing and implementing a navigator training program to ensure navigators can connect to appropriate resources, and becoming a trusted information resources for individuals needing to connect to unemployment benefits during the COVID-19 pandemic.
III. **Navigator program & grant management experience**: Partner applicants such as Maine Equal Justice and Food AND Medicine have direct connection to low-income families and have experience with peer navigator programs—in training navigators and in directly connecting affected households with needed resources.

IV. **Proposed Services**

I. **Navigator training and oversight**: Project manager will oversee all of the navigators, which will be recruited from within partner membership base and housed at partner sites. The presence of a project manager will ensure activities are coordinated across partners and outcomes are tracked and met. Maine Equal Justice will be a partner in developing and delivering training on employment and social services, referral processes, customer service, and more—for which they have extensive expertise.

II. **Extensive partnerships**: As part of navigator onboarding, navigators will conduct a series of meetings with key stakeholders in the region to build relationships and a strong referral network. The applicant will also strengthen relationships with existing workforce partners such as CareerCenters and coordinate with other navigator programs (Adult Promise, PAS)

III. **Outreach methods**: Using a mix of on-the-ground organizing techniques like canvassing, events as well as digital outreach, including social media and texting. Most importantly, applicant noted that they would consult with members of their priority communities to test messaging and ensure it resonates. Additionally, partners in the coalition will provide translation services to ensure outreach resonates in many different communities.

IV. **Cost Proposal**

I. **Most cost effective (in terms of per individual served)**: Given the expansive projected reach of the pilot, the cost per individual hovered under $200—the lowest of all 12 submitted proposals by a large margin.

II. **Paid contractual partners**: Importantly, the applicant sub-granted funding to partners that would be required to hire, train and host navigators—ensuring that the capacity required to do so would be compensated for.

III. **Budget scope**: The applicant did note that to fully fund the entirety of the program, the budget would be about $20,000 over the amount offered in the grant. The applicant stated that they would internally fundraise to cover these costs.

IV. **Conclusion**

The proposal submitted by the AFL-CIO and partners proposed the most extensive statewide reach, leverages partner expertise in navigator training, program implementation, trusted networks among priority communities, and proven outreach methods, while building on and improving existing resources and workforce systems.
February 25, 2022

Matt Schlobohm
Maine AFL-CIO
21 Gabriel Dr.
Augusta, ME  04330

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFA # 202112198, Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot

Dear Matt Schlobohm:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Applications (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Labor for the Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA. The Maine AFL-CIO’s proposal has received the evaluation teams highest ranking and has been selected as the successful vendor. Congratulations to you and your team!

Please note, this award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. This decision is subject to appeal, and the other applicants have been notified of the appeal rights included at the end of this letter.

The Department will follow up in the coming weeks to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract with the Department. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA).
1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).
Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

___________________________________     February 25, 2022
Signature            Date

Kimberly Smith, Deputy Commissioner
Maine Department of Labor
54 State House Station
Augusta, Maine, 04333-0054
Office: (207) 621-5095
STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
February 25, 2022

Sherry Locke
Aroostook County Action Program
1 Edgemont Drive
Presque Isle, ME 04769

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFA # 202112198, Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot

Dear Sherry Locke:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Labor for the Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Maine AFL-CIO

The bidder listed above received the evaluation team’s highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.
Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

February 25, 2022

Date

Kimberly Smith, Deputy Commissioner
Maine Department of Labor
54 State House Station
Augusta, Maine, 04333-0054
Office: (207) 621-5095
STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
February 25, 2022

Abdikhadar Shire
AK Health And Social Services
157 Main St Ste 102
Lewiston, ME 04240

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFA # 202112198,
Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot

Dear Abdikhadar Shire:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Labor for the Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Maine AFL-CIO

The bidder listed above received the evaluation team’s highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.
Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kimberly Smith, Deputy Commissioner
Maine Department of Labor
54 State House Station
Augusta, Maine, 04333-0054
Office: (207) 621-5095

February 25, 2022
Date
STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
February 25, 2022

Jillian Sample
Coastal Counties Workforce, Inc.
14 Maine Street, Suite 203A
Brunswick, ME 04011

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFA # 202112198,
Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot

Dear Jillian Sample:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Labor for the Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Maine AFL-CIO

The bidder listed above received the evaluation team’s highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.
Sincerely,

Signature ____________________________  February 25, 2022  
Date

Kimberly Smith, Deputy Commissioner  
Maine Department of Labor  
54 State House Station  
Augusta, Maine, 04333-0054  
Office: (207) 621-5095
STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
February 25, 2022

Doug Dunbar
Eastern Maine Development Corporation
40 Harlow Street
Bangor, Maine 04401

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFA # 202112198, Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot

Dear Doug Dunbar:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Labor for the Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Maine AFL-CIO

The bidder listed above received the evaluation team’s highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.
Sincerely,

Signature

February 25, 2022
Date

Kimberly Smith, Deputy Commissioner
Maine Department of Labor
54 State House Station
Augusta, Maine, 04333-0054
Office: (207) 621-5095
STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
February 25, 2022

Edmond Kabagambe
Maine Labor and Resource Center
15 North Street
Westbrook, ME 04092

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFA # 202112198,
Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot

Dear Edmond Kabagambe:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Labor for the Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Maine AFL-CIO

The bidder listed above received the evaluation team’s highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.
Sincerely,

__________________________
Signature

February 25, 2022
Date

Kimberly Smith, Deputy Commissioner
Maine Department of Labor
54 State House Station
Augusta, Maine, 04333-0054
Office: (207) 621-5095
STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
February 25, 2022

Dipper Castaldo  
Maine Prisoner Re-Entry Network  
2 Bangor Street  
Augusta, ME 04330

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFA # 202112198, Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot

Dear Dipper Castaldo:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Labor for the Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Maine AFL-CIO

The bidder listed above received the evaluation team’s highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.
Sincerely,

Signature

February 25, 2022

Date

Kimberly Smith, Deputy Commissioner
Maine Department of Labor
54 State House Station
Augusta, Maine, 04333-0054
Office: (207) 621-5095
STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
February 25, 2022

Rilwan Osman  
Maine Immigrant and Refugee Services (MEIRS)  
256 Bartlett Street  
Lewiston, Maine 04240

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFA # 202112198, Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot

Dear Rilwan Osman:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Labor for the Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Maine AFL-CIO

The bidder listed above received the evaluation team’s highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.
Sincerely,

[Signature]

February 25, 2022

Kimberly Smith, Deputy Commissioner
Maine Department of Labor
54 State House Station
Augusta, Maine, 04333-0054
Office: (207) 621-5095
STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
February 25, 2022

Jamie Dorr  
Midcoast Youth Center  
4 Old Brunswick Road  
Bath ME  04530

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFA # 202112198, Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot

Dear Jamie Dorr:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Labor for the Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Maine AFL-CIO

The bidder listed above received the evaluation team’s highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.
Sincerely,

Signature

Kimberly Smith, Deputy Commissioner
Maine Department of Labor
54 State House Station
Augusta, Maine, 04333-0054
Office: (207) 621-5095

February 25, 2022
Date
STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
February 25, 2022

Catharine MacLaren  
Northern Light Health  
43 Whiting Hill Road  
Brewer, Maine, 04412  

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFA # 202112198, Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot

Dear Catharine MacLaren:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Labor for the Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Maine AFL-CIO

The bidder listed above received the evaluation team’s highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.
Sincerely,

Kimberly Smith, Deputy Commissioner
Maine Department of Labor
54 State House Station
Augusta, Maine, 04333-0054
Office: (207) 621-5095

February 25, 2022
Date

Signature
STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
February 25, 2022

Brian Pickard
Strengthen LA - Lewiston Auburn Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce
415 Lisbon Street, Suite 100
Lewiston, ME 04240

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFA # 202112198, Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot

Dear Brian Pickard:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Labor for the Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Maine AFL-CIO

The bidder listed above received the evaluation team’s highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.
Sincerely,

Signature

February 25, 2022

Date

Kimberly Smith, Deputy Commissioner
Maine Department of Labor
54 State House Station
Augusta, Maine, 04333-0054
Office: (207) 621-5095
STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
February 25, 2022

Julie Sleeper-Whiting
Tree Street Youth
144 Howe Street
Lewiston, ME 04240

SUBJECT: Notice of Conditional Contract Award under RFA # 202112198, Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot

Dear Julia Sleeper-Whiting:

This letter is in regard to the subject Request for Proposals (RFA), issued by the State of Maine Department of Labor for the Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot. The Department has evaluated the proposals received using the evaluation criteria identified in the RFA, and the Department is hereby announcing its conditional contract award to the following bidder:

- Maine AFL-CIO

The bidder listed above received the evaluation team’s highest ranking. The Department will be contacting the aforementioned bidder soon to negotiate a contract. As provided in the RFA, the Notice of Conditional Contract Award is subject to execution of a written contract and, as a result, this Notice does NOT constitute the formation of a contract between the Department and the apparent successful vendor. The vendor shall not acquire any legal or equitable rights relative to the contract services until a contract containing terms and conditions acceptable to the Department is executed. The Department further reserves the right to cancel this Notice of Conditional Contract Award at any time prior to the execution of a written contract.

As stated in the RFA, following announcement of this award decision, all submissions in response to the RFA are considered public records available for public inspection pursuant to the State of Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA). 1 M.R.S. §§ 401 et seq.; 5 M.R.S. § 1825-B (6).

This award decision is conditioned upon final approval by the State Procurement Review Committee and the successful negotiation of a contract. A Statement of Appeal Rights has been provided with this letter; see below.

