

Corporation for National and Community Service

2010 Social Innovation Fund

Jobs for the Future, Inc.

Table of Contents

Application (includes Clarification Questions)	Section 1
Budget	Section 2
Budget Narrative	Section 3

2010 Social Innovation Fund

Jobs for the Future, Inc.

Section 1 – Application

PART I - FACE SHEET

APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE		1. TYPE OF SUBMISSION: Application <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Construction	
Modified Standard Form 424 (Rev.02/07 to conform to the Corporation's eGrants System)			
2a. DATE SUBMITTED TO CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE (CNCS): 04/08/10	3. DATE RECEIVED BY STATE:	STATE APPLICATION IDENTIFIER:	
2b. APPLICATION ID: 10SI115304	4. DATE RECEIVED BY FEDERAL AGENCY: 04/08/10	FEDERAL IDENTIFIER: 10SIHMA001	
5. APPLICATION INFORMATION			
LEGAL NAME: Jobs for the Future, Inc. DUNS NUMBER: 849602032		NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION FOR PROJECT DIRECTOR OR OTHER PERSON TO BE CONTACTED ON MATTERS INVOLVING THIS APPLICATION (give area codes): NAME: Fred Dedrick TELEPHONE NUMBER: (617) 728-4446 FAX NUMBER: INTERNET E-MAIL ADDRESS: fdedrick@jff.org	
ADDRESS (give street address, city, state, zip code and county): 88 Broad Street, 8th Floor Boston MA 02110 County:			
6. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (EIN): 061164568		7. TYPE OF APPLICANT: 7a. National Non Profit 7b.	
8. TYPE OF APPLICATION (Check appropriate box). <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NEW <input type="checkbox"/> NEW/PREVIOUS GRANTEE <input type="checkbox"/> CONTINUATION <input type="checkbox"/> AMENDMENT If Amendment, enter appropriate letter(s) in box(es): <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> A. AUGMENTATION B. BUDGET REVISION C. NO COST EXTENSION D. OTHER (specify below):			
		9. NAME OF FEDERAL AGENCY: Corporation for National and Community Service	
10a. CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE NUMBER:94.019 10b. TITLE: Social Innovation Fund		11.a. DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF APPLICANT'S PROJECT: National Fund for Workforce Solutions	
12. AREAS AFFECTED BY PROJECT (List Cities, Counties, States, etc): Baltimore; Boston; Central WI (including South Wood Co. and Wisconsin Rapids); Cincinnati; Dan River Region (VA); Des Moines; Milwaukee; Philadelphia; Seattle; Washington, DC; Albuquerque; Atlanta; Austin; Bradenton (FL); Greenville; Knoxville		11.b. CNCS PROGRAM INITIATIVE (IF ANY): SIF - Issue Area Opportunity	
13. PROPOSED PROJECT: START DATE: 09/30/10 END DATE: 09/30/11		14. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF: a.Applicant b.Program	
15. ESTIMATED FUNDING: Year #: <input type="text" value="1"/>		16. IS APPLICATION SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS? <input type="checkbox"/> YES. THIS PREAPPLICATION/APPLICATION WAS MADE AVAILABLE TO THE STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS FOR REVIEW ON: DATE: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO. PROGRAM IS NOT COVERED BY E.O. 12372	
a. FEDERAL	\$ 7,700,000.00		
b. APPLICANT	\$ 8,199,997.00		
c. STATE	\$ 0.00		
d. LOCAL	\$ 0.00		
e. OTHER	\$ 0.00		
f. PROGRAM INCOME	\$ 0.00		
g. TOTAL	\$ 15,899,997.00	17. IS THE APPLICANT DELINQUENT ON ANY FEDERAL DEBT? <input type="checkbox"/> YES if "Yes," attach an explanation. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	
18. TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF, ALL DATA IN THIS APPLICATION/PREAPPLICATION ARE TRUE AND CORRECT, THE DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DULY AUTHORIZED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE APPLICANT AND THE APPLICANT WILL COMPLY WITH THE ATTACHED ASSURANCES IF THE ASSISTANCE IS AWARDED.			
a. TYPED NAME OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Marlene Seltzer		b. TITLE:	c. TELEPHONE NUMBER: (617) 728-4446
d. SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:		e. DATE SIGNED: 04/08/10	

Narratives

Executive Summary

1. TITLE: National Fund for Workforce Solutions (NFWS)

2. SUMMARY INFO

INTERMEDIARY: National Fund for Workforce Solutions (Annie E. Casey Foundation, California Endowment, Ford Foundation, Hitachi Foundation, John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, Prudential Foundation, Walmart Foundation, Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation, Microsoft Corporation)

KEY COLLABORATIVE PARTNERS: Jobs for the Future, Inc. or "JFF" (implementation -- grants management, technical assistance, fiscal management); Council on Foundations (philanthropic leadership); Workforce Learning Strategies (evaluation)

ISSUE-BASED SIF (Economic Opportunity)

AMOUNT/GRANT DURATION: \$3,850,000 requested for Year 1 of a 5-year initiative

PRE-SELECTED GRANTEES: No

3. PROGRAM DESIGN

NFWS will dramatically increase economic opportunity for disadvantaged workers and job seekers through investments in nonprofit workforce collaboratives in up to 24 high need communities. These collaboratives address key gaps and weaknesses in workforce education and training at the local level by 1) expanding effective models of sector-based workforce partnerships that provide a permanent route out of poverty for disadvantaged adults while meeting workforce needs of employers in high growth sectors, and 2) providing a community-level vehicle for the financial and institutional commitments needed to sustain these new training models long-term.

NFWS funding partners have invested in workforce development as a poverty alleviation strategy for over a decade, and several for much longer. Through investments as NFWS since 2007, they have demonstrated a strategy that drives transformation of local workforce investment systems and programs. As implementation partner, JFF brings 10+ years of experience in strategic and technical

Narratives

support to local collaboratives and workforce partnerships, including management of the precursor initiative to NFWS.

Through a post-award competition, subgrants will be awarded in two categories: 1) "Scale-Up" collaboratives - to deepen impact in 12-16 communities where NFWS investments have already coalesced key stakeholders around a sustainable commitment to workforce partnerships; and 2) "Start-Up" collaboratives - in 6-8 communities in the Southern and Southwestern US, where pockets of innovative workforce partnerships exist and there is strong capacity to implement a community-wide approach to career advancement. NFWS will disseminate an RFP in targeted geographic areas, provide technical assistance to interested nonprofits, review proposals using clear criteria, conduct site visits, and select subgrantees based upon the combined rating of proposals and site visits.

NFWS will evaluate grantees through an independently conducted, quasi-experimental evaluation, which builds upon an ongoing third-party evaluation. NFWS will support subgrantees by leveraging the existing NFWS/JFF platform of strategic and technical assistance, including intensive site-specific assistance and a national, cross-site learning community.

4. ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY

Net assets: \$31,388,086 (JFF, FY 09)

Annual grants budget: \$8,812,924 (JFF, FY 10)

Number of staff: 89 (JFF)

As implementation partner, JFF now provides oversight, support, and grants management for NFWS investments in 22 communities. JFF has assembled a highly experienced team of site coaches and content specialists to deliver technical assistance and monitor site progress. Oversight will be provided through established processes, including regular contact by site coaches, monthly review of progress, quarterly reporting, annual compliance reviews, and national and local evaluations. JFF's fiscal department has extensive experience providing grants management for complex, multisite initiatives, including multiyear grants and contracts with the US Departments of Labor and Education.

Narratives

5. COST EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY

Amount/percentage of federal funds to be subgranted: \$3,080,000/80%

Match ratio: 1.13:1

Major match sources: Annie E. Casey and Weinberg Foundations

The proposed budget is based on the Fund's operational experience to date. Subgrants and local match will enable workforce collaboratives to develop and expand activities that will result in robust participant outcomes and systems change. Intermediary-level budget allocations adequately support program and fiscal oversight, plus a comprehensive strategic and technical assistance platform to support subgrantee implementation.

Program Design

A. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

A1 - PRIORITY ISSUE AREA: ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Nine national funders -- among them several of the largest grant-making institutions in the nation -- joined together in 2007 as the National Fund for Workforce Solutions ("NFWS" or the "Fund"), a groundbreaking philanthropic initiative designed to revolutionize how community and regional workforce development systems alleviate poverty and create economic opportunities for economically disadvantaged individuals. Through NFWS, these funding partners -- the Annie E. Casey, Ford, Hitachi, John S. and James L. Knight, Prudential, Walmart, and Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundations, The California Endowment, and the Microsoft Corporation -- strategically invest in local nonprofit organizations whose social innovations transform local workforce development programs and systems. Through an integrated strategy that deeply engages employers in training their front-line workers and expands education and training services in high growth industries, NFWS investments dramatically improve career advancement outcomes for low-income adults.

Jobs for the Future (JFF), a national non-profit organization and recognized leader in workforce development, serves as the Fund's implementation partner, directly overseeing and supporting the work

Narratives

of the Fund's grantees. As a national intermediary, JFF has a demonstrated record in creating and expanding social innovations that improve education and workforce outcomes for disadvantaged youth and adults, and JFF has deep experience in competitive grantee selection and management of multi-site philanthropic initiatives.

The impact of NFWS' investments in just two years -- increasing from 6 to 22 the number of communities served through NFWS sponsored social innovations; the delivery of services to 18,000 disadvantaged adults and 1,000 employers who hire them; and \$23.7 million of NFWS investments leveraging over \$100 million from 256 local and regional funders -- is evidence of the transformative impact of NFWS' unique social investment strategy.

INCREASING OPPORTUNITY. The Fund formed to improve grantmakers' response to an intensifying economic challenge--the growing disparity in opportunity for low-income adults who lack the skills to advance in an increasingly complex economy. At the turn of the new century, over a third of the US workforce lacked the skills needed to access and succeed in family-supporting careers. Even today, with unemployment high, employers in sectors from healthcare and construction to finance and manufacturing report challenges finding workers with the right skills. The education and skill demands of employers are rising steadily. As President Obama has stressed frequently, adults without adequate basic skills to earn not just a high school diploma but a postsecondary credential are losing ground and finding the door to the American Dream shut.

