



QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

RFQ 25-05

Posted October 14, 2025

Q1. Can you confirm whether the requested services include conducting a formal audit and issuing a Management Decision, or if the scope is limited to other types of program monitoring and consulting.

A1. This a formal and official monitoring for programs.

Q2. Has this project been contracted out before? If so, are there “lessons learned” or best practices that we should consider in our approach?

A2. No, it has never been contracted out.

Q3. Are there any known issues or areas of concern within grant administration, expenditures, or compliance that we should be aware of as we prepare our response?

A3. No. Conducting a risk assessment is part of this RFQ.

Q4. How does WFSCB currently monitor its subgrants, and are there any specific tools or platforms in use for monitoring and reporting?

A4. WFSCB uses TWC issued monitoring tools and in-house created tools.

Q5. Are there existing policies, procedures, or control frameworks related to program monitoring that should be leveraged or aligned with in our proposed approach?

A5. Listed on RFQ and in the Pre-Proposal conference presentation; stated which programs should be reviewed in Fall/Winter 2025-2026; and Spring/Summer 2026.

Q6. Other than the August 31, 2026, project end date, are there any key milestones, interim deadlines, or reporting periods that we should be aware of for this engagement?

A6. Program Monitoring report due prior to end of January 2026 for February Board of Directors meeting; and a second Program Monitoring report due prior to end of August for September 2026 Board of Directors meeting.

Q7. Can you confirm if the project is limited to the two contractors named in the RFQ, C2GPS and BakerRipley, or if there is potential for additional contractors to be brought under review during the contract period?

A7. Potentially, (Goodwill Inc.- SNAP TPP 10 files) but not likely.

Q8. Can you clarify how many service centers and affiliated sites will be included in the scope of this project? Additionally, are there any variations in the services offered across these locations that we should account for?

A8. Centers were named on the PowerPoint presentation reviewed during the Pre-Proposal conference, and part of the RFQ narrative also listed the service centers. All services are the same at Career Centers.

Q9. Can you confirm if each of the ten (10) programs is administered independently, or if there is overlap in their administration?

A9. Independently.

Q10. Does WFSCB anticipate separate audit reports with observations and recommendations for each of the ten (10) programs, or is there flexibility to consolidate findings into combined reports where appropriate?

A10. We anticipate separate monitoring reports for each program.

Q11. Could you please confirm whether an extension to the proposal due date is anticipated?

A11. No extension available.

Q12. Section 1.5 notes that program monitoring must “cover all programs, functions, or activities supported by federal and/or state funds.” To properly scope the level of effort, can WFSCB clarify whether the annual review is expected to include all programs and subrecipients listed in Section 1.4 or whether a risk-based sampling approach would be acceptable if supported by the monitoring plan?

A12. The Annual review is expected to include all programs.

Q13. Could WFSCB share the approximate number of subrecipient contracts and program elements typically included in the annual monitoring cycle, as well as any historical benchmarks for total hours or site visits for similar engagements?

A13. This is based on your experience monitoring listed programs.

Q14. Regarding the development of the risk assessment tool and monitoring instruments, does WFSCB anticipate these will be created entirely new, or will existing templates or prior-year tools be available to build upon?

A14. The risk assessment tool is new. For monitoring instruments, we have TWC templates.

Q15. Given the 11- county service area and multiple career center locations described in Section 1.1, should our proposed travel budget assume on-site reviews at each subrecipient facility, or is a hybrid model combining desk/virtual and on-site reviews acceptable for fulfilling contract requirements?

A15. Due to paperless system for program participant files being in place, the need to travel or be in-person may not be necessary.

Q16. Section 1.5 (M), references providing “follow-up and program compliance & monitoring technical assistance”. Could WFSCB elaborate on the anticipated scope and depth of these activities (e.g., corrective action plan support, policy revision, staff training) so we can allocate appropriate resources?

A16. Corrective Action support may be requested and WFSCB will accept suggestions to Policy revision; only if necessary.

Q17. Section 2.6 states that the contract will be cost-reimbursement. Are indirect costs, administrative overhead, or software/tool expenses allowable if justified and reasonable? Are there any ceiling rates or cost allocation guidelines we should be aware of when proposing hourly rates and indirect percentages?

A17. In the cost section of evaluation, your cost will be a smaller portion of the score but based on number of hours and hourly rates in total; we don’t need to see the breakout of the rate.

Q18. Are there any priority focus areas or recurring compliance challenges from prior monitoring cycles that WFSCB would like respondents to specifically address in their approach or methodology?

A18. No.

Q19. Does WFSCB have preferred templates or structures for monitoring guides and reports, or should respondents propose their own for review and approval prior to use?