Thank you for your interest in doing business with the State of Maine.
Sincerely,

___________________________________     February 25, 2022
Signature            Date

Kimberly Smith, Deputy Commissioner
Maine Department of Labor
54 State House Station
Augusta, Maine, 04333-0054
Office: (207) 621-5095
STATEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS

Any person aggrieved by an award decision may request an appeal hearing. The request must be made to the Director of the Bureau of General Services, in writing, within 15 days of notification of the contract award as provided in 5 M.R.S. § 1825-E (2) and the Rules of the Department of Administrative and Financial Services, Bureau of General Services, Division of Purchases, Chapter 120, § (2) (2).
RFP #: 202112198  
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT  
DATE: February 8, 2022  
Department Name: Labor  
Name of RFP Coordinator: Samantha Dina  
Names of Evaluators: Michael Roland, Kim Moore, Samantha Dina

BIDDER NAME: AK Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass/Fail Criteria</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be a community-based organization, worker group, labor union, or other non-</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>profit organization with deep ties to underserved and under-represented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities within the workforce;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have existing peer relationships with underserved populations, including</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrants, individuals with limited English proficiency, inexperienced and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>untrained individuals, low-income and homeless individuals, individuals who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have been out of the workforce for an extended period, individuals with low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literacy and individuals with disabilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the capability to carry out the duties and activities for this program,</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including knowledge of eligibility requirements and application processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related to the unemployment compensation system, reemployment services,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education and training services and other resources necessary to help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underserved populations increase their economic security;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with existing confidentiality standards to ensure the privacy of all</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information collected from individuals receiving navigator services;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide services under this section without charge to the individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receiving those services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the ability to deal with programs of this size and capability;</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regularly collect, track and share progress metrics related to program</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance standards and key performance indicators (KPIs)—including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual demographic information and personally identifiable information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(to track longer-term employment outcomes), number of connections, number of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful referrals, and employment outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Grant Review Team shall give priority for peer workforce navigator contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to a qualified entity that demonstrates one or multiple of the following</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is a <strong>recognized source of support or advocacy for underserved populations</strong>,</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such as racial and ethnic minorities, persons with low literacy,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
persons with disabilities and others seeking to improve skills and gain employment.

- Has an **organizational mission that requires them to represent the interest of unemployed or underemployed individuals.**
- Represents a **membership base of workers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Eligibility</td>
<td>Pass/ Fail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Applicant Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- **Applicant experience**
  - Strong existing network of 200 individuals
  - Seen as trusted resource in immigrant and BIPOC community—likely able to get up & running quickly
  - Some grant management experience, though relatively limited and newer efforts
  - Mentioned experience in helping individuals get connected to unemployment benefits

- **Program design**
  - Number of navigators proposed didn’t seem adequate to reach 100 per year
  - Mostly focused on direct service and not systemic change—very focused on strengthening their organization vs implementing systemic change

- **Equity**
  - Solid network in communities
  - Very focused on immigrant & BIPOC communities—doesn’t mention ability to reach other affected communities

- **Intended outputs and outcomes**
  - Limited reach regionally in LA area
  - Reaching 3,000 people and providing services to 100—why so few out of that?

- **Program sustainability plan**
  - Looking to sustain relationships and seek other funding—nothing concrete or innovative but fine approach

- **Budget and narrative**
  - Some inconsistencies in their reach within budget projections—is the project reach 100 total or yearly?
  - Lacking a budget narrative to explain detail around budget
  - Based on current budget projects, navigator roles are likely to be relatively low paid positions
RFP #: 202112198  
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT  
DATE: February 8, 2022  
Department Name: Labor  
Name of RFP Coordinator: Samantha Dina  
Names of Evaluators: Michael Roland, Kim Moore, Samantha Dina  

BIDDER NAME: Coastal Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass/Fail Criteria</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be a community-based organization, worker group, labor union, or other non-profit organization with deep ties to underserved and under-represented communities within the workforce;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have existing peer relationships with underserved populations, including immigrants, individuals with limited English proficiency, inexperienced and untrained individuals, low-income and homeless individuals, individuals who have been out of the workforce for an extended period, individuals with low literacy and individuals with disabilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the capability to carry out the duties and activities for this program, including knowledge of eligibility requirements and application processes related to the unemployment compensation system, reemployment services, education and training services and other resources necessary to help underserved populations increase their economic security;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with existing confidentiality standards to ensure the privacy of all information collected from individuals receiving navigator services;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide services under this section without charge to the individuals receiving those services</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the ability to deal with programs of this size and capability;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regularly collect, track and share progress metrics related to program performance standards and key performance indicators (KPIs)—including individual demographic information and personally identifiable information (to track longer-term employment outcomes), number of connections, number of successful referrals, and employment outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Grant Review Team shall give priority for peer workforce navigator contracts to a qualified entity that demonstrates one or multiple of the following attributes:

• is a recognized source of support or advocacy for underserved populations, such as racial and ethnic minorities, persons with low literacy, persons with disabilities and others seeking to improve skills and gain employment.
Has an organizational mission that requires them to represent the interest of unemployed or underemployed individuals.

Represents a membership base of workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Eligibility</td>
<td>Pass/ Fail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Applicant Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- **Applicant experience**
  - Significant grant management experience with similar programs—including peer navigator model w/ opioid and COVID relief grant
  - Experience in implementing similar programs though ability to quickly reach affected communities is less clear—very established and connected to workforce partners, though unsure about ability to quickly connect as a trusted resource to some affected communities (disability, BIPOC, immigrant, etc)
  - Partners include Central Western ME board—which will expand their reach and ability to create impact

- **Program Design**
  - Expanded reach in Coastal Counties and Central Western ME—with five peer navigators in each geographic area
  - Heavily reliant on community based partners to promote the job of navigator, host info sessions to make connections to navigators
  - Leveraging existing partnerships with one stop shop partners to connect individuals to resources quickly, including co-enrollment in WIOA
  - Library partnership could give some additional reach
  - Staff member focused on quality assurance will bring quality control to program design and implementation
  - Outreach efforts seemed OK but not particularly innovative—information sessions with community partners—not sure how they will reach new individuals disconnected from system today. Interesting they cited this as a primary risk of their work—yet didn’t see a clear plan or strategy to address this beyond ongoing activities and relationships

- **Equity**
  - Reliant on CBO partners that represent affected communities to help recruit individuals to be navigators and connect to navigators—though not providing funding to these partners (beyond service provider)
  - Was not particularly specific about the target communities the pilot would focus on beyond listing all affected communities

- **Intended outputs and outcomes**
  - Reach of 535 over the grant period with nearly 300 connected to jobs—relatively far-reaching

- **Project sustainability plan**
- Likely will hire on peer support navigators—strengthening workforce system in these regions
  - Noted that one of their biggest risks is in connecting with the affected communities—though don’t see very strong innovative strategies in making these connections outside of existing partnerships today

- Budget and narrative
  - Detailed, thorough and seemed like realistic estimations
  - Close to the max allowable in terms of cost per individual—not particularly cost effective
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass/Fail Criteria</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be a community-based organization, worker group, labor union, or other non-</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>profit organization with deep ties to underserved and under-represented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities within the workforce;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have existing peer relationships with underserved populations, including</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrants, individuals with limited English proficiency, inexperienced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and untrained individuals, low-income and homeless individuals, individuals who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have been out of the workforce for an extended period, individuals with low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literacy and individuals with disabilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the capability to carry out the duties and activities for this program,</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including knowledge of eligibility requirements and application processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related to the unemployment compensation system, reemployment services,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education and training services and other resources necessary to help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underserved populations increase their economic security;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with existing confidentiality standards to ensure the privacy of all</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information collected from individuals receiving navigator services;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide services under this section without charge to the individuals receiving</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the ability to deal with programs of this size and capability;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regularly collect, track and share progress metrics related to program</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance standards and key performance indicators (KPIs)—including individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demographic information and personally identifiable information (to track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>longer-term employment outcomes), number of connections, number of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful referrals, and employment outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Grant Review Team shall give priority for peer workforce navigator</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contracts to a qualified entity that demonstrates one or multiple of the following</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is a **recognized source of support or advocacy for underserved</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>populations**, such as racial and ethnic minorities, persons with low literacy,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persons with disabilities and others seeking to improve skills and gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Has an organizational mission that requires them to represent the interest of unemployed or underemployed individuals.