Our adult education and training system - designed for an earlier, industrial age when organizational structures, technology, and skill demands were comparatively static - is inadequately suited to the current economy. Hampered by limited and inflexible funding, weak connections between education and workforce providers, and lack of strong employer investment, workforce systems are increasingly unable to respond to rapidly changing technology, job requirements, and business models. Public system performance measures have emphasized job placement at the expense of skill development for long-term career advancement. The result: too many initiatives provide neither the opportunity for

Narratives

disadvantaged adults to advance into family-supporting careers nor solutions to employers' pressing workforce skill needs.

NFWS INVESTMENT STRATEGY Against this background, the Fund's investment strategy is game-changing. Building upon a decade of innovation, research, and evaluation, the Fund accelerates the creation and expansion of new workforce development strategies that emphasize skills, credentials, and career ladders in high growth sectors to provide a permanent route out of poverty. NFWS also facilitates sustained strategic investment by employers in their lower-skilled workers.

The Fund invests in a much needed social innovation: new types of nonprofit community organizations called "workforce collaboratives" that 1) create and expand highly effective models of sector-based workforce partnerships that serve disadvantaged adults AND respond to employer needs, and 2) establish a community-level organizational structure that facilitates the financial and institutional commitments needed to sustain these new models long-term.

At the level of service to workers and employers, the core of the innovation in sector-based workforce partnerships is their "dual customer" orientation -- meeting the pressing workforce needs of employers in high demand industries and workers seeking career advancement opportunities in those sectors.

These partnerships achieve better results because they:

- * Organize employers by industry sector, defining common workforce needs and designing education and training that meets industry-specific skill requirements;
- * Engage employers in long-term workforce development;
- * Create career pathways to skills and credentials needed for family-supporting jobs;
- * Broker or deliver high quality services to low-skilled workers and job seekers, including assessment, contextualized literacy, occupational training, support services, career and academic coaching, job placement and retention assistance;
- * Broker or deliver high quality services to employers, including career pathway design, resource alignment, and consulting on improved practices for entry-level hiring, training, and retention.

Narratives

In addition, these innovative career opportunity solutions are rooted in a sustainable workforce collaborative -- comprised of local civic and institutional leaders, private and public funders, industry representatives, and training providers -- that drives a community-wide strategy for setting priorities, aggregating resources, targeting investments, and assessing impacts. Workforce collaboratives:

- * Secure resources and commitments to support effective models through engagement of civic leaders;
- * Raise new local/regional funds for workforce development, align resources from different sources, and direct resources to training partnerships in high-growth industry sectors;
- * Provide capacity building and technical assistance to improve workforce partnership outcomes;
- * Drive policy and system change to align program requirements and funding streams to improve service delivery quality and coherence;
- * Use data and evaluation to assess impact and improve effectiveness.

There is no presumption of the most effective nonprofit community organization to undertake these roles --workforce collaboratives are led by community foundations, chambers of commerce, United Way affiliates, workforce boards and stand-alone nonprofits. Whatever the form, successful workforce collaboratives change their local service delivery and workforce system landscape by improving skills and economic outcomes for participating low-income workers AND their employers.

THIS APPLICATION. Applying as an ISSUE-BASED SIF, the Fund will increase economic opportunities in 18 - 24 low-income communities across the nation. Through an open competition completed within 6 months of the award, a workforce collaborative in each community will be selected to expand sector-based workforce partnerships that provide career advancement opportunity for economically disadvantaged workers and job seekers and that drive local systems reform. Awards will be made to two categories of subgrantees:

- * "Scale-Up" workforce collaboratives --in communities where there is strong preliminary evidence of workforce partnerships improving outcomes for low-wage, low-skilled workers and their employers.

These subgrants will strengthen and scale-up employer engagement within key sectors, expand

Narratives

workforce partnerships, and improve outcomes for more disadvantaged individuals.

* "Start-Up" collaboratives -- Collaboratives that are emerging in communities where pockets of innovative workforce partnerships exist and where there is strong local capacity to implement a sustainable, community-wide career advancement approach.

A2 STATISTICAL INFORMATION; AREAS LIKELY TO BE SERVED

Scale-Up collaboratives will be selected in a subset of communities where Fund investments have already coalesced key stakeholders around a sustainable, community-wide commitment to workforce partnerships. Nonprofit organizations in 22 high-poverty communities were selected for NFWS investments through a rigorous and competitive process in 2007 and 2008. NFWS will conduct a new competition among nonprofit organizations in these communities, enabling a subset to deepen models and expand lessons. The Fund will select Scale-Up grantees in 12-15 of these communities - those with the best evidence and scale and outcomes from their workforce partnership investments, and with the strongest capacity for increasing employer engagement and producing and using rigorous evidence.

Based on staff and investor assessment of the maturity and effectiveness of workforce partnerships in the 22 communities, 10 communities have been identified as most likely geographic areas to be served by Scale Up subgrantees. We stress, however, that any nonprofit community organization in all 22 will be eligible to apply and will be judged on a common set of performance criteria.

In each, the need for education and skill development among disadvantaged individuals is high. The percentage of workers earning less than 200% of poverty (\$21,660 for an individual under 2009 Federal Poverty Guidelines) ranges from 22 - 41%. Significant numbers of those earning below 100% of poverty are working, but in jobs that do not provide adequate wages, hours, or both. (BLS, American Community Survey) High school non-completion, a major predictor of poverty, further highlights the level of need (American Human Development Report 2008-2009).

BALTIMORE

Percent below 200% of poverty 22%

Narratives

Unemployment 1/2010 8.7%

Less than HS diploma 18%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 22.8%

BOSTON

Percent below 200% of poverty 23%

Unemployment 1/2010 9.3%

Less than HS diploma 16.1%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 29.8%

CENTRAL WISCONSIN (including South Wood Co. and Wisconsin Rapids)

Percent below 200% of poverty 27%

Unemployment 1/2010 10.3%

Less than HS diploma 12.1%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working n/a

CINCINNATI

Percent below 200% of poverty 26%

Unemployment 1/2010 10.8%

Less than HS diploma 14.6%

Percent below 100% poverty and working 34.5%

DAN RIVER REGION (VA)

Percent below 200% of poverty 41%

Unemployment 1/2010 10.7

Narratives

Less than HS diploma n/a

Of those below 100% poverty, % working n/a

DES MOINES

Percent below 200% of poverty 23%

Unemployment 1/2010 7.1%

Less than HS diploma 10%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 44.6%

MILWAUKEE

Percent below 200% of poverty 27%

Unemployment 1/2010 9.6%

Less than HS diploma 19.1%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 37.7%

PHILADELPHIA

Percent below 200% of poverty 27%

Unemployment 1/2010 9.5%

Less than HS diploma 26.6%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 19.9%

SEATTLE

Percent below 200% of poverty 21%

Unemployment 1/2010 9.6%

Less than HS diploma 9.2%

Narratives

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 32.6%

WASHINGTON D.C.

Percent below 200% of poverty 32%

Unemployment 1/2010 6.9%

Less than HS diploma 16.4%

Percent below 100% poverty and working 26%

In the second subgrantee category, NFWS will select Start-Up collaboratives through an open competition in 6 to 8 high need geographic areas. Subgrants will be targeted to geographic areas in the South and Southwest, where workforce collaboratives and partnerships are few. NFWS will solicit applications from eligible nonprofit organizations serving any geographic area in the South and Southwest. However, the Fund has identified 10 geographic areas where need is great and some innovative efforts to accelerate career advancement exist. In these communities identified as likely to be served, the percentage of workers earning less than 200% of poverty is between 28 - 42%.

ALBUQUERQUE

Percent below 200% of poverty 34.8%

Unemployment 1/2010 8.9%

Less than HS diploma 14.3%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 40%

ATLANTA

Percent below 200% of poverty 28%

Unemployment 1/2010 10.8%

Less than HS diploma 15.1%

Narratives

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 26.7%

AUSTIN

Percent below 200% of poverty 35.6%

Unemployment 1/2010 7.6%

Less than HS diploma 13.1%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 43.5%

BRADENTON, FL

Percent below 200% of poverty 28%

Unemployment 1/2010 13.3%

Less than HS diploma 13.3%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 32.5%

GREENVILLE, S.C.

Percent below 200% of poverty 42%

Unemployment 1/2010 11.6%

Less than HS diploma 19.3%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 29%

KNOXVILLE

Percent below 200% of poverty 31%

Unemployment 1/2010 9.3%

Less than HS diploma 17.2%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 35.5%

Narratives

LOUISVILLE

Percent below 200% of poverty 33.7%

Unemployment 1/2010 11.3%

Less than HS diploma 14.5%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 31%

MOBILE

Percent below 200% of poverty 41%

Unemployment 1/2010 12.6%

Less than HS diploma 16.9%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 29.4%

GREENSBORO, NC. (PIEDMONT TRIANGLE REGION)

Percent below 200% of poverty 37.5%

Unemployment 1/2010 12.3%

Less than HS diploma 21.6%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 40.2%

SAN ANTONIO

Percent below 200% of poverty 41.6%

Unemployment 1/2010 7.7%

Less than HS diploma 22.6%

Of those below 100% poverty, % working 32.2%

Narratives

A3 MEASURABLE OUTCOMES

The Fund will track and target for improvement measurable participant and system outcomes for each SIF subgrantee. Participant-level outcomes:

- * Number of participants served;
- * Number of participants who earn an education or workforce training credential;
- * Number of participants who secure and maintain job placements;
- * Increases in participants' post-training and post-placement wages.

System-level outcomes:

- * Number of employers served
- * Changes in employer human resources practices;
- * Changes in education and training provider practices;
- * State or local policy changes achieved through local collaborative advocacy efforts; and
- * Increases in local/regional funder support.

Proposed 3- and 5-year metrics for these outcomes for SIF subgrantees and the initiative are provided in Section I, Subsection 2G, "Accountability Approach".

A4 AVAILABILITY OF RELEVANT DATA; APPROACH TO ASSESSING WHETHER INVESTMENTS CAUSED IMPROVEMENT

The Fund's ongoing third-party evaluation, conducted by Workforce Learning Strategies (WLS), aggregates participant-level data from the collaboratives, as well as generates system-level data, which together comprise a robust body of "preliminary evidence," as defined by the SIF. The WLS evaluation relies on a theory of change method to test the hypothesis that NFWS interventions result in improvements in targeted outcomes. Data on aforementioned participant-level indicators are collected annually via an online reporting tool. Additional data needed to assess causality, such as systems-level outcomes noted above, are collected by qualitative methods, including annual surveys of workforce partnerships and employers, interviews with workforce collaborative staff, and site visits. As noted

Narratives

below, the NFWS intends to move toward a more robust, quasi-experimental evaluation design of SIF subgrantees that could provide moderately strong causal inferences.

