

**WASHINGTON STATE  
WORKFORCE TRAINING AND EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD  
MEETING NO. 165  
SEPTEMBER 27, 2012**

***HIGH SKILLS, HIGH WAGES 2012-2022: WASHINGTON'S STRATEGIC PLAN FOR  
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT***

At the June Board meeting, the Board approved the dissemination for public review of a draft for *High Skills, High Wages 2012*. Since then, the Workforce Board conducted public forums in Everett, Tacoma, Spokane, and Yakima. Among the approximately 120 participants were representatives of large array of workforce development organizations and stakeholders. The Board also received comments on the draft through e-mail and a virtual forum for business representatives.

The public comments were overwhelmingly favorable. Many expressed support for the multiple pathways theme of the draft. Besides expressing support, the most common statements were about serving target populations and specifics regarding implementation.

Included in this tab is a proposed final draft for adoption by the Board. Changes from the previous draft include the addition of a preamble. The preamble explains that this edition of *High Skills, High Wages* is written at a higher level than previous editions, and that the details of implementation and the specifics of serving particular target populations are not forgotten, but are generally not addressed in the plan. In the body of the plan, the final draft includes some relatively minor changes that are highlighted for the Board to see.

Also, included in this tab is a draft for the accountability chapter of *High Skills, High Wages 2012*. This draft is presented for the Board's discussion. It is anticipated that adoption will occur at the November meeting (along with adoption of background chapters on the economy and the workforce). The draft updates the accountability chapter from 2008 in order to make it current. Things that are completed or no longer done are deleted. Deleted language is crossed out and new language is underlined. No changes are made to the state core measures section of the chapter, pending the future review of state core measures by the Board. The accountability chapter includes performance results and targets for major workforce programs. These have not yet been updated, but will be updated for the Board's consideration in November.

**Board Action Requested:** Discussion and adoption of the Recommended Motion.

## Recommended Motion

**WHEREAS**, State statute RCW 28C.18.060 directs the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board to “Develop and maintain a state comprehensive plan for workforce training and education, including but not limited to, goals, objectives, and priorities for the state training system,” and

**WHEREAS**, State statute RCW 28C.18.080 directs that the “state comprehensive plan for workforce training and education shall be updated every four years and presented to the Governor and the appropriate legislative policy committees,” and

**WHEREAS**, The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board has shared drafts of the Goals, Objectives, and Strategies for *High Skills, High Wages 2012 - 2022* with stakeholders throughout the state, including at public forums, and has incorporated stakeholder suggestions into the final draft

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, That the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board adopts the Goals, Objectives, and Strategies for *High Skills, High Wages 2012 - 2022: Washington’s Strategic Plan for Workforce Development*.

## ***HIGHS SKILLS, HIGH WAGES 2012-2022*** **GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND STRATEGIES**

### **Preamble**

Welcome to *2012-22 High Skills, High Wages*, Washington's strategic plan for workforce development.

This blueprint for workforce development offers strategies aimed at helping more Washington residents move ahead into high-skill, high-wage jobs, while also helping employers find the skilled workers they depend on.

This is not a simple endeavor. In fact, it's proven harder in recent years as more jobs call for higher levels of education and skills across a wide range of industries. Moreover, we have not made sufficient gains in improving high school graduation rates, especially among disadvantaged students. The divide between those able to obtain living-wage jobs and those living on the margins has widened. At the same time, Washington businesses have struggled to find workers with the skills needed to fill key openings, hampering their ability to be competitive in an increasingly global economy.

This edition of *High Skills, High Wages* takes a new look at chronic challenges, approaching common issues with a fresh eye. Our commitment remains to all Washington residents, even the most disadvantaged. But this plan addresses challenges and defines solutions in a broader, more cohesive way.

Instead of addressing individual populations, defining their needs, and outlining solutions; this plan looks at the workforce system as a whole, then pulls apart key pieces to focus on in the coming years. We call this a multiple pathways approach. By viewing the workforce system as a series of interconnected pathways, with multiple options for workers and students to advance, we are able to outline strategies to strengthen these pathways so more Washington residents move ahead in their education, work experience, job skills, and lives.