Represents a membership base of workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Eligibility</td>
<td>Pass/ Fail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Applicant Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- **Applicant experience**
  - Significant grant management experience with similar programs—including peer navigator model w/ opioid and COVID relief grant
  - Specifically mentioned strong relationships with re-entry and recovery community to be able to get program implemented and reach these communities quickly
  - Strong connection to social service providers

- **Program Design**
  - Building on existing peer navigator programs—including tools like assessment to understand individual needs
  - No strong mention of strategies to connect individuals to unemployment benefits

- **Equity**
  - Seems to have deep relationships with some communities like re-entry and recovery—though lacks partnerships in others—immigrant, BIPOC, disability
  - Mentioned wanting to work with several partners to reach new populations like New Mainer and disability community—though didn’t mention providing funding to these organizations to partner on this effort

- **Intended outputs and outcomes**
  - At least 400 individuals reach with 170 into jobs
  - Relatively limited in terms of geographic scope—focused on Eastern ME

- **Project sustainability plan**
  - Idea to train partner organizations to host navigators as well as sustain relationships formed during grant beyond grant period
  - Otherwise—not concrete plan to sustain the navigator roles

- **Budget and narrative**
  - Close to the max allowable in terms of cost per individual—not particularly cost effective
## PASS/FAIL CRITERIA

### Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Be a community-based organization, worker group, labor union, or other non-profit organization with deep ties to underserved and under-represented communities within the workforce;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have existing peer relationships with underserved populations, including immigrants, individuals with limited English proficiency, inexperienced and untrained individuals, low-income and homeless individuals, individuals who have been out of the workforce for an extended period, individuals with low literacy and individuals with disabilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the capability to carry out the duties and activities for this program, including knowledge of eligibility requirements and application processes related to the unemployment compensation system, reemployment services, education and training services and other resources necessary to help underserved populations increase their economic security;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with existing confidentiality standards to ensure the privacy of all information collected from individuals receiving navigator services;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide services under this section without charge to the individuals receiving those services</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the ability to deal with programs of this size and capability;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regularly collect, track and share progress metrics related to program performance standards and key performance indicators (KPIs)—including individual demographic information and personally identifiable information (to track longer-term employment outcomes), number of connections, number of successful referrals, and employment outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Grant Review Team shall give priority for peer workforce navigator contracts to a qualified entity that demonstrates one or multiple of the following attributes:

- is a **recognized source of support or advocacy for underserved populations**, such as racial and ethnic minorities, persons with low literacy,
persons with disabilities and others seeking to improve skills and gain employment.

- Has an organizational mission that requires them to represent the interest of unemployed or underemployed individuals.
- Represents a membership base of workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Eligibility</td>
<td>Pass/ Fail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Applicant Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- Applicant experience
  - Experience implementing peer support worker programs in the past
  - Coalition of partners will expand reach beyond 40,000
  - Partners will help reach priority communities such as low-income, rural, New Mainer communities quickly

- Program Design
  - Leverage partner strengths to recruit navigators from affected communities—and other strengths to provide program management and training support
  - Innovative outreach—canvassing, events, digital
  - Mention of experience connecting individuals to UI benefits—seen as trusted resource
  - Systemic improvements noted include UI recipiency rate
  - Can extend reach due to volunteer model and referral approach—including storytelling and personal referral approach
  - Integration with existing resources and programs like CareerCenters and navigation programs like Adult Promise, PAS

- Equity
  - Translation services provided by partners
  - Mentioned testing messaging/outreach with priority communities to ensure it resonates
  - Housing navigators on-site at community organizations that have trusted community roots in Lewiston, Portland and Eastern ME
  - Not all communities are covered—disability, BIPOC communities are not explicitly mentioned

- Intended outputs and outcomes
  - Huge reach—1650 people to jobs and 5500 people in outreach
  - Unsure how realistic this is—though network today among partners is large

- Project sustainability plan
  - Seeking other funding to sustain—including stipends to train other community orgs to host navigators
• Budget and narrative
  o Well below cost effective threshold of $2000—at $200
  o Full budget for program is beyond $995k—though mention that they plan to fundraise the gap
  o Navigators seem well paid and are full time positions—though if roles are very similar, uncertain why salaries vary across partners
### Pass/Fail Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass/Fail Criteria</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be a community-based organization, worker group, labor union, or other non-profit organization with deep ties to underserved and under-represented communities within the workforce;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have existing peer relationships with underserved populations, including immigrants, individuals with limited English proficiency, inexperienced and untrained individuals, low-income and homeless individuals, individuals who have been out of the workforce for an extended period, individuals with low literacy and individuals with disabilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the capability to carry out the duties and activities for this program, including knowledge of eligibility requirements and application processes related to the unemployment compensation system, reemployment services, education and training services and other resources necessary to help underserved populations increase their economic security;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with existing confidentiality standards to ensure the privacy of all information collected from individuals receiving navigator services;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide services under this section without charge to the individuals receiving those services</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the ability to deal with programs of this size and capability;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regularly collect, track and share progress metrics related to program performance standards and key performance indicators (KPIs)—including individual demographic information and personally identifiable information (to track longer-term employment outcomes), number of connections, number of successful referrals, and employment outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Grant Review Team shall give priority for peer workforce navigator contracts to a qualified entity that demonstrates one or multiple of the following attributes:</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is a recognized source of support or advocacy for underserved populations, such as racial and ethnic minorities, persons with low literacy, persons with disabilities and others seeking to improve skills and gain employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Has an organizational mission that requires them to represent the interest of unemployed or underemployed individuals.
- Represents a membership base of workers.

### Scoring Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Eligibility</td>
<td>Pass/ Fail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Applicant Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- **Applicant experience**
  - Ability to quickly reach target community given trusted presence among immigrant community is high
  - Grant management experience

- **Program Design**
  - Partnership with youth serving organization and public health organization will extend reach to other communities
  - Likely able to easily recruit and hire navigators with lived experience
  - Addition of working with large employer to address barriers to employment among priority communities is interesting component

- **Equity**
  - Mention of ability to quickly reach several priority communities including youth, immigrant, homeless and low-income
  - Realistic about the time frame it may take to build trust and relationships

- **Intended outputs and outcomes**
  - Small reach at 150 individuals
  - Limited geographic scope

- **Project sustainability plan**
  - Nothing innovative mentioned beyond seeking funding and sustaining relationships built

- **Budget and narrative**
  - Not particularly cost effective though not hitting the full max either
PASS/FAIL CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Be a community-based organization, worker group, labor union, or other non-profit organization with deep ties to underserved and under-represented communities within the workforce;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have existing peer relationships with underserved populations, including immigrants, individuals with limited English proficiency, inexperienced and untrained individuals, low-income and homeless individuals, individuals who have been out of the workforce for an extended period, individuals with low literacy and individuals with disabilities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the capability to carry out the duties and activities for this program, including knowledge of eligibility requirements and application processes related to the unemployment compensation system, reemployment services, education and training services and other resources necessary to help underserved populations increase their economic security;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with existing confidentiality standards to ensure the privacy of all information collected from individuals receiving navigator services;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide services under this section without charge to the individuals receiving those services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the ability to deal with programs of this size and capability;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regularly collect, track and share progress metrics related to program performance standards and key performance indicators (KPIs)—including individual demographic information and personally identifiable information (to track longer-term employment outcomes), number of connections, number of successful referrals, and employment outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Grant Review Team shall give priority for peer workforce navigator contracts to a qualified entity that demonstrates one or multiple of the following attributes:

• is a recognized source of support or advocacy for underserved populations, such as racial and ethnic minorities, persons with low literacy,
persons with disabilities and others seeking to improve skills and gain employment.

- Has an **organizational mission** that requires them to represent the interest of unemployed or underemployed individuals.
- Represents a **membership base** of workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Eligibility</td>
<td>Pass/ Fail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Applicant Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- Applicant experience
  - Relatively limited grant experience given the nascency of the organization in its new formation
  - Strong partnership network representative of employers, social service providers, workforce partners and community organizations—some of which are representative and trusted partners within affected populations

- Program Design
  - While the collaborative seems to have strong community partner relationships that could connect with priority communities, these partners do not seem heavily involved in the design and implementation of the program (or not as explicitly)
  - Outreach and education activities primarily rely on outreach activities and relationships of existing workforce system partners vs. extending to new communities
  - Pretty heavily focused on deep case management for individuals once they get enter the workforce system as opposed to connecting new individuals to the workforce system & resources
  - Did not see connection to how this program would improve workforce system or result in systemic change—focused more on their individual program design rather than how that might shift how workforce system connects with affected communities

- Equity
  - Seemed very employer and business community focused—as opposed to worker and community-based organization focused
  - Unsure if this grant is building new relationships with community partners that aren’t yet connected to the collaborative or funding existing work

- Intended outputs and outcomes
  - Limited reach given specific focus on Lewiston/Auburn area
  - Intend to reach over 100+ individuals with navigation services—though important to note that about half of these are already engaged in a program that they are serving vs. expanding reach to serve 100 new individuals
• Goal is to employ all 100 individuals that they connect with—that seems unrealistic that they will be able to connect every individual to employment

• Project sustainability plan
  o Mentioned sustaining relationships and seeking additional funding to sustain work though nothing particularly concrete or innovative to sustain the work

• Budget and narrative
  o Seems like navigators will be well paid position
  o Least cost effective—reaching the limit of $2000 per individual served
# Pass/Fail Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Be a community-based organization, worker group, labor union, or other non-profit organization with deep ties to underserved and under-represented communities within the workforce;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have existing peer relationships with underserved populations, including immigrants, individuals with limited English proficiency, inexperienced and untrained individuals, low-income and homeless individuals, individuals who have been out of the workforce for an extended period, individuals with low literacy and individuals with disabilities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the capability to carry out the duties and activities for this program, including knowledge of eligibility requirements and application processes related to the unemployment compensation system, reemployment services, education and training services and other resources necessary to help underserved populations increase their economic security;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with existing confidentiality standards to ensure the privacy of all information collected from individuals receiving navigator services;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide services under this section without charge to the individuals receiving those services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the ability to deal with programs of this size and capability;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regularly collect, track and share progress metrics related to program performance standards and key performance indicators (KPIs)—including individual demographic information and personally identifiable information (to track longer-term employment outcomes), number of connections, number of successful referrals, and employment outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Grant Review Team shall give priority for peer workforce navigator contracts to a qualified entity that demonstrates one or multiple of the following attributes:

- is a recognized source of support or advocacy for underserved populations, such as racial and ethnic minorities, persons with low literacy, persons with disabilities and others seeking to improve skills and gain employment.
• Has an organizational mission that requires them to represent the interest of unemployed or underemployed individuals.