A5 QUALIFICATIONS TO SUPPORT FOCUS, GOALS AND APPROACH

The Fund is comprised of large and influential grantmaking institutions, other funders, and a leading nonprofit organization. They share a commitment and long track record on increasing economic opportunity for low-income adults and their families. NFWS funding partners have invested in workforce development as a poverty alleviation strategy for over a decade, and several for much longer. Through a set of successful investments since 2007, NFWS partners have demonstrated a compelling capacity and strategy--combining a clear framework for local social innovation, performance management, technical assistance, research and evaluation, and learning across grantees--that drives transformation of local workforce investment systems and programs.

JFF, the Fund's implementation partner, brings over 10 years experience in strategic and technical support to local workforce collaboratives and partnerships. JFF has 25 years experience in competitive grantee selection and management of large national initiatives for private philanthropic and public agency partners. JFF managed Investing in Workforce Intermediaries (IWI), the precursor to the Fund, which demonstrated the efficacy of workforce collaboratives and partnerships as engines of innovation and poverty alleviation.

B. USE OF EVIDENCE

The Fund has a strong track record of using evidence, data and evaluations to design the NFWS innovation model, select grantees, support their progress, monitor replication and expansion, and achieve measurable outcomes. The Fund has used and built upon previous studies and evaluations of workforce collaboratives and partnerships, as well as the ongoing third-party evaluation of the Fund. Through the SIF, the Fund will strengthen the base of evidence through a quasi-experimental evaluation of SIF subgrantee efforts.

B1 and B4 USE OF EVIDENCE IN DECISION-MAKING ON DESIGN; STUDIES GENERATING

Narratives

EVIDENCE

PRELIMINARY level research on Boston's SkillWorks project provided important data on the power of innovative sectoral workforce development models to help low-income workers advance. Evidence of effectiveness from evaluations of SkillWorks and similar programs (e.g., Baltimore, Bay Area) helped shape the Fund's design as implemented in the 2007 and 2008 expansion of the Investing in Workforce Intermediaries pilot initiative.

The Abt Associates evaluation of Skillworks (www.skill-works.org/resources-evaluation-reports.php) found that the program met or exceeded its enrollment and placement expectations, with starting wages ranging from \$10 to \$12.15 per hour. Job retention rates for formerly unemployed participants ranged from 63-88%, significantly higher than retention in comparable initiatives, such as the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Jobs Initiative (54%). Retention rates for participating incumbent workers ranged from 71-81%. Interviews with employers confirmed a high level of satisfaction. Skillworks' emphasis on state policy also informed NFWS design. In 2004 Skillworks advocacy secured \$6 million in supplemental state funding for workforce development; in 2006 policy advocacy led to \$24.5 million in state workforce funding and the establishment of a state Workforce Competitiveness Trust Fund.

This and other, less rigorous, studies of IWI pilot sites provided Fund staff and investors with outcome data that encouraged investors to move to model replication and expansion. Once the Fund was launched in 2007, additional rigorous studies of sectoral workforce programs have reinforced and informed the Fund's investments and interventions.

P/PV's 2009 "Job Training that Works: Findings from the Sectoral Employment Impact Study" presents STRONG evidence from a two-year random assignment evaluation study of significant impacts for participants in high-quality sector-focused job training programs. Among the findings: participants earned significantly more than control group members, with most earnings gains in year 2; participants were more likely to work and, in year 2, worked more consistently.

(ppv.org/ppv/publication.asp?section_id=26&search_id=&publication_id=294)

Narratives

A MODERATE level quasi-experimental impact evaluation from the University of Texas found that an Austin sector-based local intermediary that focused on skill-development, long-term engagement with participants, and comprehensive support services produced significantly higher earnings and job retention than a comparison program promoting short-term training and rapid labor market attachment. http://www.utexas.edu/research/cshr/pubs/pdf/County-City_Workforce_%20Providers_Jan2010.pdf

When investors launched the Fund, they funded a national evaluation. This study (see Part I, A4; Part II, A4) is designed to expedite comparability across site strategies, identify performance issues, and shape mid-course corrections, as well as to increase the base of evidence for what works. The 2009 baseline report found that NFWS grantees are successfully reaching underserved populations: just over 50% of participants had no more than a high school education, compared to 46% nationally; 2% held an Associates Degree, versus 7% nationally. African-Americans comprised 49% of participants. On outcomes, the baseline study found that 31% of participants were placed at wages of \$10 - \$14.99/hour; 20% or more earned more than \$15/hour; and 20% of construction trainees earning more than \$20/hour upon placement. <http://nfwsolutions.org/evaluation-baseline-local>

B2 PROCESS USED TO INCORPORATE EVIDENCE IN SELECTION

Selection criteria for current Fund grantees were derived from preliminary evidence of effectiveness from evaluations of SkillWorks and other IWI pilot sites, bolstered by findings from rigorous studies of sectoral programs and the ongoing national NFWS evaluation. Fund partners hypothesize from this evidence that better participant completion, employment, and earnings result from workforce partnerships and collaboratives that incorporate:

- * Strong and committed local leaders;
- * A culture of evidence-based decision-making and a commitment to using evidence to improve practice;
- * A dual-customer, sector-focused model that addresses the needs of both employers and workers;
- * A career advancement focus for low-skilled workers that builds on strong workforce partnerships;

Narratives

- * Engaged and committed employers;
- * Flexible local funding for workforce partnerships;
- * State and regional policy advocacy that expands resources and removes obstacles to more effective models and designs.

B3 and B5 EVIDENCE TO DRIVE IMPROVEMENT AND INCREASE EVIDENCE BASE; SHARING AND INTEGRATING LESSONS

Beyond the national evaluation, NFWS requires local grantees to report quarterly (through data "dashboards") on a set of performance measures aligned with the national evaluation. The dashboards support ongoing monitoring and technical support. Evaluation results and data dashboards are reviewed regularly, shared with grantees, and used to drive guidance to grantees on improved design and implementation. An example: a regional labor market analysis conducted by the evaluator - which includes demographic, industry and sub-sector characteristics, including population growth, educational attainment and industry employment by race - helped several grantees target their interventions better.

Each grantee is required to commission an independent local evaluation providing detailed performance data on each supported sectoral partnership. One recent evaluation, for the Greater Cincinnati Workforce Network, reported on first-year progress: several hundred graduates across its health care workforce partnership; engagement of over 150 local organizations; a Leadership Council of 19 employers, philanthropies, public agencies, educational institutions and others. These data are informing calibration of performance benchmarks (see Greater Cincinnati Workforce Network: Evaluation <http://nfwsolutions.org/evaluation-baseline-local>).

Promising practices identified by the national evaluation are shared with grantees through semi-annual grantee conferences, webinars highlighting successful strategies, cross-grantee site visits to learn from each other, and evaluation-informed technical assistance by coaches.

Narratives

B6 PROPOSED IMPACT EVALUATION DESIGN ELEMENTS

If this proposal is successful, NFWS will build on the current third party evaluation to implement a MODERATE level impact evaluation of SIF-funded investments. The evaluation design and implementation plan will be developed after an award with parameters that include:

- * Final design and implementation by an independent individual or entity, in close coordination with national evaluators and NFWS partners;
- * Quasi-experimental design that can support causal conclusions, closely approximating experimental studies;
- * Use of comparison groups, with participants matched to non-participants using characteristics based on desired program outcomes, and careful attention to both groups' pre-intervention characteristics;
- * Use of model designs and/or tests to control for selection bias;
- * Close monitoring to ensure implementation as designed (e.g., local evaluators working with program staff to reduce participant attrition);
- * Research questions on impact closely aligned with a clear, widely-accepted logic model and theory of change;
- * Close coordination of impact evaluation design, implementation, and analysis with formative, qualitative evaluation of subgrantees and the overall initiative.

If feasible, the evaluation will employ regression discontinuity or cutoff-based design, with assignment of participants to treatment and comparison groups based on an ordered assignment variable not directly related to the treatment, which enables closer approximation of experimental design. The evaluation may also supplement the study with "pattern matching" designs -- to provide multiple tests of causal hypotheses and reduce threats to internal validity. This could include, for instance, multiple pre- and post-test assessments of participants.

C. COMMUNITY RESOURCES

See discussion in Section III.

Narratives

D. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES

1. SUBGRANTING

1A APPROACH TO IDENTIFYING/SELECTING SUBGRANTEES WITH IMPACT POTENTIAL

Based on our knowledge of workforce collaborative development and implementation nationally, we anticipate that an open and competitive post-award Year I competition will lead to the selection of:

* 12 to 16 "Scale-Up" subgrantees from specifically targeted communities that can demonstrate a track record of improving outcomes for economically disadvantaged individuals through workforce partnerships and the capacity to deepen employer engagement and expand the scope of quality workforce partnerships. These subgrantees will be located in communities with current Fund investments.

* 6 to 8 "Start-Up" subgrantees, serving low-income communities where there is some experience in implementing workforce partnerships producing strong outcomes, as well as significant local commitment to a community-wide career advancement strategy through workforce partnerships. These subgrantees will be located in the South and Southwestern regions of the US.

In the geographic areas targeted in each category of competition, any community nonprofit organization that meets eligibility criteria for the applicable category will be encouraged to apply. Although the Fund anticipates selecting up to 24 subgrantees in a Year I competition, the number of subgrantee awards will be contingent upon the quality of applications received.

Subgrants to Scale-Up and Start-Up collaboratives selected in Year I will be made for periods of 3 - 5 years, renewed annually based upon performance and subject to SIF funding availability. Scale-Up collaboratives may apply for annual grants of \$200,000 - 300,000, with the level of award depending on evidence presented re: the scope of sectoral partnership activities to date and those proposed. Awards to Start-Up collaboratives will be \$150,000/year. The Fund will hold a second-round competition during Year II to select up to 4 additional grantees in each category for three-year SIF subgrants that will begin in Year III.