The changes in our economy to being more knowledge based, technology-dependent and global, requires current workers to be able gain new skills and education throughout their careers and young people to better understand how their classroom learning relates to work. For youth particularly, education and work need to be more fully integrated so they can more quickly find their place in the economy and not get stuck and passed by future generations.

This plan envisions employers as a central component of our workforce system. To ensure the system is strongly aligned with their needs, employers need to be active participants in the system's design, delivery, and evaluation of training programs. Running through this plan is the theme of employers as both customers and co-investors in the workforce system.

While our system has made headway over the past 20 years, many Washington residents continue to be left behind. To meet the challenges of the next 10 years, we need the concerted resources of all workforce system partners. The purpose of this plan is to provide direction on how we can do what we do well, more broadly, for the benefit of all.

# **Goal I**

## **Multiple Pathways for First Careers**

**Objective 1: Improve the availability and quality of career and education guidance for students in middle school, high school and postsecondary institutions.**

**Strategies:**

- a. Enhance career guidance for students.

Begin career guidance at an earlier age, involve parents and guardians, and value all career paths. Implement comprehensive guidance programs such as Navigation 101 at all Washington high schools and middle schools. Like the Navigation 101 program, bring career guidance into the classroom to enhance student engagement and make guidance more accessible. Prepare faculty to perform this role through professional development. Provide students and their families with extensive information about career pathways, and education and career opportunities, including opportunities that require a bachelor's degree and opportunities that call for a shorter-term investment in education and training. Make information about **apprenticeships** and entrepreneurship part of that guidance. Provide students at colleges, universities and other postsecondary institutions with greater access to guidance information.

- b. Partner with employers to help students explore careers and workplaces.

Increase the engagement of private sector partners at schools and colleges. Include businesses, unions, community-based organizations, and public sector employers in the effort to inform students about career opportunities. Bring partners into the classroom and provide students with the opportunity to explore workplaces. Leverage private and public resources at schools.

**Objective 2: Identify, assess, and certify skills for successful careers.**

**Strategies:**

- a. Increase workplace and life skills development for students.

In addition to academic skills and skills for specific careers, ensure students develop workplace and life skills. Workplace skills (also known as soft skills, work readiness, and employability skills) include such things as problem solving, positive work habits, team work, and many other skills. Employers report critical deficits in the workplace skills of new employees and job applicants. Life skills include the skills required to manage lives and careers; for example, financial literacy and safe and healthy living.

- b. Increase the use of industry-based skill standards, assessments, and credentials.

Bring the education system together with industry to identify skill standards and assessments, both general workplace standards and those specific to particular industries. Enable students to obtain industry-recognized credentials. Emphasize transferable skills that are useful across many occupations, and that “stack” towards career and educational progress **from high school through post-high school education and training**. Whenever possible, select standards that enhance hiring and promotion within a targeted industry cluster. Have faculty consult regularly with industry representatives so standards remain relevant.

### **Objective 3: Expand Programs of Study that bring together a sequence of career-focused courses that start in high school and extend through college.**

#### **Strategies:**

- a. Expand the use of Programs of Study.

Programs of Study provide a sequential, **accessible** road map of courses required for a career pathway, including multiple points for students to stop out to work and reenter without losing momentum, and to take branches leading to more specific careers. Programs of Study will be a regular way that education is organized.

- b. Improve the transfer of credits earned in a student’s Program of Study.

Offer high school students the chance to earn credits for both high school and college through Programs of Study. Create an easy transfer of these “dual credits” among colleges and universities. Improve articulation among the state’s two-year colleges, and between two-year and four-year institutions so that credits earned in one institution are applicable at another. Open source curriculum and common course numbering could help more students earn credits that transfer easily among different institutions.

### **Objective 4: Increase work-integrated learning.**

#### **Strategies:**

- a. Increase the number and types of workplace experiences available to students and out-of-school youth.

Create more opportunities for students and out-of-school youth to have work experiences. Experiences may include, among other things, paid and unpaid internships, workplace mentorships, pre-apprenticeships and apprenticeships, cooperative education, **summer employment**, and work study. Align work experiences with the student’s Program of Study, and build in transferable, academic credits whenever possible.