• Represents a membership base of workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Eligibility</td>
<td>Pass/ Fail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Applicant Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- Applicant experience
  - Strong existing network within affected youth population and seen as trusted resource in the community—ability to quick set up this program and connect to community
  - Grant management experience with a mix of state and federal grants
  - Partners are strong partners in employment and education system to connect individuals to training and employment--does not mention expertise or experience in connecting individuals to unemployment resources/benefits

- Program Design
  - Strong ability to quickly hire and train navigators from existing networks with lived experience with ability to connect to individuals within their own networks
  - More focused on deep case management and programming with the small group of individuals served vs. navigation and connection of individuals to existing program and resources
  - Outreach and education methods are innovative and effective at connecting with young adult community—though unsure if the program is extending reach beyond individuals who they might be connected with today

- Equity
  - Strong presence within young adult population in LA area and clearly seen as trusted resource given network of youth served—specific focus on BIPOC and immigrant youth
  - Navigators would be directly from affected communities as many staff that would be involved in overseeing and implementing the program

- Intended outputs and outcomes
  - Focused and limited reach within one specific neighborhood at around 30 individuals per year

- Project sustainability plan
  - Some good ideas to sustain the program though not particularly concrete in terms of funding or timing to implement

- Budget and narrative
  - Least cost effective—reaching the limit of $2000 per individual served
**PASS/FAIL CRITERIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass/Fail Criteria</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Be a community-based organization, worker group, labor union, or other non-profit organization with deep ties to underserved and under-represented communities within the workforce;</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Have existing peer relationships with underserved populations, including immigrants, individuals with limited English proficiency, inexperienced and untrained individuals, low-income and homeless individuals, individuals who have been out of the workforce for an extended period, individuals with low literacy and individuals with disabilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Have the capability to carry out the duties and activities for this program, including knowledge of eligibility requirements and application processes related to the unemployment compensation system, reemployment services, education and training services and other resources necessary to help underserved populations increase their economic security;</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Comply with existing confidentiality standards to ensure the privacy of all information collected from individuals receiving navigator services;</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Provide services under this section without charge to the individuals receiving those services</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Have the ability to deal with programs of this size and capability;</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Regularly collect, track and share progress metrics related to program performance standards and key performance indicators (KPIs)—including individual demographic information and personally identifiable information (to track longer-term employment outcomes), number of connections, number of successful referrals, and employment outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Grant Review Team shall give priority for peer workforce navigator contracts to a qualified entity that demonstrates one or multiple of the following attributes:

- a **recognized source of support or advocacy for underserved populations**, such as racial and ethnic minorities, persons with low literacy, persons with disabilities and others seeking to improve skills and gain employment. | | X |
• Has an **organizational mission that requires them to represent the interest of unemployed or underemployed individuals.**
• Represents a **membership base of workers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Eligibility</td>
<td>Pass/ Fail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Applicant Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- **Applicant experience**
  - Limited grant management experience and relatively early in existing grants—though grant programs are relevant

- **Program Design**
  - Very limited focus on equipping individuals with computer skills in order to create resumes and apply for jobs
  - Little mention of other targets of the program in terms of connecting individuals to training and education resources or other needed wraparound supports and programs—very focused on one piece of the challenge vs seeking to address multiple components or improving the system
  - Unsure if individuals within target community would have digital literacy and other resources needed to fully participate in the program
  - No outreach or education to individuals who do not receive the laptops
  - Unsure how to determine when engagement with program is “done” and equipment is to be returned

- **Equity**
  - Direct connection to community
  - Very focused on one community within affected populations—justice involved—though limited reach and mention of other communities

- **Intended outputs and outcomes**
  - Very limited reach of around 30 individuals at a time
  - Ambitious reach for one part-time staff

- **Project sustainability plan**
  - Given the limited life of laptops, the program would not sustainable beyond a few years as the technology would become obsolete

- **Budget and narrative**
  - Did not submit a two year budget—only for the one year
  - Mention of a “buffer” category with no explanation
  - Relatively cost effective as the cost per individual served was not at the max
### Pass/Fail Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Be a community-based organization, worker group, labor union, or other non-profit organization with deep ties to underserved and under-represented communities within the workforce;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have existing peer relationships with underserved populations, including immigrants, individuals with limited English proficiency, inexperienced and untrained individuals, low-income and homeless individuals, individuals who have been out of the workforce for an extended period, individuals with low literacy and individuals with disabilities;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the capability to carry out the duties and activities for this program, including knowledge of eligibility requirements and application processes related to the unemployment compensation system, reemployment services, education and training services and other resources necessary to help underserved populations increase their economic security;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with existing confidentiality standards to ensure the privacy of all information collected from individuals receiving navigator services;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide services under this section without charge to the individuals receiving those services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the ability to deal with programs of this size and capability;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regularly collect, track and share progress metrics related to program performance standards and key performance indicators (KPIs)—including individual demographic information and personally identifiable information (to track longer-term employment outcomes), number of connections, number of successful referrals, and employment outcomes.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Grant Review Team shall give priority for peer workforce navigator contracts to a qualified entity that demonstrates one or multiple of the following attributes:

• is a **recognized source of support or advocacy for underserved populations**, such as racial and ethnic minorities, persons with low literacy,
persons with disabilities and others seeking to improve skills and gain employment.

- Has an organizational mission that requires them to represent the interest of unemployed or underemployed individuals.
- Represents a membership base of workers.

### Scoring Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Eligibility</td>
<td>Pass/ Fail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Applicant Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- **Applicant experience**
  - Strong grant management experience with several relevant grants
  - Connected to workforce system including training and educational partners—though deep connection with community partners that represent affected populations seems limited
  - Strong connection to apprenticeship programming
  - Related program in Portland with new navigator program—seems relatively new with limited evidence of effectiveness

- **Program Design**
  - Not clear on how they will recruit navigators or how they would engage people outside the workforce system beyond engaging with traditional partners
  - Outreach methods were traditional focusing on information sessions with community partners and workforce system partners—unsure how they might engage those outside the system today
  - Little mention of how the program would connect individuals to necessary resources and benefits that are outside of the Northern Light system such as social services or unemployment benefits
  - Scope seemed very focused on connecting individuals with training and employment within Northern Light and healthcare

- **Equity**
  - Primarily focused on New Mainer community and mentions a strong relationship with community partner that serves this community though there is no mention of contractual funds given to this organization to aid in recruitment or outreach
  - Mentioned contracted English language learning in-house support, which would be great to ensure services are delivered in linguistically appropriate way
  - Described Northern Light’s commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion through this initiative as well as several others

- **Intended outputs and outcomes**
  - Relatively limited geographic reach in Bangor area
- Estimating 150 individuals served per year from affected communities—which may be ambitious through one primary community partner in a limited size area
- No mention of systemic change for the workforce system—the focus was limited to how the program would help improve the organization’s internal processes

- Project sustainability plan
  - Mention of leveraging existing funds to help fund the program for launch and in the future

- Budget and narrative
  - Navigator roles seem well paid and
  - Cost per individual is below the maximum at $1500
  - Indirect cost rate seems a little high at 49%
  - No mention of funds for outreach or travel
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**DATE:** February 8, 2022
**Department Name:** Labor
**Name of RFP Coordinator:** Samantha Dina
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass/Fail Criteria</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be a community-based organization, worker group, labor union, or other non-profit organization with deep ties to underserved and under-represented communities within the workforce;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have existing peer relationships with underserved populations, including immigrants, individuals with limited English proficiency, inexperienced and untrained individuals, low-income and homeless individuals, individuals who have been out of the workforce for an extended period, individuals with low literacy and individuals with disabilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the capability to carry out the duties and activities for this program, including knowledge of eligibility requirements and application processes related to the unemployment compensation system, reemployment services, education and training services and other resources necessary to help underserved populations increase their economic security;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with existing confidentiality standards to ensure the privacy of all information collected from individuals receiving navigator services;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide services under this section without charge to the individuals receiving those services</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the ability to deal with programs of this size and capability;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regularly collect, track and share progress metrics related to program performance standards and key performance indicators (KPIs)—including individual demographic information and personally identifiable information (to track longer-term employment outcomes), number of connections, number of successful referrals, and employment outcomes.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Grant Review Team shall give priority for peer workforce navigator contracts to a qualified entity that demonstrates one or multiple of the following attributes:

- is a **recognized source of support or advocacy for underserved populations**, such as racial and ethnic minorities, persons with low literacy, persons with disabilities and others seeking to improve skills and gain employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass/Fail Criteria</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Has an organizational mission that requires them to represent the interest of unemployed or underemployed individuals.
- Represents a membership base of workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Eligibility</td>
<td>Pass/ Fail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Applicant Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- Applicant experience
  - Good broad partnerships with several organizations in the area—many workforce, social service, education, employment partners
  - Network of 550 within network provides strong ground to quickly connected with affected young adult community
  - Described relatively grant management experience, with one example of a project/relationship that did not achieve the desired goals or go as intended

- Program Design
  - Outreach methods focused on people who aren't currently in the program—using the grant funding to expand their reach and serve new individuals
  - Staff role exclusively focused on conducting outreach using innovative methods such as digital and social media to reach new young adults
  - Navigator recruitment will leverage existing young adult relationships to recruit peers quickly who have lived experience and likely trusted within their networks
  - Mentioned experience connecting individuals to resources and benefits such as MaineCare

- Equity
  - Within 18-24 age group, level of trust seems quite strong though reach of program would be limited to young adults
  - Clear understanding of their affected communities including individuals with disabilities, immigrants, those experiencing homelessness
  - Also mentioned other systemic barriers facing this audience such as transportation and need for drivers license support