Narratives

SELECTION CRITERIA FOR SCALE-UP SUBGRANTEES. Organizations selected as Scale-Up subgrantees will be expected to broaden and deepen the innovations that have contributed to their success and progress. Successful applicants must demonstrate:

- * Commitment and specific plan for expanding scale of sectoral workforce partnerships, in terms of new sectors, more employers within existing sectors, and/or significantly expanded scale in existing efforts;
- * Capacity and plans to deepen employer engagement in specific industry sectors by: deepening understanding of sector workforce needs and labor market trends; strengthening/updating sector-focused curricula; facilitating the hiring of program graduates; providing post-placement supports, including work-based learning and on-the-job training to participating workers; and/or working with other employers to aggregate demand for training, education, or support services;
- * Capacity and plan to implement a broader range of career advancement services for disadvantaged workers, including: extending efforts to include access to postsecondary credentials; providing a robust array of counseling and other support services; and working with employers to help advance workers post-placement;
- * Specific plans and capacity to achieve local, regional and state policy change and systems impact and to strengthen and sustain the workforce system's capacity to educate and train for high-demand occupations;
- * Capacity to work with local and national evaluators to create a clear and detailed plan for assessing the impact of SIF investments, including the capacity and infrastructure to support quasi-experimental evaluations that allow for valid causal inferences.
- * At least a 4:1 committed match of local funds to the first \$150,000 per year of a SIF grant, and at least a 1:1 committed match for additional SIF grant amounts.

SELECTION CRITERIA FOR START-UP SUBGRANTEES. Building upon the criteria used to select Fund grantees in the 2007 and 2008 competitions, augmented by NFWS replication experience, nonprofit community organizations applying as Start-Up collaboratives will need to demonstrate:

Narratives

- * Commitment to a theory of change aligned with the NFWS social innovation--i.e., high capacity local workforce partnerships and workforce collaborative--but flexible enough to respond to local context;
- * Evidence of strong leadership, champion(s), and workforce collaborative membership representative of local civic leadership and stakeholders;
- * Evidence of emerging capacity to serve effectively both employers and individuals seeking career advancement in key high-demand sectors through existence of one or more robust workforce partnerships;
- * Commitment of a community-wide leadership group to a comprehensive strategy of expanded high quality sector programs, targeted policy and advocacy, and sustainable capacity to guide the overall strategy;
- * Capacity for data collection and management, including detailed plans for implementing the infrastructure needed to support a quasi-experimental evaluation design within a year; and
- * A realistic plan for securing, within a year, at least a 4:1 committed match of local funds to the \$150,000 in SIF funds.

FIRST-ROUND SELECTION PROCESS. Within one month of receiving a SIF award, the Fund will release a call for proposals that will be posted on its website, distributed through the network of our collaborating partner, the Council on Foundations, and through the networks of NFWS partner grantmaking institutions. Organizations applying as Start-Up collaboratives will have three months from RFP release to prepare and submit proposals. During that period, JFF will host bidders conference calls and webinars for interested nonprofit community organizations, supplemented by NFWS resources on quality sectoral workforce initiatives and Q&A format technical assistance. Proposals from Scale-Up collaboratives will be due six weeks after RFP release. Technical assistance to these applicants will be provided through webinars and conference calls clarifying proposal criteria and benchmarking the expected set of innovations.

All proposals in each competition category will be reviewed and scored by NFWS staff and members of

Narratives

the NFWS Investor Committee (the Fund's governing board) using a standardized evaluation tool. The full review team will meet within two weeks of the proposal due date to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal and identify non-responsive proposals. All applicants that meet the selection criteria will be asked to host a one-day site visit, during which a NFWS team will interview local funders, employers, service providers, and other stakeholders to assess their understanding of and commitment to the proposal. Site visit reports will be reviewed by the full review team. Based on the combined rating of the proposal and site visit, the Investor Committee will select first-round subgrantees.

1B COMPETITIVENESS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTION APPROACH

The Fund awards grants based on a local nonprofit organization's readiness to implement or expand sector-based workforce partnerships and its likelihood of success. Since 2007, NFWS has conducted two expansion competitions to select sites beyond initial pilots. In 2007, 10 communities were identified and offered technical assistance. Only four of the 10 met the NFWS design criteria and were awarded grants. In 2008, extensive outreach to identify interested organizations elicited interest from nonprofits in 37 communities. All were offered technical assistance; 21 applied; 10 were funded. Two others were offered additional assistance and selected off-cycle.

The commitment to invest only in organizations that meet NFWS readiness and performance criteria has paid off. All 22 funded workforce collaboratives are implementing their strategic plans and meeting local match requirements.

1C ENSURING QUALITY IDENTIFICATION/SELECTION OF SUBGRANTEES

The Fund conducts intensive due diligence to assess the readiness of a workforce collaborative to meet criteria for investment. Applicants learn in the RFP that a site visit will be required of all finalists, and that the active engagement of civic leadership, funders, employers and service providers will be non-negotiable. The applicant's ability to mobilize stakeholders is a key selection criterion, and the site visit both verifies information in the proposal and assesses the collaborative's leadership quality and

Narratives

community support. The active involvement of Investor Committee members, who are leading experts on sector-based workforce development, is critical to quality assurance.

2. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT

2A LONG-TERM SUBGRANTEE RELATIONSHIPS

The Fund's commitment to financial and technical support for funded sites is long-term. Financial commitments to local collaboratives are for a minimum of three years, subject to meeting annual performance requirements. NFWS provides extensive technical support (described below) to grantees for the entire grant period.

Three- to five-year goals are established with each grantee based on its proposed innovations and strategies. Each year, NFWS staff propose annual goals in relation to long-term goals and the grantee's progress, which are iterated and incorporated into an annual MOU. If needed, modifications are negotiated as part of ongoing monitoring and assistance.

2B HELPING SUBGRANTEES THROUGH DATA, EVALUATION

As is current practice, the Fund will require and support SIF subgrantees to use data and evaluation to assess program effectiveness and guide performance improvement. The national evaluators provide feedback in comprehensive annual reports and quarterly memos on implementation issues identified through interviews, focus groups, performance reports and grantee progress narratives. NFWS leadership reviews this feedback to identify trends, concerns, and technical assistance priorities. NFWS also uses its annual re-funding process to target performance issues surfaced by national evaluators.

As noted above, NFWS requires local collaboratives to report quarterly on common performance measures through a "data dashboard" aligned with national evaluation measures and definitions. Dashboard data provides a "real-time" snapshot of progress, and is used by coaches to provide guidance on performance improvement. Site coaches also consult to grantees to ensure they have adequate management systems to review local evaluation data and identify implementation issues, needs, and improvement strategies.

Narratives

2C BUILDING SUBGRANTEE CAPACITY

The SIF initiative will leverage the existing, comprehensive NFWS/JFF platform of strategic and technical assistance. As now, NFWS will provide extensive technical assistance services to build grantee organizations' capacity across key competencies, including employer engagement, strategic planning, partnership implementation, leadership, communications and advocacy, and evaluation. These services are both site-specific and delivered cross-site (see Subsection 2D).

Each subgrantee will be assigned a site coach to provide strategic and content expertise. Coaches will meet monthly in person or by phone with sites to provide advice, help develop detailed workplans tied to annual goals, review progress against goals and deliverables, address performance, and share information on best practices and strategies. Site coaches will conduct annual formal site visits to review progress and compliance. NFWS site coaches meet monthly as a team to identify themes that should be addressed across all funded collaboratives. Each subgrantee will also receive customized assistance from content area specialists (e.g., policy and communications; data and evaluation).

2D FACILITATING LEARNING IMPROVEMENT

Building on its current national "learning community" platform, JFF will facilitate cross-site learning and improvement across the subgrantee portfolio through:

- * Peer learning conferences (three/year);
- * Affinity groups, promoting site-to-site networking through bimonthly conference calls or webinars. Current affinity groups address manufacturing, green jobs, construction, health care, and rural workforce development;
- * E-Learning, including monthly webinars on practice and policy issues;
- * Documentation, including reports, briefs, and case studies on strategic, design, and implementation issues being addressed by one or more sites;
- * Website resources, including tools and materials developed by NFWS and grantees, and peer learning, webinar, and affinity group proceedings.

Narratives

2E SUPPORT IN ACHIEVING MATCH AND SUSTAINABILITY

The Fund policy is that its first \$150,000 invested in a grantee must be matched by local funders by at least a 4:1 ratio. By investing in organizations that can secure the majority of their budget locally, NFWS promotes grantees' long-term support and sustainability.

The Council on Foundations helps sites meet the 4:1 match requirement through outreach to local and regional foundations, identification of interested funders, and visibility for NFWS strategies among philanthropies nationally.

All sites have met the NFWS match requirement to date. We know of no other national philanthropic initiative that has leveraged local funds so effectively.

2F USING DATA TO MEASURE, IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

NFWS uses evaluation results, quarterly performance data, and other research and site visit data to measure and improve grantee performance and program effectiveness. For example, NFWS intensified site-specific technical assistance on career advancement design after first-year evaluation research indicated that some grantees were favoring training leading only to short-term outcomes. NFWS also created a self-assessment tool to benchmark workforce partnerships against criteria for high performing sectoral training initiatives, using evaluation evidence on indicators of effective practice.

2G ACCOUNTABILITY APPROACH

At the intermediary level, the Fund's investors have set five-year measurable goals for the entire initiative, including: supporting workforce collaboratives in at least 30 regions nationwide, serving at least 50,000 individuals and at least 1000 employers, and to support workforce collaboratives. Funding partners and JFF develop annual objectives and a related workplan, with ongoing monitoring by JFF-based NFWS staff and quarterly and annual review against objectives by the Investor Committee.

Subgrantee performance goals are set annually relative to long-term goals. Annual goals drive a detailed workplan monitored by regular site coach contact and an annual review. The NFWS Investor Committee's Performance, Evaluation and Research subcommittee reviews coaches' quarterly progress

Narratives

reports, recommending corrective action if appropriate.

The Fund will track and report on both participant and system outcomes at the grantee and intermediary levels. Grantee accountability metrics are aggregated to define intermediary-level accountability metrics.

Proposed aggregate 3- and 5-year participant-level metrics, assuming 12 to 16 Scaling-Up subgrantees and 6 to 8 Start-Up subgrantees, include:

- * Number of participants (job seekers and incumbent workers) served: between 17,000 and 23,000 over 3 years; 32,500 to 43,500 over 5 years;
- * Number of participants who complete training: between 11,800 and 16,000 over 3 years; 22,500 to 30,000 over 5 years;
- * Numbers of job seekers who secure employment: between 5,000 and 6,600 in 3 years; 9,500 to 12,600 in 5 years; and
- * Earnings increase of 20 - 25 percent on average after two years, post-placement, as compared with pre-training wages.