- b. Bring more work experiences into the classroom by engaging employers and workers.

Bring employers into the classroom and students into the workplace. Make what’s learned in the classroom more relevant to students by including project-based learning,

classroom visits by business and **public and not-for profit employers**, contextualized learning, and applied learning through internships and cooperative education. This can help students make experience-based career and education choices.

### **Objective 5: Improve student access and retention.**

#### **Strategies:**

- a. Expand high school dropout prevention and retrieval programs.

Prevent students from dropping out of high school and retrieve those students who have dropped out by expanding state programs. This includes programs that leverage the resources of middle and high schools, social service agencies, Workforce Development Councils, community-based-organizations, and other partners.

- b. Increase non-traditional opportunities to obtain postsecondary certificates and degrees.

Expand methods of reducing the time to postsecondary credentials including competency based learning programs and credit for prior learning. Make more “upside-down” degree programs available—programs that first provide vocational technical training so that students who leave college after a year or two have marketable skills, followed by general education leading to a bachelor’s degree. Grow the number of Applied Bachelor’s Degree programs at community and technical colleges. Develop more “earn and learn” models, such as those that integrate apprenticeship training and college degrees and certificates.

- c. Provide wrap-around and new models of support and employment services including special services for diverse populations with multiple barriers to education and training.

Enhance support services for diverse populations with multiple barriers to education and training, including those with disabilities. The services include traditional support services, but also rethinking how to serve people with barriers by creating new partnerships with employers, and with social service agencies and community-based organizations—better leveraging resources.

### **Objective 6: Job search and placement for people into first careers.**

#### **Strategies:**

- a. Help students locate and land jobs.

Strengthen partnerships between the education and WorkSource systems to share job-finding information and resources. Increase the use of the successful navigator model that provides brokers to help students understand the world of work and connect with employers. Help students identify their knowledge, skills and abilities and package themselves to meet the needs of the job. Teach students job search skills such as how to sift through job listings, write a resume, fill out a job application, and impress in an interview. Teach students networking skills. Bring together schools and colleges with business and labor organizations so students have easier access to potential jobs.

## **Goal II**

### **Multiple Pathways for Employers and Workers**

#### **Objective 1: Increase employer engagement with the workforce development system.**

##### **Strategies:**

- a. Improve outreach to employers.

Improve communication with employers using materials designed and written with a business audience in mind, including the use of virtual, web-based communication. Materials must identify products and services that benefit employers, including small businesses. Coordinate outreach among public agencies, and cross-train staff so they are familiar with the full range of business services available. Partner with private sector organizations, and employer groups. Utilize existing resources for outreach such as Industry Skill Panels, Centers of Excellence, Associate Development Organizations, (including Economic Development Councils), local governments, community-based organizations, and business groups such as Chambers of Commerce and industry associations.

- b. Engage employers in identifying skill standards and develop training programs that meet their standards.

Involve employers in identifying skill standards and industry-based certifications of workers who meet the standards. Also involve employers in helping to develop and keep training programs current so that the programs prepare workers to meet the standards.

- c. Increase industry involvement in work-integrated learning.

Develop more opportunities for students and job-seekers to learn in workplaces and provide classroom experiences connected to the world of work. Examples include on-the-job training, apprenticeships, cooperative education, and internships. Tie work-integrated learning to students' Program of Study, where possible.

- d. Increase employer investment in workforce training.

Employer investments in workforce training include, but are not limited to, employer matches to public sector or employee investments, providing faculty and equipment as well as space for on-site training programs, offering employees time to advance their skills as part of their workday, paying for off-site training opportunities, and making their worksites available for career exploration and work-based learning opportunities.

#### **Objective 2: Promote economic development by connecting workforce development with job creation and growth.**

##### **Strategies:**

- a. Provide and market business services to employers.

Provide and market business services to existing employers and those looking to locate into the region. In providing business services, the public sector must avoid unfair competition with businesses providing the same or similar services. Often, the public sector can partner with businesses to provide services. Business services include customized training for specific employers or groups of employers including incumbent worker training; recruitment and assessment of job applicants, and job match and placement services; early intervention services to prevent layoffs or closures; including the Shared Work Program, and employment retention services, such as connecting employees with social services to address personal and family issues that affect job performance.