- Intended outputs and outcomes
  - Very small reach at only 30 individuals
  - Hiring only part-time staff may make achieving intended outputs quite difficult

- Project sustainability plan
  - Hiring only part-time staff may make achieving intended outputs rather difficult
  - Seems project is contingent upon renting additional space—if this doesn’t occur, could affect outcome of the program
• Budget and narrative
  o Least cost effective reaching maximum cost per individual served at $2000
RFP #: 202112198  
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT  
DATE: February 8, 2022  
Department Name: Labor  
Name of RFP Coordinator: Samantha Dina  
Names of Evaluators: Michael Roland, Kim Moore, Samantha Dina  

BIDDER NAME: Maine Labor Resource Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass/Fail Criteria</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be a community-based organization, worker group, labor union, or other non-profit organization with deep ties to underserved and under-represented communities within the workforce;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have existing peer relationships with underserved populations, including immigrants, individuals with limited English proficiency, inexperienced and untrained individuals, low-income and homeless individuals, individuals who have been out of the workforce for an extended period, individuals with low literacy and individuals with disabilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the capability to carry out the duties and activities for this program, including knowledge of eligibility requirements and application processes related to the unemployment compensation system, reemployment services, education and training services and other resources necessary to help underserved populations increase their economic security;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with existing confidentiality standards to ensure the privacy of all information collected from individuals receiving navigator services;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide services under this section without charge to the individuals receiving those services</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the ability to deal with programs of this size and capability;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regularly collect, track and share progress metrics related to program performance standards and key performance indicators (KPIs)—including individual demographic information and personally identifiable information (to track longer-term employment outcomes), number of connections, number of successful referrals, and employment outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Grant Review Team shall give priority for peer workforce navigator contracts to a qualified entity that demonstrates one or multiple of the following attributes:

• is a recognized source of support or advocacy for underserved populations, such as racial and ethnic minorities, persons with low literacy, persons with disabilities and others seeking to improve skills and gain employment.  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Has an organizational mission that requires them to represent the interest of unemployed or underemployed individuals.
- Represents a membership base of workers.

### Scoring Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Eligibility</td>
<td>Pass/ Fail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Applicant Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation Team Comments:

- **Applicant experience**
  - Emerging network of several community-based organizations that represent vast reach of New Mainer community throughout Maine—and relatively large network of 8,000 across the state
  - Relatively new collaboration among the partners—though partner organizations have managed grants, unclear that this collaborative has significant experience doing so
  - Unclear about the staffing and overall coordination of the program with many navigators and little paid staff

- **Program Design**
  - Portrays strong ability to recruit navigators from the 16 partner organizations and conduct outreach within membership organizations
  - Described lived experience in apply for social service benefits and resources—and connection to a workforce firm that could help with this process
  - Connection to business advisory committee to ensure employers are part of the solution in creating more diversity and equitable workforces—though unsure exactly of their role in this project
  - Uncertain about the outreach and dissemination methods within the membership bases or experience/plan to train and onboard navigators or how the program will be cohesive across the 16 partners

- **Equity**
  - Advisory committee composed of community partners will ensure communities are represented at decision making table—and these leaders will be compensated for their time and expertise, very important
  - Very focused and far-reaching roots among the immigrant, refugee and asylum seeking communities—with direct lived experience at the helm of the organizations
  - Navigators will be recruited from within organizations—representing individuals who are themselves underemployed or unemployed—presenting direct lived experience

- **Intended outputs and outcomes**
  - Relatively broad reach—estimating 1000 individuals in outreach and 400 reached in navigation services annually
• Uncertainty about attainable nature of these goals without strong program leadership and coordination beyond advisory group

• Project sustainability plan
  o Given nascency of organization, may be difficult to sustain the program beyond grant funding

• Budget and narrative
  o Confusion around the budget—the proposal suggests there will be 16 peer workforce navigators though lack of clarity around how those 16 individuals will be paid a fair wage at suggested budget amount or if the individuals will only be working a very part time schedule
## Pass/Fail Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section I. Preliminary Information (Eligibility)</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Be a community-based organization, worker group, labor union, or other non-profit organization with deep ties to underserved and under-represented communities within the workforce;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have existing peer relationships with underserved populations, including immigrants, individuals with limited English proficiency, inexperienced and untrained individuals, low-income and homeless individuals, individuals who have been out of the workforce for an extended period, individuals with low literacy and individuals with disabilities;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the capability to carry out the duties and activities for this program, including knowledge of eligibility requirements and application processes related to the unemployment compensation system, reemployment services, education and training services and other resources necessary to help underserved populations increase their economic security;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comply with existing confidentiality standards to ensure the privacy of all information collected from individuals receiving navigator services;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide services under this section without charge to the individuals receiving those services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have the ability to deal with programs of this size and capability;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regularly collect, track and share progress metrics related to program performance standards and key performance indicators (KPIs)—including individual demographic information and personally identifiable information (to track longer-term employment outcomes), number of connections, number of successful referrals, and employment outcomes.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Grant Review Team shall give priority for peer workforce navigator contracts to a qualified entity that demonstrates one or multiple of the following attributes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• is a <strong>recognized source of support or advocacy for underserved populations</strong>, such as racial and ethnic minorities, persons with low literacy, persons with disabilities and others seeking to improve skills and gain employment.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Has an organizational mission that requires them to represent the interest of unemployed or underemployed individuals.

Represents a membership base of workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Sections</th>
<th>Points Available</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 – Eligibility</td>
<td>Pass/ Fail</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 – Applicant Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 – Program Design</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4 – Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 – Intended outputs &amp; outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 6 – Project Sustainability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 7 – Budget &amp; Narrative</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Team Comments:**

- Applicant experience
  - Demonstrated experience with comparable state/federal grants
  - Administer many of the programs that would be targeted as services to connect participants to
  - Direct connection to targeted communities through existing programs

- Program Design
  - Difficult to discern what will be different—how grant funding would be used to expand existing reach/services vs. funding existing programs
  - Connections and partners are existing programs and services the Navigator would be connecting participants to.
  - Lack of focus on the truly disconnected. Described services are an enhancement to existing programming.
  - Approach described appears to be more focused on case management than navigation services as described in the RFA

- Equity
  - Clear dedication to DEI by organization
  - Partnership appears to be existing. Services and programs under ACAP are extensive. Unclear if this approach is addressing unmet, immediate needs.
  - Unclear if there is an intended target population beyond individuals living in poverty. Strategies to specifically connect with and address the unmet needs of specified target communities in the RFP are not clear.

- Intended outputs and outcomes
  - Output around outreach and connection to jobs is low for the service area (Aroostook County).

- Project sustainability plan
  - Sustainability plan is average- Propose to integrate approach into future federal grant applications.

- Budget and narrative
  - Cost is at the maximum allowable per participant.
o Personnel costs do not appear adequate to fund 1.6 FTE Navigators with 40% fringe and management staff.

o Unsure what outreach costs are intended to fund.

o 10k clothing is an interesting in-kind addition to the budget
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: AK Health
DATE: February 8, 2022
EVALUATOR NAME: Sam Dina
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Applicant experience
  - Strong existing network of 200 individuals
  - Trusted resource among BIPOC & immigrant community
  - Experience in helping individuals with UI claims
  - Some grant experience, though newer and limited

- Program Design
  - Strong outreach efforts plan and experience with vaccine outreach
  - Ability to hire navigators with lived experience
  - Unsure about how they will overcome barriers and make connections to resources
  - No mention of systemic change—very focused on their program vs making workforce system more accessible

- Equity
  - Staff w/ direct lived experience
  - Trusted resource among BIPOC & immigrant community
  - Limited reach beyond BIPOC and immigrant community

- Intended outputs and outcomes
  - Small reach—only 100 individuals, very focused in one geographic area
  - Unsure how they are reaching 3,000 with outreach but only connecting with 100

- Project sustainability plan
  - Nothing too creative—mention of building relationships and trying to sustain with other funding

- Budget and narrative
  - Some disconnects with their budget and intended outputs—are they reaching 100 per year or 100 total?
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Coastal Counties Workforce Inc
DATE: February 8, 2022
EVALUATOR NAME: Sam Dina
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- **Applicant experience**
  - Significant grant management experience with similar programs
  - Experience in implementing similar programs though ability to quickly reach affected communities is less clear
  - Connected to workforce partners and established regional leader
  - Unsure about ability to quickly connect as a trusted resource to some affected communities (disability, BIPOC, immigrant, etc)

- **Program Design**
  - Reliant on community based partners for a lot of connections to affected populations—though aren’t clear partners in this
  - Co-enrollment in WIOA
  - Outreach efforts seemed fine but not particularly innovative—unsure how they will address risk identified

- **Equity**
  - Reliant on CBO partners that represent affected communities to help recruit individuals to be navigators and connect to navigators—though not providing funding to these partners (beyond service provider)
  - Unsure who their specific priority community would be or how they would tailor to community needs

- **Intended outputs and outcomes**
  - Reach of 535 over the grant period with nearly 300 connected to jobs

- **Project sustainability plan**
  - Likely will hire on peer support navigators and strengthen system

- **Budget and narrative**
  - Close the max limited per individual served
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: EMDC
DATE: February 8, 2022
EVALUATOR NAME: Sam Dina
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Applicant experience
  - Significant grant management experience with similar programs
  - Mentioned re-entry and recovery community relationship
  - Strong connection to social service providers

- Program Design
  - Building on existing peer navigator programs—including tools like assessment to understand individual needs
  - No strong mention of strategies to connect individuals to unemployment benefits
  - Didn’t mention particularly innovative outreach methods to connect to new individuals