Expected system change outcomes within 3-5 years include:

- * Number of new participating employers: between 800 and 1,000 in 3 years; 1,000 to 1,200 in 5 years.
- * Improvements in at least two of the following indicators in each SIF community: 1) changes in employer human resources practices supportive of advancement; 2) supportive changes in education and training provider practices; 3) state or local policy innovations due to local collaborative advocacy; and/or 4) increases in local/regional funder support for grantees.

The projected 3-year and 5-year participant metrics are based upon evidence from the NFWS national evaluation on: average annual participant levels for both newer and more mature workforce collaboratives and their respective annual rates of growth; completion rates in NFWS-supported training (70%); and rates of job seekers completing training and securing employment (70%). Projected post-placement earnings increases are based upon evidence from rigorous evaluation of comparable

Narratives

sectoral initiatives (e.g., P/PV, 2009) and 2008 data on participant wage increases as reported by NFWS-supported workforce partnerships. Three-year and 5-year metrics for numbers of new participating employers are based upon NFWS' historical experience, adjusted for differences in community size and projected mix of Start-Up and Scale-Up subgrantees.

Organizational Capacity

A. ABILITY TO PROVIDE PROGRAM OVERSIGHT

A1 NFWS HISTORY; TRANSITIONS & ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Fund's design was built on the experience of the Investing in Workforce Intermediaries (IWI) initiative. Begun in 2004, IWI supported the development of local workforce collaboratives in Boston, the Bay Area, Austin, Baltimore, Pennsylvania, New York City, and Rhode Island. Success in these pilot sites led national funders to conduct a feasibility study and plan for a major national initiative. US DOL joined in these efforts to fund a national evaluation, as it saw the emerging plan as a future vehicle for driving changes in the public workforce system. In late 2006 NFWS funding partners/investors engaged JFF as implementation partner, and the COF as collaborating partner for philanthropic leadership. After recruiting additional foundations, the Fund was launched in September 2007.

For its first grantee cohort, the Fund selected 10 collaboratives, including IWI-funded pilots and newly-formed collaboratives. Workforce Learning Strategies was competitively selected as evaluation partner. Additional national funders joined the initiative in 2007 and 2008. Twelve local collaboratives, including several in rural areas, were selected as a second cohort in 2008.

NFWS investments are spurring dramatic changes in workforce development systems and service delivery. The WLS evaluation has confirmed that between 2008 and 2009 the number of workforce partnerships created or expanded grew from 37 to 63; the number of job seekers and low-wage workers served increased from 6306 to 18,036; and the number of employers engaged nearly doubled from 504 to 998. The evaluation confirmed that NFWS grants have leveraged extraordinary investment by local funders -- better than a 4:1 leverage ratio.

Narratives

A2 ORGANIZATION'S EXPERIENCE

The Fund partners have extensive experience in investments and strategies to increase economic opportunity and in operating and overseeing relevant initiatives. Most national funding partners have been actively involved in workforce development for many years, some for decades. JFF was selected as the Fund's implementation partner because of its 25-year track record in spurring adoption and scale-up of social innovations through research and development, capacity building, and policy and systems work. Comparable programs operated and overseen by JFF - each large and multi-site, and successful in expanding innovative, evidence-based strategies -- include: the Gates Foundation-led Early College High School Initiative, which has successfully scaled the high-performing early college model to 220 schools serving 45,000 mostly disadvantaged students across 25 states; Jobs to Careers, a Robert Wood Johnson Foundation-led initiative to advance skill and career development of low-wage, front-line health care workers, which created 17 education-employer partnerships that revolutionize learning in the workplace; and Breaking Through, launched with multi-year Mott Foundation funding, through which 40 community colleges across 18 states have redesigned occupational-technical pathways to improve outcomes for lower-skilled adult learners.

A3 CAPACITY TO MANAGE A FEDERAL GRANT

As the NFWS implementation partner, JFF will manage the SIF grant and provide on-site monitoring of subgrantee financial and other systems required for Federal grant administration. Specific processes and procedures that JFF will use to ensure fiscal compliance are described in Subsection B5 of Part II.

JFF has significant capacity to manage a federal grant and has administered many government-funded grants and contracts, including multi-year grants and contracts with the U.S. Depts. of Labor and Education. JFF recently competed successfully for the US Department of Education Streamlined Acquisition Tool (ED-SAT) for technical assistance services. JFF has substantial experience providing fiscal management and oversight for complex national initiatives, working with numerous subgrantees simultaneously and with different funding sources that have their own processes, requirements, and

Narratives

procedures. JFF's eight-person professional fiscal department is well-versed in OMB Circular A-133 and Circular A-122. JFF's personnel have taken continuing education courses on Federal Cost Principles, OMB Circular A-133; have access to qualified consultants specializing in federal grants and contracts; and understand responsibilities under OMB Circular A-133 to monitor subgrantees for fiscal as well as program compliance.

A4 EVALUATIONS CONDUCTED OR SPONSORED

The Fund is conducting an evaluation of the national initiative and sponsoring and guiding independent evaluations by each local workforce collaborative. The national evaluation design is for a formative and summative evaluation of the initiative's first six years. Its methodology, including data collection and analyses, can be found in the Evaluation Design document at:

<http://www.nfwsolutions.org/classroom/tools>. The 2009 Baseline Evaluation Report documents activities and outcomes over the first full implementation year. (<http://nfwsolutions.org/evaluation-baseline-local>). The second evaluation report, covering program year II, will be completed in Spring 2010.

The Fund requires each local collaborative to conduct an independent evaluation of its local systems impacts and participant outcomes. Local evaluations use the same performance metrics as the national evaluation as well as additional metrics related to the particular local collaborative goals. Local data collection strategies include quantitative MIS databases on participant demographics, services received, and outcomes, as well as site visits, surveys and telephone interviews with service providers, employers, and other stakeholders. Recent local evaluation reports are at <http://nfwsolutions.org/evaluation-baseline-local>.

A5 PROCEDURES FOR HIGH QUALITY, INDEPENDENT EVALUATIONS

The Fund ensures high standards of quality and independence in evaluations in several ways. The most important has been to choose a highly experienced and nationally regarded evaluation team to conduct the ongoing third-party national evaluation. The NFWS Performance, Evaluation, and Research

Narratives

subcommittee reviewed the proposed evaluation design in detail, to ensure it would meet NFWS goals and could be conducted at a high level of technical quality and independence. The subcommittee meets quarterly by phone with the national evaluators to review progress and address technical and conceptual issues. The evaluators provide quarterly memos and a yearly report to the Investor Committee, enabling in-depth discussion of the evaluation process, progress, and quality.

NFWS national evaluators provide guidelines for the design and standard metrics of local evaluations, and assist local collaboratives in selecting evaluators capable of producing both quantitative analysis of participant outcomes and assessments of systems impacts. The national evaluators have developed a detailed Data Dictionary and Data Collection and Reporting Guide to ensure data integrity and quality across sites.

A6 USING AND SHARING EVALUATION RESULTS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The Fund shares evaluation results and findings and uses them regularly as the basis for program improvement discussions with grantees. This typically happens during the annual review of site progress against the goals detailed in its MOU. This use of evaluation data in the site review has enabled several struggling sites to develop new strategies and approaches, helping them improve outcomes.

A7 RANGE OF REPLICATIONS OR EXPANSIONS.

NFWS has overseen and sponsored replications across highly diverse communities and regions. The 2007 and 2008 replication cohorts include a range of collaboratives: some serve large urban neighborhoods; some are in large, medium and small metropolitan areas; and others in rural regions. Across the grantee communities, there are significant differences in the local economy, and the workforce, education, and stakeholder landscape; but NFWS technical and financial support has enabled each new grantee to begin implementation of community-wide reform. Since 2007, NFWS technical assistance and sponsorship of peer-to-peer networking has supported workforce partnership expansion into 10 industry sectors, including health care, green sectors, and manufacturing.

A8 RESOURCES FOR SUBGRANTEE REPLICATION OR EXPANSION

Narratives

NFWS provides a range of services and resources to assist subgrantee replication and expansion. As NFWS implementation partner, JFF provides intensive coaching to replication sites, together with planning tools (readiness assessments, success criteria, etc.). JFF's ongoing technical assistance to NFWS grantees includes consultation on workforce partnership expansion. To support expansion and replication, JFF devotes time of over a dozen staff, including the NFWS Executive Director, senior and mid-level project staff from its Building Economic Opportunity division, policy experts, researchers, trainers, and consultants.

WLS, as evaluation partner, provides significant tools (e.g., the Data Dictionary) and assistance (site-specific and cross-site) to new and existing sites. COF, as philanthropic leadership partner, helps collaboratives secure resources for expansion through outreach to local and regional foundations.

A9 SUPPORTING/OVERSEERING MULTIPLE PROGRAMS AND LOCATIONS

JFF brings significant organizational competencies that assure effective support and oversight across multiple grantees and locations. JFF oversees NFWS investments in 22 workforce collaboratives nationally. JFF has assembled a highly qualified team to provide extensive technical assistance and support, as well as fiscal and grants management. Program and technical assistance includes the time of over a dozen staff and consultants, each with at least 5 -- 10 years in the workforce development field and deep content and oversight expertise. JFF's fiscal staff have extensive experience in fiscal and grants management in large-scale, multi-site initiatives.

A10 CURRENT OR PREVIOUS PROGRAMMATIC RELATIONSHIPS

The Fund develops and maintains significant programmatic relationships with grantees. This begins when interested nonprofit organizations receive strategic consultation as they are preparing an application for a NFWS grant, and it extends to ongoing technical assistance and support throughout the duration of the Fund grant.

A11 MONITORING SITE COMPLIANCE PROGRAMMATIC REQUIREMENTS

NFWS will monitor compliance by SIF grantees through regular contact between subgrantees and site

Narratives

coaches and through site reporting requirements. Coaches will review monthly the progress against MOU deliverables and the annual site workplan, and they will conduct annual formal site visits to assess progress and compliance. Through such monitoring, programmatic compliance issues will surface and be addressed early. Local collaboratives submit quarterly data summaries, which are reviewed against annual performance goals, and mid-year and annual narrative and financial progress reports.