- b. Invest in strategic economic opportunities.

Develop funding mechanisms to adequately resource and sustain high-demand occupational training. Continue to improve the quality of labor market information to identify high demand occupations and Programs of Study, and to identify local strategic economic clusters. Continue to develop and maintain special initiatives to address critical state and local economic opportunities (such as aerospace).

- c. Encourage and support entrepreneurship.

Offer entrepreneurial training and mentorship programs.

### **Objective 3: Expand and support learning opportunities for workers at all stages of their education or career paths.**

#### **Strategies:**

- a. Offer greater career and education guidance for adults.

Provide navigators to help adults identify and access education and training programs, pay for school, and connect with other support services. Make consumer information on training programs widely available.

- b. Increase the accessibility of training programs for adult workers and reduce the time it takes to complete training.

Increase the use of credit for prior learning, competency-based programs, stackable and portable credentials, direct connect training (such as OJT, incumbent worker training, and Individualized Certificate Programs), and online and hybrid learning programs. Offer training at times and locations that reach underemployed, often low-wage workers, juggling work and families. Expand co-investment models such as Lifelong Learning Accounts (LiLAs), where employers and employees contribute to an account that pays for employee education expenses.

- c. Improve training for adult workers with barriers to advancement.

Increase use of programs such as I-BEST that integrate basic or developmental education with job skills training. Provide support services that fit the needs of diverse populations including veterans returning to the civilian labor force and long-term unemployed workers. Offer bridge programs for adults with barriers to postsecondary education. Increase partnerships with community-based organizations and state Department of Social and Health Services programs that focus on vulnerable populations to provide needed supports for adult workers with barriers.

#### **Objective 4: Improve job search and placement services for unemployed and underemployed workers.**

##### **Strategies:**

a. Improve the quality and speed of job matching and referrals between job seekers and employers with job openings.

Improve the technology used to make job matches and the job referral process so that the skill sets that job applicants have match the skill sets that employers want. Help job seekers and employers recognize transferable skills and where the skills can be applied in the workforce. Help veterans cross-match their transferable skills gained in the armed forces to civilian employment opportunities.

b. Make job search and placement assistance more widely known and available.

Improve access and marketing for job search and placement assistance to students, workers, and employers.

### **Goal III**

## **Washington's Workforce Development System is a Model of Accountability and Efficient Co-Investment.**

#### **Objective 1: Strengthen performance accountability across all workforce development partners, by focusing on employment and earnings outcomes.**

##### **Strategies:**

a. The Workforce Board will lead a full scale review in collaboration with all workforce partners to reconsider core measures for Washington's workforce system.

To fulfill its statutory assignment to develop common measures for the workforce development system, the Workforce Board developed the Washington Workforce Core Measures. These measures indicate skill attainment, employment, earnings, customer satisfaction, and return on investment and have been in place since 1996. Based on this work, the U.S. Department of Labor asked the Workforce Board to lead the states in developing a new generation performance management system. This process resulted in the creation of the Integrated Performance Information (IPI) measures. The IPI measures later became the basis of similar performance measures endorsed by the National

Governors Association—measures that are now being considered by Congress for codification as part of WIA reauthorization. The Workforce Board will lead a broad, collaborative process to reconsider the state’s core measures in light of new federal measures and the *High Skills, High Wages 2012* strategic plan.

b. Reduce administrative burdens and improve performance outcomes through a focus on outcome rather than input measures.

The requirement to measure inputs is often a tool to ensure that services are delivered in the same way, and at an adequate quality level regardless of geographic location or service provider. Yet, the workforce development system relies on local governance to ensure that services are designed to meet the specific needs of each region’s employers and job-seekers. Focus performance measurements on outcomes rather than processes.

c. Develop a unified plan for multiple federal workforce development programs.

In 2012, the Department of Labor issued planning instructions that allow states to write a “Unified Plan.” The unified plan option offers state partner agencies the ability to submit a single five-year plan covering up to 13 federal programs administered by five federal agencies. In Washington, these 13 programs are administered through nine state agencies and agency divisions. Washington will work toward uniting workforce programs by developing a unified plan with common goals, and performance measures.