A19. WFSCB does have access to TWC monitoring templates and previously used an in-house template; however, respondents may propose to use their own as long as program(s) attributes are covered.

Q20. Beyond entrance and exit interviews and final reports, does WFSCB expect interim progress reports or periodic status updates during the engagement?

A20. If necessary, debriefing may take place to alert WFSCB of any concerns prior to completion of reports.

Q21. Regarding the potential for up to three (3) additional renewal terms, Section 2.2, would WFSCB prefer the proposal narrative and budget to address multi-year scalability, or focus exclusively on the initial term ending August 31, 2026?

A21. WFSCB prefers to focus on the initial term ending August 31, 2026.

Q22. If a non-HUB respondent proposes to subcontract portions of the work to a certified HUB, will that subcontracting plan be considered in the evaluation of HUB participation points?

A22. No. HUB evaluation consideration is only for the direct respondent.

Q23. Section 3.17 references compliance with the Model Security Plan and NIST 800.53 standards. Will WFSCB require a formal cybersecurity plan or attestation as part of the proposal submission, or is compliance addressed post-award?

A23. If awarded a contract, you must attest to this criterion and are subject to provide white paper or other credentialing information on anything that is subject to NIST.

Q24. Section 2.6, Contract Services, indicates that this will be a cost-reimbursement contract. Will the other contracted fee structures be acceptable, such as a Fixed Fee contract or Hourly Rates based on market rates?

A24. This will be evaluated on hourly rates and the number of hours.

Q25. Are these services currently being performed by a contractor?

A25. No.

Q26. Can you provide an estimate of the number of hours previously needed to complete the work?

A26. This is based on your experience monitoring similar programs.

Q27. Can you provide a budget for the contractor to complete all the requirements in the scope of work?

A27. No. Respondents with knowledge of workforce program monitoring should know the key attributes by program and duration needed for participant files to then build a fee schedule.

Q28. How many subrecipients do you have?

A28. Two (2).

Q29. Can the work be done virtually/remotely? If not, what is the estimated number of on-site visits (and days) per subrecipient?

A29. Yes. Due to paperless system for program participant files being in place, the need to travel or be in person may not be necessary.

Q30. How many contractors are you selecting to perform the work?

A30. One (1).

Q31. Aside from the points awarded, is there a specific requirement to engage a Historically Underutilized Business (HUB)?

A31. This is part of our solicitation process.

Q32. What is the breakdown of subrecipients and award amount per subrecipient by specific grant program for the monitoring period?

A32. Please see attached budgets for each subrecipient.

Q33. What is the estimated budget for the project?

A33. WFSCB is expecting you to estimate the number of hours, which would then yield your budget based on your hourly rate.

Q34. Will the PowerPoint presentation be uploaded?

A34. Yes. It will be posted on our website under Procurement Opportunities page.

Q35. While reviewing the Request for Statement of Qualifications and Response Document for the RFQ, in the “Demonstrated Ability/References” section, one section noted that one document requests references for “fiscal monitoring services”, while another refers to “program compliance & monitoring services”. Could you please confirm which reference requirement is accurate?

A35. The correct requirement is program compliance & monitoring services.

WORKFORCE SOLUTIONS OF THE COASTAL BEND

BakerRipley

Effective: 10/01/25 - 09/30/26

CFDA No.

Operations			REGULAR FORMULA	TOTAL
Payroll Costs	2226CCF001	93.575	\$ 2,161,698.00	\$ 2,161,698.00
Fringe Benefits			458,496.00	458,496.00
Other Operational Costs			106,628.00	106,628.00
Mentor Budget	2226CCQ001	93.575	725,878	725,878.00
<i>*Includes all wages, fringe, travel, training cost, etc.</i>				
Indirect Fee. 28.2%			702,522	702,522.26
Total Operations			\$ 4,155,222.26	\$ 4,155,222.26
			DIRECT CHILDCARE	
Child Care Services Formula Discretionary (Carryover)	2226CCF001	93.575	300,000.00	300,000.00
Child Care Services Formula Estimate (mandatory)	2226CCF001	93.596	4,661,352.00	4,661,352.00
Child Care Services Formula Estimate (mandatory)	2226CCF001	93.558	1,123,432.00	1,123,432.00
Child Care Services Formula Discretionary	2226CCF001	00.000	\$ 2,028,853.00	2,028,853.00
Child Care Services Formula Discretionary FY26 Contract	2226CCF001	93.575	\$ 13,277,819.84	13,277,819.84
Local Match FY'26 -Ending 12/31/2026				
*Local Match-Commission Not Approved Yet	2226CCM001	93.596	1,858,292.00	1,858,292.00
Child Care DFPS *Estimate	2225CCP001	00.000	750,000.00	750,000.00
Total Direct Child Care Funds			\$ 23,999,748.84	\$ 23,999,748.84
Total Child Care Services Contract (Operations and Direct Care)			\$ 28,154,971.10	\$ 28,154,971.10