B. BOARD OF DIRECTORS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND STAFF

B1 MANAGEMENT AND STAFF STRUCTURE

The NFWS Investor Committee is the governing board for the Fund. Comprised of all contributing NFWS funding partners, the Investor Committee defines the mission, vision, goals and strategic direction for the Fund; assures that the Fund is adequately funded; and provides oversight for operations and activities. The Investor Committee meets quarterly.

The Executive Committee - comprised of the Investor Committee Chair and Co-Chair and two the sub-committee chairs -- is charged with acting expeditiously on policy, fiscal, and administrative matters that require immediate guidance and/or decisions. The Executive Committee also provides oversight for the Fund's comprehensive communications strategy. The Executive Committee, the President/CEO of JFF, the Executive Director of the Fund, and the Vice President of JFF's Building Economic Opportunity division convene monthly.

Investor Committee members serve on at least one of the following subcommittees, which meet quarterly: Budget and Resource Development; Policy and Advocacy; and Performance, Evaluation and Research.

B2 KEY PROGRAM POSITIONS

Three key staff positions within JFF and one within COF provide day-to-day management, oversight and guidance. These positions are assisted by the full range of functions provided through additional personnel at JFF and COF.

FRED DEDRICK, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NFWS. The Executive Director has a dual reporting

Narratives

relationship to the Chair of the Investor Committee and to the President/CEO of JFF. He acts on behalf of the Investor Committee on all matters related to NFWS, and serves as the primary liaison between the Investor Committee, JFF and COF. He manages the NFWS project team at JFF and provides overall direction and management for all Fund-related operations and activities. He also directs the work of consultants, including Rosenberg Communications and Brody Weiser Burns.

MARIA FLYNN, VICE PRESIDENT, JFF. As VP of JFF's Building Economic Opportunity division, Ms. Flynn provides executive leadership for NFWS implementation. In conjunction with the Fund's E.D., she advises the Investor Committee on initiative design and implementation, oversees execution of JFF implementation and staffing plans, and budgeting. As a former member of the federal government's Senior Executive Service, she is expert in federal procurement rules and grants management.

GERI SCOTT, PROGRAM DIRECTOR, JFF. As Project Director for JFF, Ms. Scott oversees the work of staff and external consultants to implement the NFWS work plan, coordinates with national partners and the Investor Committee on design and implementation, and coordinates with other JFF departments to support communications, grants management, and budgets. She manages technical assistance and monitoring across the grantee portfolio.

STEPHANIE POWERS, PROJECT DIRECTOR, COF. Ms. Powers develops opportunities for foundation leaders to engage in regional collaboratives. She oversees the national outreach and information dissemination to foundations across the country.

C. PLAN FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT OR IMPROVEMENT

NFWS conducts regular assessments of its overall systems, structure, staffing, and other capacities, as part of its continuous improvement process. Assessments are conducted by external and internal parties. WLS, the national evaluator, gathers and reports qualitative data on the Fund's systems, structure, staffing and capacity each year. The Performance, Evaluation, and Research subcommittee conducts regular internal assessments addressing qualitative and quantitative factors (e.g., cost of operations, success factors in managing relationships with collaboratives, staffing strengths and

Narratives

weaknesses). Assessments are reviewed at quarterly Investor Committee meetings, and are important inputs for the annual strategic planning retreat.

B. ABILITY TO PROVIDE FISCAL OVERSIGHT

B1 QUALIFICATIONS AND STRATEGIC COLLABORATIONS

The National Fund for Workforce Solutions is an eligible partnership as defined under the NOFA and qualified to apply as a SIF intermediary. The NFWS is an initiative of the following existing grantmaking institutions, all of whom are organizations where investing in nonprofit community organizations or programs is an essential part of fulfilling their respective missions: Annie E. Casey Foundation; The California Endowment; Ford Foundation; John S. and James L. Knight Foundation; The Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation; The Hitachi Foundation; The Prudential Foundation; The Walmart Foundation. Although not an existing grantmaking institution, the Microsoft Corporation is also a NFWS funding partner.

Jobs for the Future, a Section 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization and recognized leader in workforce development programs and strategies for economically disadvantaged individuals, is the Fund's implementation partner, responsible for managing NFWS pooled funds, making NFWS grants to local collaboratives, grants management, technical assistance, policy and research support, and evaluation management.

NFWS' collaborating partners are: the Council on Foundations, responsible for engaging and supporting the network of local foundations participating in NFWS local workforce collaboratives; and Workforce Learning Strategies, responsible for conducting a formative and summative national evaluation of the initiative.

B2 GRANTS MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE AND INFRASTRUCTURE

JFF has significant grants management experience and infrastructure. With a \$30 million annual budget, JFF has successfully managed dozens of grants and contracts for public and private funders. Across a number of large, national initiatives, JFF administers and manages numerous sub-grants to

Narratives

program partners -- totaling \$9 million during its most recently completed fiscal year. JFF also has an approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement with the Department of Labor.

JFF's fiscal and grant administration is built upon systems, processes, and administrative controls that ensure compliance with Federal fiscal and administrative rules, regulations, and requirements. Robust fiscal and budget systems include a general ledger that tracks expenses and revenues by fund source, a monthly time/labor tracking system, and monthly budget to actual reports. JFF's grant and contract management staff confirm grant and contract allowance and budget availability, monitor and approve expenses against approved budgets, produce accurate and timely fiscal and expenditure reports to numerous funders, and conduct regular reviews with senior leadership on all grant and contract reporting, expenses, and budgets. Reflecting its high capacity to manage large and complex grants, JFF has had unqualified independent financial audits for 11 consecutive years.

B3 and B4 CURRENT ORGANIZATIONAL BUDGET; PERCENTAGE OF BUDGET THIS GRANT REPRESENTS

The Fund's partner responsible for fiscal and grants management, JFF, has a current organizational budget of \$30,027,275. The requested SIF grant would represent 11.4% of JFF's budget.

B5 ENSURING COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

JFF will provide fiscal oversight and ensure compliance with Federal requirements through the following processes and procedures:

- * All subgrantees shall be informed of their legal requirements to be in compliance with all appropriate OMB Circulars and applicable rules and regulations, including but not limited to OMB Circular A-133, the relevant cost principles and the appropriate procurement standards. All subgrantees will be provided with the appropriate CFDA number and any special conditions passed to JFF from the Corporation.
- * Each potential subgrantee will be required to prepare and submit to JFF a budget and budget narrative. Any material changes to the budget (i.e. changes to line items in excess of 10% or changes to

Narratives

key personnel) must be approved by JFF in advance.

* All subgrantees will be required to certify to JFF that all federal funds will only be expended for allowable costs as defined in the appropriate OMB Cost Principles Circular.

* If a subgrantee qualifies for A-133 Audit, a copy of this audit will be requested. If the A-133 Audit includes findings and questioned costs pertaining to Federal Funds passed through by JFF to a subgrantee, that subgrantee will be required to submit a corrective action plan to JFF.

* On a quarterly basis, each subgrantee will be required to submit a financial statement on an accrual basis for the quarter and the project to date.

* If necessary, experienced JFF fiscal personnel will make a site visit to the subgrantee to review supporting documentation for any costs found to be questionable upon review of quarterly financial statements and budget comparisons.

Budget/Cost Effectiveness

A. BUDGET AND PROGRAM DESIGN

A1 DIVERSE, NON-FEDERAL SOURCES

The Fund is predicated upon a diverse funding base designed to ensure budget adequacy and long-term sustainability. At the core is a collaborative investment strategy that brings together a diverse set of public and private funders at the national and local levels. Counteracting traditional practice in workforce development funding, in which funders invest in a series of disconnected interventions that do not roll-up into a comprehensive strategy, NFWS drives collaborative investment that results in alignment of diverse resources for greater impact.

The Fund is applying for \$3.85 million from the SIF, matched by \$4.35 million of private funding, for the first year of a five-year initiative. In Year I, NFWS will secure significant match funds from a set of private funders (described below) to support subgrants and intermediary-level activities.

Substantial non-federal resources at the subgrantee level will also assure successful program implementation and sustainability. \$5.1 million (80% of the \$3.8 million, or \$3 million, in SIF funds,

Narratives

plus \$2.1 million in match funds) will be subgranted to the two categories of workforce collaboratives described in Section I. Six to eight Start-Up Collaboratives will each be funded at \$150,000 a year. Twelve to 16 Scale-Up Collaboratives will be funded at levels that range from \$200,000 to \$300,000 per year. Grantees funded at the \$150,000 level will secure at least a 4:1 match, or \$600,000 per year, in local matching funds. Scale-Up sites will secure at least a 4:1 match at for the first \$150,000 in SIF funds and a 1:1 match for the additional \$50,000 to \$150,000 in SIF funds they will receive, or at least \$650,000 to \$750,000 per year in total (see also "Match Sources" below).

A2 BUDGET ADEQUACY

This budget has been developed based on lessons learned from Fund operations to date and third-party evaluation of national and grantee activities. Subgrant award amounts, combined with local match funds, will enable workforce collaboratives to develop and expand significant activities that will result in robust outcomes and outputs as described in Section I. Intermediary-level budget allocations are adequate to support high quality program and fiscal oversight as well site-specific and cross-site technical assistance and support, which will be designed to address operational challenges faced by subgrantees as well as their strategies for expansion.

In Year One, 20 percent of the SIF funds and \$2.25 million in matching funds will be allocated to intermediary-level activities, as follows:

PERSONNEL: \$525,221 (\$142,109 SIF and \$383,112 match) for a total of 5.5 FTE. The fringe benefits total \$141,810 (\$38,370 SIF and \$103,440 match). This includes:

- * .55 FTE for the Executive Director to provide overall direction and management of all Fund-related activity.
- * .2 FTE for the JFF VP to provide strategic direction and implementation oversight.
- * 1.0 FTE Senior Project Manager to provide day-to-day operational management, including peer learning meetings, webinars, affinity groups, and coordination with other JFF departments and consultants.

Narratives

* 1.75 FTE to provide site coaching technical assistance to a subset of sites and to manage the third-party evaluation.

* 1 FTE to provide grant management, including contract development for subgrantees and consultants and approval of reports and invoices.

* .5 FTE in administrative support

* .5 FTE in conference planning support and editorial and design support for publications and communications.