- Equity
  - Seems to have deep relationships with some communities like re-entry and recovery—though lacks partnerships in others—immigrant, BIPOC, disability
  - Mentioned wanting to work with several partners to reach new populations like New Mainer and disability community—though didn’t mention providing funding to these organizations to partner on this effort

- Intended outputs and outcomes
  - At least 400 individuals reach
  - Limited geographic scope

- Project sustainability plan
  - Some ideas though not specific

- Budget and narrative
  - Close to max cost per individual served
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Maine AFL-CIO
DATE: February 8, 2022
EVALUATOR NAME: Sam Dina
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Applicant experience
  - experience with similar programs
  - Coalition of partners with very large statewide reach
  - Partners will help reach priority communities such as low-income, rural, New Mainer communities quickly

- Program Design
  - Experience with UI and ideas to improve system
  - Can extend reach due to volunteer model and referral approach

- Equity
  - Housing navigators in trusted community orgs that represent New Mainer, low income, unemployed & underemployed communities
  - Not all communities covered—disability, BIPOC communities are not explicitly mentioned

- Intended outputs and outcomes
  - Huge reach—5500 people and 1650 in jobs

- Project sustainability plan
  - Mentioned fundraising to provide stipends to more community orgs to train navigators
  - Seeking other funding sources actively to fund
  - Volunteer network could create sustainable path

- Budget and narrative
  - Well below cost effective threshold of $2000—at $200
  - Budget request is over amount available?
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: MEIRS
DATE: February 8, 2022
EVALUATOR NAME: Sam Dina
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Applicant experience
  - Ability to quickly reach target community given trusted presence among immigrant community is high
  - Grant management experience

- Program Design
  - Partnerships w/ youth & public health org will extend reach and leverage expertise
  - Likely able to easily recruit and hire navigators with lived experience
  - Mention of employers at the table

- Equity
  - Clearly established trust w/ communities including youth, immigrant, homeless and low-income
  - Realistic about the time frame it may take to build trust and relationships

- Intended outputs and outcomes
  - Small reach, limited geographic scope

- Project sustainability plan
  - No clear plan to sustain beyond seeking funding

- Budget and narrative
  - Below cost per individual threshold—though not significantly
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Strengthen LA
DATE: February 8, 2022
EVALUATOR NAME: Sam Dina
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

*******************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Applicant experience
  - Limited grant experience
- Strong partnership network

- Program Design
  - While the collaborative seems to have strong community partner relationships that could connect with priority communities, these partners do not seem heavily involved in the design and implementation of the program (or not as explicitly)
  - Outreach and education activities rely existing workforce system partners
  - focused on case management for individuals once they get enter the workforce system vs getting folks connected

- Equity
  - Seemed very employer and business community focused

- Intended outputs and outcomes
  - Limited reach given specific focus on Lewiston/Auburn area
  - Half of the people they’d reach they are already delivering services to—may be duplicative

- Project sustainability plan
  - Some ideas—not very concrete

- Budget and narrative
  - Least cost effective—reaching the limit of $2000 per individual served
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Tree Street Youth
DATE: February 8, 2022
EVALUATOR NAME: Sam Dina
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

******************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

• Applicant experience
  o trusted resource in the community among youth
  o Grant management experience

• Program Design
  o ability to quickly hire and train navigators with lived experience
  o More focused on deep case management and programming with the small group of individuals served vs. connection of individuals to resources
  o Innovative outreach and education methods

• Equity
  o Specific focus on BIPOC and immigrant youth

• Intended outputs and outcomes
  o Focused, limited reach at 30

• Project sustainability plan
  o Some good ideas—not too concrete

• Budget and narrative
  o Least cost effective—reaching the limit of $2000 per individual served
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Maine Prisoner Re-entry Network
DATE: February 8, 2022
EVALUATOR NAME: Sam Dina
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

*********************************************************

**Individual Evaluator Comments:**

- **Applicant experience**
  - Limited grant management experience and relatively early in existing grants

- **Program Design**
  - Very limited focus on equipping individuals with computer skills in order to create resumes and apply for jobs
  - No outreach or education to individuals who do not receive the laptops

- **Equity**
  - Direct connection to justice involved community

- **Intended outputs and outcomes**
  - Limited reach—30 individuals

- **Project sustainability plan**
  - Just one part time staff?
  - Technology will break or die—become obsolete

- **Budget and narrative**
  - Did not submit a two year budget—only for the one year
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Northern Light Health
DATE: February 8, 2022
EVALUATOR NAME: Sam Dina
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Applicant experience
  - Strong grant management experience with several relevant grants
  - connection to apprenticeship programming
  - similar navigator program in Portland now—new so not many evidence points
- Program Design
  - unclear how they would engage people outside the workforce system
  - focused on northern light employment and services—vs broader supports in system
- Equity
  - New Mainer community, though no mention of contractual funds given to this organization to aid in recruitment or outreach
  - Described Northern Light’s commitment to DEI
- Intended outputs and outcomes
  - Relatively limited geographic reach in Bangor area
  - focus was limited to how the program would help improve the organization’s internal processes
- Project sustainability plan
  - Mention of leveraging existing funds to help fund the program for launch and in the future
- Budget and narrative
  - Cost per individual is below the maximum at $1500
Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Applicant experience
  - Good broad partnerships with several organizations in the area—many workforce, social service, education, employment partners—reach of 550 youth

- Program Design
  - Outreach methods focus on expanding their reach and serve new individuals
  - Staff role exclusively on social media
  - Navigator recruitment will have lived experience and likely trusted within their networks

- Equity
  - Limited to young adults—though understanding of their affected communities including individuals with disabilities, immigrants, those experiencing homelessness

- Intended outputs and outcomes
  - Very small reach at only 30 individuals
  - Hiring only part-time staff may make achieving intended outputs quite difficult

- Project sustainability plan
  - Seems project is contingent upon renting additional space—if this doesn’t occur, could affect outcome of the program

- Budget and narrative
  - Least cost effective reaching maximum cost per individual served at $2000
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Maine Labor Resource Center
DATE: February 8, 2022
EVALUATOR NAME: Sam Dina
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Applicant experience
  - Emerging network of orgs that represent New Mainer community throughout Maine—and relatively large network of 8,000 across the state
  - Relatively new collaboration among the partners
  - Unclear about the staffing and overall coordination of the program with many navigators and little paid staff

- Program Design
  - Ability to recruit navigators from orgs likely strong
  - Described lived experience in apply for social service benefits and resources
  - Connection to business advisory committee
  - How the program will be cohesive and managed across the 16 partners

- Equity
  - Advisory committee composed of community partners—ensuring representation and compensation for their time
  - Very focused and far-reaching roots among the immigrant, refugee and asylum seeking communities—with direct lived experience at the helm of the organizations

- Intended outputs and outcomes
  - Relatively broad reach

- Project sustainability plan
  - Unclear about how the work will be coordinated
  - Given nascency of organization, may be difficult to sustain the program beyond grant funding

- Budget and narrative
  - Confusion around the budget—how will 16 individuals will be paid a fair wage at suggested budget amount? Or working very few hours?
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: ACAP
DATE: February 8, 2022
EVALUATOR NAME: Sam Dina
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Individual Evaluator Comments:

- Applicant experience
  - Grant management experience
  - Similar programs in region—clearly workforce partner
- Program Design
  - Feels pretty focused on intensive case management vs connecting broad groups of individuals to resource
  - Unsure how the grant will expand or offer innovative programming—feels like funding ongoing work
  - Unclear how the navigators will be recruited to ensure they represent target communities
- Equity
  - Seen as trusted resources among low-income community and connection to homeless community through demonstration project
- Intended outputs and outcomes
  - Relatively limited geographic reach
- Project sustainability plan
  - Some ideas—nothing too concrete
- Budget and narrative
  - Budget is a little confusing—are they paying staff reasonable salaries?
  - Not fully cost effective
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: ACAP
DATE: 2/10/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Kim Moore
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************************
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

************************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Directions: Follow the sections of your RFP to develop a bulleted outline for notes. Delete the sample below and these directions and replace with your own outline based on your RFP.

I. Applicant experience
   Extensive past experience, multifaceted
   Current programming provides direct connection to target populations

II. Program Design
   Strength is in connectivity and partnership, weak in program design specifics. Difficult to determine what is different.
   Connections to existing programs and services
   Case management model?

III. Equity
   Clear focus on DEI in the org
   What is the target population and how are unmet needs being identified and addressed in a new way?

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   Low output for huge service area

V. Project sustainability plan
   Build into future applications. Average response.

VI. Budget and narrative
   Maximum cost per
   How will personnel fund 1.6 FTEs, management, and fringe at 40%? Just personnel at 1.6 appears to be paying under minimum wage.
   Outreach costs?
   Clothing in kind
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: AFL-CIO lead
DATE: 2/10/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Kim Moore
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************************

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

************************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Directions: Follow the sections of your RFP to develop a bulleted outline for notes. Delete the sample below and these directions and replace with your own outline based on your RFP.

I. Applicant experience
   □ Direct experience with hiring and implementing peer navigation programming
   □ Huge reach within the partnership
   □ Great diversity in partner populations of focus/experience

II. Program Design
   Outreach plan is strong and focused on methods that feel aligned with connecting the disconnected
   Great plan for volunteer engagement to organically expand reach and model
   Expertise/Existing connection to programs/services
   Experience with training and preparing peer navigators

III. Equity
   Translation mentioned as one of the services provided
   Testing of approach with target communities
   Great geographical and target population reach, though not all

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   Incredible reach proposed and huge network described. How many disconnected?