Local Match	93.596	\$	1,858,292.00	
CCF (includes fully-subsidized/choices direct care)	93.575		13,577,819.84	
CCF	93.558		1,123,432.00	
CCF	93.596		4,661,352.00	
CCP	00.000		2,778,853.00	
Total Direct Care		\$	23,999,748.84	
Total Contract				\$ 28,154,971.10

FY 2026 Budget Allocation

Original Budget

Program		CFDA	Direct Services									Total	In-Kind
			Indirect Wages (709)		Wages (612)	Fringes (612)	Other (612)	Sub Total		Client	Profit (709)		
WIOA Adult *Inc est. carryover		17.258	64,095.55		526,698.26	143,964.19	31,601.90	702,264.35		477,294.17	38,256.94	1,281,911.00	
WIOA Dislocated Worker *Inc est. carryover		17.278	46,896.50		385,366.79	105,333.59	23,122.01	513,822.38		349,219.85	27,991.27	937,930.00	
WIOA Youth ISY *See benchmark table		17.259	18,086.45		148,623.34	40,623.71	8,917.40	198,164.46		134,682.78	10,795.31	361,729.00	
WIOA Youth OSY *See benchmark table		17.259	54,259.35		445,869.96	121,871.12	26,752.20	594,493.29		404,048.43	32,385.93	1,085,187.00	
WIOA Rapid Response *Est Carryover		17.278	-		12,750.00	3,485.00	765.00	17,000.00		-	-	17,000.00	
TANF		93.558	130,929.36		1,197,576.50	327,337.58	71,854.59	1,596,768.66		366,150.30	88,307.62	2,182,155.94	
SNAP E&T		10.561	17,752.56		162,378.07	44,383.34	9,742.68	216,504.10		49,645.81	11,973.53	295,876.00	
SNAP-TPP		10.561	-					-		2,875.30	-	2,875.30	
Non-Custodial Parent (NCP)		93.558	15,655.98		124,252.58	33,962.37	7,455.15	165,670.11		70,453.58	9,153.34	260,933.00	
Trade Act Services for Dislocated Workers		17.245	-		-	-	-	-		-	-		
VET (TVC)		17.801	-		-	-	6,000.00	6,000.00		-	-	6,000.00	
WCI TVLP **Est frm FY25		17.207	-		-	-	8,224.00	8,224.00		-	-	8,224.00	
WCI YOU Choose **Est frm FY25		93.558	-		6,000.00	1,640.00	360.00	8,000.00		-	-	8,000.00	
Resource Administration Grant		17.207/17.273	-		-	-		-		-	-		
Wagner-Peyser Employment Services *Exp 2/28/25		93.558	-		-	-	-	-		-	-		
Reemployment Services & Eligibility Assessment		17.225	33,248.03		369,282.71	100,937.27	22,156.96	492,376.95		-	16,624.02	542,249.00	
Externships for Teachers ***C2 will do entire project		17.278	-					-		-	-		
Child Care - Fund 2573		93.667	-		30,107.79	14,829.21	-	44,937.00		-	-	44,937.00	
Military to Civilian - MTC *Exp 5/31/26 *Est Carryover		17.258	1,183.74		9,085.65	4,487.10	1,200.00	14,772.75		35,716.67		51,673.16	
Healthcare Internship Fund *Exp 5/31/26 *Est Carryover		17.258	1,392.87		2,443.87	2,443.87	5,000.00	9,887.74		36,271.82		47,552.43	
Contractual In-Kind								-					39,000.00
Total			383,500.40		3,420,435.53	945,298.36	223,151.89	4,588,885.78		1,926,358.71	235,487.95	7,134,232.83	39,000.00

*Note individual comments

WIOA Benchmark		30-Jun-25		
		Total	WIOA Benchmarks	%
WIOA Adult		1,281,911.00	935,795.03	73%
WIOA Dislocated		937,930.00	684,688.90	73%
Youth ISY		361,729.00	264,062.17	73%
Youth OSY		1,085,187.00	792,186.51	73%
Total		\$ 3,666,757.00	\$ 2,676,732.61	

Service Provider must obligate a minimum of 73% percent of of each WIOA allocation by June 30, 2025.

The 73% Benchmark includes 75 % of Operations Budget and 70% of Client Budget.

Participant Expenditures must be 75/25 split and have a total of 25% work experience combined.