CONSULTANTS: \$925,000 (\$200,000 SIF and \$725,200 match) for technical assistance (\$248,400), affinity groups 5 @ \$25,800 each), and the third-party evaluation (\$496,800).

MEETING COSTS: \$305,768 (\$46,643 SIF and \$259,125 match) for up to 3 peer conferences for three representatives each from up to 24 subgrantees. NFWS pays for hotel costs, speaker honoraria, materials for each 1½ day meeting. Subgrantees pay their own travel.

TRAVEL: \$101,300 (\$33,300 SIF and \$68,000 match) for travel to subgrantee meetings, conferences, partner meeting trips, and 30 due diligence site visits as part of the site selection process. Costs include air travel, local transportation, hotel and per diem for 1 or 2 overnights @1,100 to 1,360/trip

PRODUCTION AND OTHER DIRECT COSTS: \$62,467 (\$19,726 SIF and \$42,741 match) for production, technology, telephone, supplies and other direct costs.

INDIRECT COSTS: \$958,236 (\$289,853 SIF and \$668,383 match) calculated at JFF's approved indirect cost rate of 36%.

B. MATCH SOURCES

The Fund has secured the following match for Year I at the time of application from three leading national funders: Annie E. Casey Foundation - \$925,000, the Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation - \$1 million, and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation - \$250,000. Letters of Commitment from these foundations have been submitted to the Corporation. This \$2,175,000 million in secured dollars equals 56% of the \$3.85 million requested.

Narratives

The Fund is aggressively pursuing additional grantmaking institutions to join as NFWS funding partners and provide the balance of the required Year One match. NFWS has approached the Hitachi Foundation, Walmart Foundation, the Open Society Institute, and the Bank of America Charitable Foundation. Commitments have not yet been secured as the funding cycles of these organizations fall after the due date of this application.

In addition to the private dollars included in the match, approximately \$1.2 million in additional resources will support the work of the Fund. These resources come from other funding partners, including the Ford Foundation, the Prudential Foundation, and Microsoft Corporation, and they will be used for additional technical assistance, peer learning activities, grants, financial management, and philanthropic outreach. While these resources are not included in SIF match, the SIF subgrantees will benefit from the activities and information generated by these investments.

All subgrantees will be required to match the first \$150,000 of SIF dollars 4:1, four times the amount required by the SIF. A 1:1 match will be required for any amounts above \$150,000 awarded to a subgrantee. To date, the Fund's match requirement has leveraged over \$100 million from 256 local funders to date, including philanthropy, corporate giving, United Ways, and city and state government. Most current Fund grantees have exceeded the matching requirement. If eight start-up collaboratives are funded at \$150,000 each -- the investment of \$1.2 million will leverage at least \$4.8 million in local match. If 16 scale-up collaboratives are funded at \$250,000 -- the investment of \$4 million will leverage \$11.2 million in local match.

Clarification Summary

1. Will you issue a competitive RFP for a "MODERATE level impact evaluation"? When do you propose to secure your evaluation partner?

Yes. The National Fund will issue a competitive RFP for the moderate level impact evaluation of SIF-funded investments. We anticipate disseminating the RFP to a set of at least five or six evaluation firms

Narratives

that are identified by the NFWS Investor Committee and JFF as having the experience and technical capacity to implement a moderate level impact evaluation. To align with the schedule we have proposed for selection of Scale-Up Collaboratives for SIF sub-grants, the impact evaluation evaluator will be selected within four months of the National Fund receiving a SIF award.

2. What challenges might Start-Up collaboratives in the South face and how does your program design address these challenges? How have you budgeted for these challenges?

We anticipate that Start-Up collaboratives in the South may encounter several kinds of challenges, each of which the National Fund is prepared to address.

First, there are general start-up issues for any new collaborative related to setting strategic goals, hiring staff, and implementing new, innovative designs. As we have done in the past, the Fund will provide an orientation for new sites, linked to a National Fund peer learning meeting. The orientation will address collaborative governance, workforce partnership design, and evaluation and grant management, among other key topics. The peer learning meeting that follows will provide new collaboratives with the opportunity to develop connections with mature collaboratives to call upon for start-up advice and ongoing peer consultation in the future. Additionally, we will assign coaches to the Start-Up sites who are experienced in supporting the launch of workforce collaboratives through the Fund. We have budgeted for both peer learning opportunities and site coaching in our proposed budget.

Second, regional economies in the South are frequently a mix of urban and rural economies, and as such, they present a unique set of challenges to workforce initiative design and implementation.

Regional economies in the South are also undergoing dramatic transformation due to the influences of globalization and growth of the knowledge economy. Supplementing the expertise NFWS management

Narratives

and site coaches in addressing these factors, the National Fund has and will continue to consult with economic and workforce development experts with deep knowledge of Southern economies, including Aspen Institute's Communities Strategies Group, and MDC, Inc. We have budgeted funds for such experts under the consulting line item in the budget.

A third factor to consider as the National Fund expands to the South (and Southwest) is the smaller philanthropic presence in some regions. Although there are fewer and smaller foundations in many regions, there are still significant opportunities in communities to align resources from community foundations, United Ways, and public sources, including community colleges, adult education, economic development, community development, among others. The Council on Foundations will provide technical assistance to prospective collaboratives to help them identify public and philanthropic resources in their community and to develop effective outreach strategies. Such COF support will be provided outside the SIF budget.

An additional challenge that Start-Up Collaboratives in the South may face is the limited experience of local workforce development systems with career advancement strategies that integrate education and workforce training with significant employer engagement. The National Fund provides considerable technical assistance on the workforce partnership approach, including sample RFPs for collaboratives, workforce partnership design guides, monthly webinars on different aspects of career advancement, and sector networking groups that include practitioners in healthcare, manufacturing, construction, and green sectors. In addition, the National Fund expects each collaborative to invest in "capacity building" within the region, through professional development workshops, planning and curriculum development investments, and technical assistance to service providers. Such technical assistance supports are reflected in the proposed budget, in the staffing and consultant line items.

Narratives

Finally, there are disproportionately low literacy levels among low-income workers in regions across the South, presenting particular challenges in preparing such workers for mid-skilled jobs. Although significant, this challenge is not unique to the South, and several National Fund collaboratives have developed innovative approaches, including contextualized literacy linked to occupational training and long-term strategies that continue to build workers' skills after they have begun employment, and to work with employers and post secondary institutions to make education and training more accessible to working adults. The National Fund facilitates site-to-site exchanges, peer learning meetings, webinars, and technical assistance coaching to share such strategies among collaboratives (again budgeted for in the proposed SIF budget).

3. You note, "each grantee is required to commission an independent local evaluation". How do you assist subgrantees in selecting an appropriate evaluator and designing an appropriate study? How do you ensure consistent quality across your portfolio?

There are several ways in which we assist subgrantees to select an appropriate evaluator and design an appropriate study. We have:

- * Developed an evaluation guide on how to select, implement and oversee a local evaluation;
- * Provided sample RFPs and technical assistance to collaboratives as they develop RFPs for local evaluators; and
- * Assisted collaboratives by reviewing and commenting on local evaluation proposals.

There are a number of ways in which the National Fund helps to ensure consistent quality across the portfolio of local evaluations. We have:

- * Provided common question protocols that local evaluators use as a base for their protocols;
- * Developed a data dictionary and reporting guidelines describing data metrics, reporting processes,

Narratives

common definitions for reporting categories and metrics;

* Facilitated regular calls between national and local evaluators; and

* Assigned a member of the national evaluation team as a liaison to each local evaluator.

4. What indicators are on the quarterly data dashboard? Can you provide an illustrative example of how the dashboard impacted your approach to supporting collaboratives?

Quarterly data dashboards provide grant management indicators to track the collaboratives' progress implementing their initiatives, including meeting systems change goals, expanding the resources available to the collaborative, and in serving job-seekers, incumbent workers, and employers. Progress is measured against one- and three-year benchmarks for workers and employers served, funders involved, funds raised, workforce partnerships established, and sectors organized.

EMPLOYER INDICATORS that are tracked include the number of employers served and employer cash and in-kind contributions. SYSTEMS CHANGE indicators that are tracked through the dashboards include: Changes to institutional practices; changes in employer practices; policy accomplishments; and program accomplishments. INDICATORS FOR JOB-SEEKERS include: the number of job-seekers served; the number of job-seekers enrolled in training/education; the total number of job placements; the number of placements at different wage levels; retention in employment; and the number of education or industry credentials received. INDICATORS FOR INCUMBENT WORKERS include: the total incumbent workers served; the number who are enrolled in training/education; the number who receive wage increases; the number of promotions; and number of education or industry credentials received.

The JFF-NFWS management team and NFWS Investor Committee analyze the individual and aggregate

Narratives

dashboard indicators in a quarterly review to gauge progress towards the initiative's overall goals and to flag issues that warrant an intervention. For example, at the end of the first quarter in FY 2010, the dashboards revealed that too few workforce partnerships were implementing incumbent worker services, even though the economy was still reeling from the effects of the recession and there were few new jobs available for unemployed workers. In response, the NFWS management team implemented a series of interventions to raise the visibility of incumbent worker strategies for workforce development in a jobless recovery. These included increased emphasis by site coaches on program designs and policies to promote incumbent worker advancement, affinity group meetings that featured examples of incumbent worker designs, and webinars addressing the development of incumbent worker services with employers.

5. What are the qualifications you look for in site coaches?

The National Fund looks for site coaches who have significant experience (10 years or more) in specific aspects of workforce development, including career advancement strategies, employer engagement, sectoral partnerships, and workforce intermediaries. Along with content expertise, we look for individuals with substantial experience as senior level technical assistance providers or as workforce program designers, either in consulting at the national level or as implementers of multi-site projects. We also seek site coaches who have worked with private philanthropy, public sector funders, and employers. Because National Fund coaches play a dual role as strategic advisors to the collaboratives and as the National Fund's grants management representatives to sub-grantees, we seek site coaches who have sophisticated interpersonal skills, with the ability to balance technical assistance provision with grants management functions.

6. Please clarify the proposed role of the Council on Foundations.

Narratives

The proposed role of the Council on Foundations (COF) includes technical assistance to local collaboratives and building knowledge among local and national funders in the work of the Fund. More specifically, COF's proposed role includes: 1) Technical assistance to local funders in order to build their capacity to support and sustain local collaboratives; 2) technical assistance to collaboratives and workforce partnerships to increase their ability to work productively with other regional workforce system stakeholders; 3) increasing NFWS's visibility among COF members, to build interest in and appreciation for the Fund's work, and to create opportunities for cooperative grant making; and 4) generating increased dialogue among local and national funders to improve understanding of NFWS strategic principles, local implementation strategies, future NFWS plans, and to share best practices. All such COF activities are to be funded outside the proposed SIF budget.