V. Project sustainability plan
   Reasonable- intent but not concrete plan.

VI. Budget and narrative
   Way below max threshold
   ? budget for more than available without breaking out where in-kind or fundraising will be applied?
   Are the differences in navigator salaries due to differences in fringe/overhead costs? All reasonable, but large differences across partner orgs.
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: AK Health
DATE: 2/10/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Kim Moore
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Directions: Follow the sections of your RFP to develop a bulleted outline for notes. Delete the sample below and these directions and replace with your own outline based on your RFP.

I. Applicant experience
   □ Limited, recent with regard to government funding. Most funders are foundations and historically do not require the intense record keeping and outcome reporting connected to state and federal monies.

II. Program Design
   □ Seems like continuation of/funding existing services (ie: job placement, long term plans) they want to provide vs a focus on identifying those not currently connected to services and funded programs/providers of E&T and supportive, family sustaining services. Target shouldn’t be those already connected to entities like FedCAP (ASPIRE/TANF).  
   □ Intensive service delivery vs lighter touch navigation services as described in RFA. 
   □ Focus on job placement. Unsure what services others will receive from navigators.

III. Equity
    Clear connection to L/A immigrant community and related orgs partnerships with community orgs and partners

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
    Severely limited service area (L/A)
    Limited to only immigrant/refugees and BIPOC in L/A? 
    Can’t distinguish between Strengthen L/A collaboration outputs and AK Health outputs 
    3000 reached but only 100 connected to navigation services for three workers?

V. Project sustainability plan
    Average sustainability plan. Nothing specific but intent is there.

VI. Budget and narrative
   □ Funding for personnel (AK Health navigators and management) is not adequate to support 3 Navigators if we’re to assume full time status/benefits. Unsure of the staff time commitment to the grant.
   □ Unsure what falls under the $87,500 in the “contract” line and no detail in proposal, budget, or letters of support to clarify.

Rev. 2/4/2020
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Coastal Counties Workforce Inc
DATE: 2/10/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Kim Moore
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

******************************************************************************

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

******************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Directions: Follow the sections of your RFP to develop a bulleted outline for notes. Delete the sample below and these directions and replace with your own outline based on your RFP.

I. Applicant experience
   - Extensive experience with grant management
   - Experience in employing peer navigators

II. Program Design
    - Overall very strong design.
    - Traditional approach described and narrative acknowledges challenges currently existing with traditional approach. Unsure what will be new with regard to approach, services, or partnerships for the service provider/applicant.

III. Equity
   Light on specifics, no named CBO’s or ECBO’s as paid or unpaid partners in the work while acknowledging the need for connections and current challenges in connecting with disconnected workers in current programming.

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   Large service delivery area, focus on multiple target populations
   Numbers look very strong with regard to outreach, service delivery, and connection to jobs.
   Additional focus on system wide orientation output

V. Project sustainability plan
   Average sustainability plan with intent to integrate learnings into future programming

VI. Budget and narrative
   Budget and narrative easily understood and reasonable.
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: EMDC
DATE: 2/10/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Kim Moore
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************************
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

************************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Directions: Follow the sections of your RFP to develop a bulleted outline for notes. Delete the sample below and these directions and replace with your own outline based on your RFP.

I. Applicant experience
   □ Extensive experience with grant management
   □ Experience in employing peer navigators

II. Program Design
   □ Overall an adequate delivery model but unsure what is different in the program design from current services- appears to be existing partners, services, and knowledge?

III. Equity
   Light on specifics, few named CBO’s or ECBO’s, none as paid partners in the work beyond existing service providers under WIOA.

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   Large service delivery area, focus on multiple target populations
   Overall numbers look good with regard to outreach and service delivery comparatively light on connection to jobs

V. Project sustainability plan
   Average sustainability plan with intent to integrate learnings into future programming

VI. Budget and narrative
   Budget understood and reasonable, cost per nearing the highest allowable.
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Maine Labor Resource Center
DATE: 2/10/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Kim Moore
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************************

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

************************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Directions: Follow the sections of your RFP to develop a bulleted outline for notes. Delete the sample below and these directions and replace with your own outline based on your RFP.

I. Applicant experience
   Unsure of past experience or how the grant would be managed by this entity (mostly volunteers?). Partners have a little more clear experience with grants than the collaborative.

II. Program Design
   Strength is in connectivity and partnership, weak in program design specifics.
   Who will play the lead?
   Past informal, unpaid experience in connection individuals to services and benefits described, clear knowledge of the existing barriers

III. Equity
   Grass roots- communities are definitely represented in the advisory committee for the organization. Impressive network of partners signed on to MOA/MOU!!
   Direct, lived experience of committee members
   Navigators will come directly from multiple ECBO’s- great saturation despite limited target population

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   Large reach proposed, but unsure if outcomes/outputs can be achieved and captured (metrics) with what appears to be little admin support.

V. Project sustainability plan
   Sustainability looks to be more organic than planned

VI. Budget and narrative
   The budget is unrealistic for 40 navigators. Extremely part time assuming even minimum wage, and not accounting for % for administrative or oversight functions.
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Directions: Follow the sections of your RFP to develop a bulleted outline for notes. Delete the sample below and these directions and replace with your own outline based on your RFP.

I. Applicant experience
   - Definitely grant management experience, though new and relatively limited
   - Trusted and established community organization for target population

II. Program Design
    Solid partnership that has potential to expand reach to target populations beyond immigrants and refugees
    Great connection to potential navigators

III. Equity
    Existing connections to trusted partners (CBO’s/ECBO’s) and large employer

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
    Limited scope, good reach for community served but low for pilot and funding level

V. Project sustainability plan
   Reasonable intent but not concrete plan.

VI. Budget and narrative
    Budget nicely done and below max
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: MidCoast Youth
DATE: 2/10/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Kim Moore
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Directions: Follow the sections of your RFP to develop a bulleted outline for notes. Delete the sample below and these directions and replace with your own outline based on your RFP.

I. Applicant experience
   Strong partnerships in the region among a diverse groups of service providers
   Unsure of applicant’s experience in administering grants- mentioned one with limited outcomes/success?

II. Program Design
   Good recognition of the intent to serve those disconnected
   Outreach plan strong and customized to target population- social media/digital
   Recruitment of past successful youth and peer recruitment
   Lived experience
   Design includes a focus on the unique barriers experienced by the target population
   (disconnected/opportunity youth)
   What happens if extra space is not secured? Will the project be able to move forward as planned?

III. Equity
   Clear connection to and experience serving target population. Acknowledgement that the group is likely to also hit upon other intended target populations

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   Very small service area, unknown how many 18-24 young adults are disconnected from current services efforts in the region.
   Small reach
   Focus on disconnected/opportunity youth is strong
   Part time staff- with past failure, will this be enough to deliver the intended outcomes?

V. Project sustainability plan
   Sustainability has been considered.
   What happens if extra space is not secured? Will the project be able to move forward as planned?

VI. Budget and narrative
   Highest cost per allowable.
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Directions: Follow the sections of your RFP to develop a bulleted outline for notes. Delete the sample below and these directions and replace with your own outline based on your RFP.

I. Applicant experience
   □ Definitely grant management experience
   □ Strong connections to training and ed partners, including apprenticeship
   □ Outcomes for current navigator program?

II. Program Design
   Approach seems to lean on traditional partners- not sure of plan to capture those disconnected
   Is the design focused on recruitment for NLH? Not a lot of detail about connection to RFP specified resources and benefits

III. Equity
    Focus on New Mainers but no ECBO partner listed/paid in proposal? What is different?
    Approach seems focused on NLH and employment within. What about participants who are not interested in NLH employment? How are systems changing beyond strengthening NLH?
    DEI is clearly a focus on NLH- awesome to see

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
    Limited scope, reach appears to be outsized, particularly with the comparatively limited New Mainer population in the region.

V. Project sustainability plan
    Leveraging existing funds

VI. Budget and narrative
    Budget nicely done and below max
    High indirect
    No outreach or travel?
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Strengthen LA
DATE: 2/10/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Kim Moore
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************************
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

************************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Directions: Follow the sections of your RFP to develop a bulleted outline for notes. Delete the sample below and these directions and replace with your own outline based on your RFP.

I. Applicant experience
   □ Limited grant experience with state or federal. Partner in grants vs lead?
   □ Extensive network in L/A and trusted collaborative

II. Program Design
   □ Unsure of role of community partners. What falls on lead (Chamber) vs partners?
   □ Referrals coming from existing network of service providers- opposite of connecting those disconnected?
   □ Program design feels less connected to the RFP and more to the existing strengthen L/A model with case management, training programming, etc

III. Equity
    Connections to trusted partners (CBO’s/ECBO’s)

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
    Extremely limited reach- L/A
    How will it be demonstrated that participants are connected to services and programs if they are coming from/referred by the targeted services and programs?
    Reach and employment numbers match- realistic?

V. Project sustainability plan
   Reasonable- intent but not concrete plan.

VI. Budget and narrative
    Budgeted to the per person limit- not cost effective
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Directions: Follow the sections of your RFP to develop a bulleted outline for notes. Delete the sample below and these directions and replace with your own outline based on your RFP.

I. Applicant experience
   - Limited experience with similar grants- unproven?

II. Program Design
   - Design not aligned with the goals of the RFP- focus is on computer use and skills vs 1:1 navigation.
   - How long does engagement last? What is the trigger?
   - Do participants have digital literacy to engage with a virtual navigator?
   - Severely limited staff and staff engagement

III. Equity
   - Proven connection to target community
   - Limited in scope- only focused on justice involved as primary barrier to employment

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   - Service area appears to be the whole state but covered up to 30 at a time with one part time staffer. Admirable, but ambitious…and not well aligned with the need/services in the RFP.