**Objective 2: Establish cost-effective co-investment models, across government funding streams and across the tri-partite spectrum (employer, worker, and government).**

**Strategies:**

a. Reduce barriers to sharing or splitting funding across funding streams.

At the service level, it is often difficult for staff working directly with customers to alter how funds are used or how services are provided. Creative frontline staff work in the best interest of the customer to leverage the resources of other organizations. Make routine practices that leverage resources across agencies and enhance customer performance outcomes. Data sharing and customer tracking is easier and more effective through use of technology.

b. Establish cost-sharing practices and policies that stretch public dollars to serve the largest number of participants and attain the highest performance outcome levels.

While there have been numerous attempts and pilots, Washington needs a common practice framework, across all operating agencies, that brings private resources into the system. This calls for a co-investment framework where customer partners provide input into service design, monitor service quality, and have access to objective information about the return on their investment.

# Performance Accountability

To meet the combined challenges of a competitive economy and changing labor force, and to make the best use of increasingly scarce resources, the workforce development system must continuously improve its performance. What counts are results in meeting the needs of our customers—students, job seekers, workers, and employers. The workforce development system must continuously measure results, identify areas to improve, and make the necessary improvements.

Prior to the creation of *High Skills, High Wages*, Washington did not have an accountability system for workforce development. What we had were separate accountability activities for many of our programs.

Because these accountability activities were developed to meet separate program missions and requirements, they did not add up to systemwide accountability. There were no agreed upon measurable goals for the system as a whole, no common performance measures, and no standards for collecting consistent data from agency to agency. Often, data collection focused on inputs rather than results. Some programs did not evaluate what happened to their participants once they left their program, nor did they use program results to guide improvements. This has all changed.

## Performance Management for Continuous Improvement

In January 1996, the Workforce Board adopted the design for a new accountability system, “Performance Management for Continuous Improvement.” (PMCI) Having a systemwide framework has many advantages, including increased accountability, improved strategic planning, better research, more efficient use of resources, and a sense of shared responsibility among workforce development programs. These advantages can improve the credibility of workforce programs and, in turn, enhance the support they receive and, ultimately, their ability to serve customers.

Based on Washington’s success with PMCI, in 2003 the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) asked the Workforce Board to lead the 50 states in the design of the next generation performance management system. The result is *Integrated Performance Information for Workforce Development: A Blueprint for States* (IPI). Other states are implementing the IPI Blueprint, and Congress is now considering the IPI performance measures as the standard for workforce development programs.

[Congress is currently working on reauthorizing the Workforce Investment Act \(WIA\). In 2013 Congress may consider reauthorizing both the Workforce Investment Act \(WIA\) and the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act.](#) As part of reauthorization, Congress is reconsidering the measures to use for the federal core indicators. Options under consideration include the measures recommended in the IPI Blueprint; this would codify consistent measures across federal workforce programs. ~~At the same time, DOL is moving forward with changes in some of the measures required for DOL programs, changes that may be temporary depending on how Congress acts. How these things will play out remains uncertain at this time. *High Skills, High Wages: 2008–*~~

~~2018 makes no changes to the workforce core measures pending the outcome of these federal developments. Following the reauthorization of WIA, the Workforce Board will join its partners in a full scale review of the workforce core measures to determine if any changes are warranted.~~

Washington has not adopted the IPI measures, waiting first to see what Congress did during reauthorization. It has, however, been nine years since WIA first came up for reauthorization. After the beginning of *High Skills, High Wages 2012*, whether or not Congress acts, the Workforce Board will join its partners in a full scale examination of state core measures to ensure measures align with state goals.

## **PMCI Overview**

The PMCI accountability system consists of four parts:

- **Desired Outcomes and Performance Measures:** The results that we are continuously working to improve and the measures that indicate how well we are doing.
- **Performance Targets and Consequences:** Numerical targets for results and a combination of incentives and sanctions in response to achieving or not achieving the targets.
- **Data Collection and Reporting:** Standards for the data elements needed to measure and analyze performance, and a series of reports that present results.
- **Government Management Accountability and Performance (GMAP):** Governor Gregoire's system of management measures, reporting, and improvement.