For Official Use Only

Required Documents

Document Name

Status

Match Verification

Sent

For Official Use Only

2010 Social Innovation Fund

Jobs for the Future, Inc.

Section 2 – Budget

**National Fund for Workforce Solutions
Jobs for the Future, Inc.**

Application ID: 10SI115304

Budget Dates: 08/01/2010 - 07/31/2015

	Total Amt	CNCS Share	Grantee Share
Section I. Program Costs			
A. Project Personnel Expenses	999,613	305,425	694,188
B. Personnel Fringe Benefits	269,896	82,466	187,430
FICA	0	0	0
Health Insurance	0	0	0
Retirement	0	0	0
Life Insurance	0	0	0
Total	<u>\$269,896</u>	<u>\$82,466</u>	<u>\$187,430</u>
C. Travel	767,950	174,212	593,738
D. Equipment			
E. Supplies	14,144	13,236	908
F. Contractual and Consultant Services	1,750,773	435,830	1,314,943
H. Other Costs	5,292,329	3,115,156	2,177,173
Subgrants	5,180,000	3,080,000	2,100,000
Total	<u>\$10,472,329</u>	<u>\$6,195,156</u>	<u>\$4,277,173</u>
Section I. Subtotal	\$14,274,705	\$7,206,325	\$7,068,380
Section II. Indirect Costs			
J. Federally Approved Indirect Cost Rate			
Indirect Costs	1,625,292	493,675	1,131,617
Total	<u>\$1,625,292</u>	<u>\$493,675</u>	<u>\$1,131,617</u>
Section II. Subtotal	\$1,625,292	\$493,675	\$1,131,617
Budget Totals	\$15,899,997	\$7,700,000	\$8,199,997
Funding Percentages		48.4%	51.6%
Required Match		n/a	
# of years Receiving CNCS Funds		n/a	

2010 Social Innovation Fund

Jobs for the Future, Inc.

Section 3 – Budget Narrative

Budget Narrative: National Fund for Workforce Solutions for Jobs for the Future, Inc.**Section I. Program Costs****A. Project Personnel Expenses**

Position/Title -Qty -Annual Salary -% Time	CNCS Share	Grantee Share	Total Amount
Year 1 Vice President: - 1 person(s) at 190867 each x 20 % usage	19,086	19,087	38,173
Year 1 Executive Director: - 1 person(s) at 190867 each x 55 % usage	19,087	85,890	104,977
Year 1 Program Director: - 1 person(s) at 118574 each x 60 % usage	0	71,144	71,144
Year 1 Senior Project Manager: - 2 person(s) at 89067 each x 100 % usage	97,974	80,160	178,134
Year 1 Project Manager: - 1 person(s) at 68523 each x 56 % usage	0	38,373	38,373
Year 1 Project Assistant: - 1 person(s) at 48021 each x 100 % usage	0	48,021	48,021
Year 1 Senior Project Manager: - 1 person(s) at 89067 each x 32.6 % usage	0	29,036	29,036
Year 1 Project Assistant: - 1 person(s) at 48021 each x 30.47 % usage	3,602	11,030	14,632
Year 2 Vice President: - 1 person(s) at 190867 each x 20 % usage	21,703	16,470	38,173
Year 2 Executive Director: - 1 person(s) at 190867 each x 48 % usage	22,904	68,712	91,616
Year 2 Program Director: - 1 person(s) at 118574 each x 49 % usage	0	58,101	58,101
Year 2 Senior Project Manager: - 2 person(s) at 89067 each x 100 % usage	115,787	62,347	178,134
Year 2 Senior Project Manager: - 1 person(s) at 89067 each x 29.5 % usage	0	26,275	26,275
Year 2 Project Manager: - 1 person(s) at 68523 each x 46 % usage	0	31,521	31,521
Year 2 Program Assistant: - 1 person(s) at 48021 each x 100 % usage	0	48,021	48,021
Year 2 Program Assistant: - 1 person(s) at 48021 each x 11 % usage	5,282	0	5,282
CATEGORY Totals	305,425	694,188	999,613

B. Personnel Fringe Benefits

Purpose -Calculation	CNCS Share	Grantee Share	Total Amount
FICA: Included Above	0	0	0
Health Insurance: Included Above	0	0	0
Retirement: Included Above	0	0	0
Life Insurance: Included Above	0	0	0
Year 1 Fringe Benefits: 27% x Salary per Indirect Cost Rate Agreement including FICA, Unemployment, Health, Dental and other Insurances, Retirement and other benefits	37,733	103,340	141,073

Year 2 Fringe Benefits: All Fringe Benefits at 27%	44,733	84,090	128,823
CATEGORY Totals	82,466	187,430	269,896

C. Travel

Purpose -Calculation	CNCS Share	Grantee Share	Total Amount
Year 1 Due Diligence Site Visits: 30 person trips x 1,110 per trip	33,300	0	33,300
Year 1 Partner Meetings, Training, Peer Learning: 50 person trips x \$1,360 per trip	0	68,000	68,000
Year 1 Peer Learning Meeting Costs: 3 Meetings x 3 Participants per site x 24 Sites x \$1,416	46,643	259,125	305,768
Year 2 Due Diligence Site visits: 30 Visits X \$1,309 per	39,270	0	39,270
Year 2 Conferences, Partner Meetings, Training: 41 trips * \$1,360 per trip	0	55,760	55,760
Year 2 Peer Learning Meetings: 3 meetings x 3 participants per site x 24 sites x \$1,230	54,999	210,853	265,852
CATEGORY Totals	174,212	593,738	767,950

D. Equipment

Item/Purpose -Qty -Unit Cost	CNCS Share	Grantee Share	Total Amount
CATEGORY Totals	0	0	0

E. Supplies

Item -Calculation	CNCS Share	Grantee Share	Total Amount
Year 1 Meeting Materials: 3 Meetings x 3 Participants per site x 24 Sites x \$11	1,815	561	2,376
Year 1 Printed Papers: 500 Copies x \$5	2,500	0	2,500
Year 1 Office Supplies: 12 Months x 22 Items x \$5 per	1,320	0	1,320
Year 2 Meeting Materials: 3 meetings x 3 participants per site x 24 sites x \$13	2,461	347	2,808
Year 2 Printed Papers/Outcomes: 5 copies x \$500	2,500	0	2,500
Year 2 Office Supplies: 12 months x 22 items x \$10	2,640	0	2,640
CATEGORY Totals	13,236	908	14,144

F. Contractual and Consultant Services

Purpose -Calculation	CNCS Share	Grantee Share	Total Amount
Year 1 Evaluation: 24 sites x 35 days x \$600/day	200,000	304,000	504,000

Year 1 Coaching: 24 sites x 17 days x \$600/day	0	244,800	244,800
Year 1 Rural: 42 days x \$600/day	0	25,200	25,200
Year 1 Green Jobs: 42 days x \$600/day	0	25,200	25,200
Year 1 Healthcare: 42 days x \$600/day	0	25,200	25,200
Year 1 Manufacturing: 42 days x \$600/day	0	25,200	25,200
Year 1 Skilled Trades: 42 days x \$600/day	0	25,200	25,200
Year 1 Documentation: 2 Products x 42 days per x \$600/day	0	50,200	50,200
Year 2 Evaluation: 24 Sites x 33 days x \$600/day	235,830	239,370	475,200
Year 2 Manufacturing: 24 Sites x 33 days x \$600/day	0	20,400	20,400
Year 2 Rural: 24 Sites x 33 days x \$600/day	0	20,400	20,400
Year 2 Green Jobs: 24 Sites x 33 days x \$600/day	0	20,400	20,400
Year 2 Healthcare: 24 Sites x 33 days x \$600/day	0	20,400	20,400
Year 2 Skilled Trades: 33 days x \$600/day	0	20,400	20,400
Year 2 Coaching: 24 Sites x 14.4 days x \$600	0	207,773	207,773
Year 2 Documentation: 2 products x 34 days each x \$600	0	40,800	40,800
CATEGORY Totals	435,830	1,314,943	1,750,773

H. Other Costs

Purpose - Calculation	CNCS Share	Grantee Share	Total Amount
Subgrants:	3,080,000	2,100,000	5,180,000
Year 1 Occupancy, Equipment, Telecommunications:	12,848	41,345	54,193
Year 1 Webinars & Conference Calls:	980	0	980
Year 1 Mailing & Shipping:	500	1,000	1,500
Year 1 Criminal Background Checks:	2,780	0	2,780
Year 1 Dues & Fees:	0	500	500
Year 2 Subgrants:	3,080,000	2,100,000	5,180,000
Year 2 Occupancy, Equipment, Telcomm:	15,121	33,602	48,723
Year 2 Webinars/conf calls:	1,178	0	1,178
Year 2 Mailing/Shipping:	1,279	326	1,605
Year 2 Dues & Fees:	490	400	890
CATEGORY Totals	6,195,156	4,277,173	10,472,329

SECTION Totals	7,206,325	7,068,390	14,274,705
PERCENTAGE	50%	50%	

Section II. Indirect Costs

J. Federally Approved Indirect Cost Rate

Calculation -Cost Type -Rate -Rate Claimed -Cost Basis	CNCS Share	Grantee Share	Total Amount
: Total Direct Costs: Indirect: 36% x (Total Direct Costs + first 25K of each subgrant) Year 1: 958,234 total; 289,852 CNCS Year 2: 687,057 total; 203,823 CNCS with a rate of 36 and a rate claimed of 36	493,875	1,131,617	1,625,292
CATEGORY Totals	493,875	1,131,617	1,625,292
SECTION Totals	493,875	1,131,617	1,625,292
PERCENTAGE	30%	70%	

BUDGET Totals	7,700,000	8,199,997	15,899,997
PERCENTAGE	48%	52%	

Source of Funds

Section	Match Description	Amount	Type	Source
Source of Funds	Weinberg Foundation	1,000,000	Cash	Private
	Casey Foundation	925,000	Cash	Private
	Knight Foundation	250,000	Cash	Private
Total Source of Funds		2,175,000		