V. Project sustainability plan
   - Technology/equipment focused approach, sustainability will be impossible beyond the life of equipment.

VI. Budget and narrative
   - One year budget?
   - What is covered in the “buffer”?
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Tree Street Youth
DATE: 2/10/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Kim Moore
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************************

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

************************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

Directions: Follow the sections of your RFP to develop a bulleted outline for notes. Delete the sample below and these directions and replace with your own outline based on your RFP.

I. Applicant experience
   - Great connection to target population
   - Demonstrated success with state and fed grants
   - Unsure if navigation beyond training and work is an existing/natural strength

II. Program Design
   - Strong connection to possible, truly peer, navigators from existing programming
   - Not sure where the current gap is- are these youth already being served and this is an additional service? Does this expand reach? Are youth going unserved/turned away in the region?
   - Programming depth- case management model and approach vs lighter touch navigation and pass off to existing case management/programming/services.

III. Equity
    - Proven connection to target community- focus on immigrant and BIPOC youth
    - Proven effectiveness of programming- trusted community partner

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   - Very limited reach (L/A- Tree street neighborhood focus) and limited target population.
   - Smaller numbers annually than would be expected for a light touch navigation model

V. Project sustainability plan
   - Aspirational, no real specifics

VI. Budget and narrative
   - Max dollar amount per person served
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

I. Applicant experience

II. Program Design
   Aroostook County,
   1.6 FTE Navigators(?) (rotate?), where recruited?(existing?)

III. Equity

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   100 served/2yrs, 35/yr "connect to jobs" 35/yr wage increase (same?)

V. Project sustainability plan

VI. Budget and narrative
    $200g, Cost per = $2000
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Maine AFL-CIO
DATE: 2/8/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Mike Roland
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

I. Applicant experience

II. Program Design
   Statewide, community partners=MEJ, GCSM, ProsperityMaine, F&M
   4 Navigators, 1 project mgr, volunteers

III. Equity

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   5500 served/2yrs, reach=20,000(?!), 3300(var)svcs, 1650 "connect to jobs", 1238 higher pay

V. Project sustainability plan

VI. Budget and narrative
   Total (over?!), Cost per (/5500) = ~$184
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

I. Applicant experience

II. Program Design
   Lewiston/Auburn, embedded/est partnerships
   Outreach Qs? ➔ check record
   3 Navigators (immigrants ➔ how?) (wage?)

III. Equity

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   3000 reached/2yrs (how?), 100 served, ?jobs, ?higher pay

V. Project sustainability plan

VI. Budget and narrative
   $400g ➔ Cost per = $2000 (?annual) ($4g total?)
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

I. Applicant experience

II. Program Design
   Region (large, #s), GWNNE, libraries, other partners?
   5 Navigators, employed by GWNNE (WS?)

III. Equity

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   535/2yrs reached, 375 served, 263, jobs, “80%” higher pay (?)

V. Project sustainability plan

VI. Budget and narrative
   $729g ➔ Cost per =~$1900
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

Individual Evaluator Comments:

I. Applicant experience

II. Program Design
   Region (10 Counties), collab w/ACAP
   8 (4/yr) Navigators

III. Equity

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   “100s” reached, 400 served/2yrs, 170, jobs, “90%” higher pay (163 or 360 ?)

V. Project sustainability plan

VI. Budget and narrative
   $711 → Cost per =~$1777
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Maine Labor & Resource Center
DATE: 2/7/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Mike Roland
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************************

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

************************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

I. Applicant experience

II. Program Design
Large target area, 16 community partners
40-50 Navigators (rotated?) from partner orgs

III. Equity
Close DEI gaps

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
800 served/2yrs, reach=1000/yr, 200/yr “connect to jobs” (50%), all ptpts higher pay(!?)

V. Project sustainability plan

VI. Budget and narrative
Cost per = ~$518 (?)
RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: MEIRS
DATE: 2/7/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Mike Roland
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************************
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

************************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

I. Applicant experience

II. Program Design
   Lewiston/Auburn
   3 Navigators PT (20hrs/wk) & Project Mgr FT, x2yrs

III. Equity

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   100 served/2yrs reach=150(& “conn to nav svcs”), 25 jobs, 40 higher pay

V. Project sustainability plan

VI. Budget and narrative
   $403g ➔ Cost per =
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Midcoast Youth
DATE: 2/7/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Mike Roland
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

********************************************************************************
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

********************************************************************************
Individual Evaluator Comments:

  I. Applicant experience

  II. Program Design
     Sagadahoc County, “vulnerable 18-24 yr-old population
     FT Director and 5(?) PT navigators (10 hrs/wk, rotated?), recruit from youths (above)

  III. Equity

  IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
      60 served/2yrs, reach=250, 40 jobs, 50 higher pay(?)

  V. Project sustainability plan

  VI. Budget and narrative
      $240g (Cost per not correct?!)

Rev. 2/4/2020
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: EMHC/NLight
DATE: 2/7/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Mike Roland
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************************

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

************************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

I. Applicant experience

II. Program Design
Statewide,
Partners=MDOL, DOE, PAE (&otherAEs), others
2 FTE Navigators/2yrs(1yr?) (2 already there?)

III. Equity

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
300(400?) served/2yrs, 200 “connect to jobs”, 120 wage increase

V. Project sustainability plan

VI. Budget and narrative
$463g, Cost per = ? ($/300 "connected to employment"?)
RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Strengthen LA
DATE: 2/8/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Mike Roland
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************************

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

************************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

I. Applicant experience

II. Program Design
   Lewiston/Auburn
   1 Navigator

III. Equity

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   100 served/2yrs, all connect to svcs, jobs", higher pay (?)

V. Project sustainability plan

VI. Budget and narrative
   $200g, Cost per = $2000
RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Maine Prisoner Reentry Network
DATE: 2/7/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Mike Roland
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************************
Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

************************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

I. Applicant experience

II. Program Design
   Statewide? Partners=?
   1 PT Navigator/2yrs?(1yr+1yr?) (2 already there?), laptops & software, job search assistance?

III. Equity

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   50-60 served

V. Project sustainability plan

VI. Budget and narrative
   $60g, Cost per = 1000 - 1200? (not clear)
STATE OF MAINE
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION NOTES

RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE: PEER WORKFORCE NAVIGATOR PILOT
BIDDER NAME: Tree Street Youth
DATE: 2/7/22
EVALUATOR NAME: Mike Roland
EVALUATOR DEPARTMENT: Labor

************************************************************************************************************************

Instructions: The purpose of this form is to record proposal review notes written by individual evaluators for this Request for Proposals (RFP) process. It is required that each individual evaluator make notes for each proposal that he or she reviews. No numerical scoring should take place on these notes, as that is performed only during team consensus evaluation meetings. A separate form is available for team consensus evaluation notes and scoring. Once complete, please submit a copy of this document to your Department’s RFP Coordinator or Lead Evaluator for this RFP.

************************************************************************************************************************

Individual Evaluator Comments:

I. Applicant experience

II. Program Design
   Lewiston/Auburn, Target Pop=low-income youth ages 18-24 & others, Partner=LewistonCC
   4-8 Navigators (PT?,some existing?)

III. Equity

IV. Intended outputs and outcomes
   30-45 served/2yrs, reach=100, 30-40 “connect to jobs”

V. Project sustainability plan

VI. Budget and narrative
   $120g, Cost per = $2000 (#s? ➔60ptps)
I, Samantha Dina, accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Labor. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. “Interest” may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder’s company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder’s official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

Samantha Dina

Signature  Date

2/5/22
AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

RFP #: RFA# 202112198
RFP TITLE: Peer Workforce Navigator Pilot

I, __Michael Roland__ accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Labor. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. “Interest” may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder’s company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder’s official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

________________________________________
Signature

________________________________________
Date

February 5, 2022

Rev. 8/25/2021
AGREEMENT AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
RFP #: 202112198
RFP TITLE:

I, Samantha Dina, accept the offer to become a member of the Request for Proposals (RFP) Evaluation Team for the State of Maine Department of Labor. I do hereby accept the terms set forth in this agreement AND hereby disclose any affiliation or relationship I may have in connection with a bidder who has submitted a proposal to this RFP.

Neither I nor any member of my immediate family have a personal or financial interest, direct or indirect, in the bidders whose proposals I will be reviewing. “Interest” may include, but is not limited to: current or former ownership in the bidder’s company; current or former Board membership; current or former employment with the bidder; current or former personal contractual relationship with the bidder (example: paid consultant); and/or current or former relationship to a bidder’s official which could reasonably be construed to constitute a conflict of interest (personal relationships may be perceived by the public as a potential conflict of interest).

I have not advised, consulted with or assisted any bidder in the preparation of any proposal submitted in response to this RFP nor have I submitted a letter of support or similar endorsement.

I understand and agree that the evaluation process is to be conducted in an impartial manner without bias or prejudice. In this regard, I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no circumstances that would reasonably support a good faith charge of bias. I further understand that in the event a good faith charge of bias is made, it will rest with me to decide whether I should be disqualified from participation in the evaluation process.

I agree to hold confidential all information related to the contents of Requests for Proposals presented during the review process until such time as the Department formally releases the award decision notices for public distribution.

__________________________________________
Signature
__________________________________________
Date

Rev. 8/25/2021