Governor Gregoire has instituted the GMAP system consisting of performance measures for each executive agency, regularly and frequently reporting results, quickly identifying problem areas, and identifying and implementing solutions. GMAP employs real-time measures designed for the unique mission of each agency. This system enables managers to quickly spot near-term changes in their agency performance and make appropriate management changes.

PMCI has a different focus, one that complements GMAP: PMCI focuses on common measures across workforce development programs that share certain desired outcomes (and many of the same customers). Consistent with the Workforce Board's role as policy coordinating body, the measures are designed for policy leaders operating at the "30,000 foot level." The PMCI measures enable policy leaders to know the lasting results of programs so they can make appropriate policy decisions, as opposed to administrative changes and changes in practice to ensure accountability and a focus on results that managers can make at the ground level. Together the PMCI and GMAP accountability systems provide a full array of policy and management measures.

Operating agencies have responsibility for their GMAP measures. The state's Employment

Security Department has GMAP responsibility for WorkSource, including establishing real-time measures (and targets) that can be reported frequently to the Governor. The Workforce Board has the responsibility to maintain strategic measures (and targets) of the results for the entire workforce development system, including WorkSource, the state's one-stop career center system. ~~In 2009, the Workforce Board and the Employment Security Department will reexamine the nexus of these two sets of measures—strategic and real time—for WorkSource.~~

## DESIRED OUTCOMES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

### Desired Outcomes

PMCI identifies five desired outcomes for the workforce development system as a whole. These outcomes focus on the difference workforce development makes in the lives of program participants, their families, and their communities. They are the outcomes that policy leaders want to see. They are not static targets, but conditions that should be increasingly true for all people. Results on indicators of these outcomes are measured for the population as a whole and separately for women, subgroups of people of color, and people with disabilities.

- **Employment:** Washington's workforce finds employment opportunities.
- **Earnings:** Washington's workforce achieves a family-wage standard of living from earned income.
- **Skills:** Washington's workforce possesses the skills and abilities required in the workplace.
- **Customer Satisfaction:** Workforce development participants and their employers are satisfied with workforce development services and results.

### Performance Measures

Policy leaders are busy people and have to digest a tremendous amount of varied information. Measures are more useful if they are understood quickly and easily—the fewer the measures the better. Policy leaders do not have the time to understand a dozen different numerators and denominators for each program. The term "employment rate" should not mean many different things depending on the programs measured.

The PMCI performance measures, therefore, are designed around a small set of measures - the State Core Measures - that can be applied, for the most part, vertically and horizontally throughout the workforce development system.

What are the best performance measures for workforce development if the same measures are applied horizontally and vertically within the system? Core state measures should address outcomes policymakers want to see and answer basic questions such as, "Do people get jobs?" and "What are they paid?" Beyond this, measures should meet certain quality criteria.

## Criteria for Good Performance Measures

Other things being equal, performance measures are better the extent to which they:

- *Are outcome measures:* Performance measures should be measures of the results for customers as opposed to process measures or measures of program outputs.
- *Promote desired results:* Because you get what you measure, measures should be carefully designed to promote behavior and results that are consistent with the desired outcomes.
- *Are easily explainable to a lay audience:* Policy leaders are lay people when it comes to the often arcane subject of performance measures. Keeping it simple is good advice.
- *Create a level playing field among programs and service strategies:* Measures should be designed so that they do not create a bias toward one program or strategy.
- *Are scaleable and divisible:* Measures should be applicable, to the extent possible, to local institutions, regional areas, and the state. Measures should also be divisible so that results can be understood for subpopulations and service strategies.
- *Are not easily “gamed”:* While there may be no measure that is completely impervious to manipulation, some measures are more susceptible than others.
- *Are inexpensive:* Performance measures are very important for ensuring taxpayer dollars are wisely used, but policy leaders very reasonably want to minimize the amount of money spent on activities other than direct service to customers, and those include performance measurement.

Based on the above criteria, and after a long consensus process, PMCI identifies the following as the state’s core measures for workforce development:

### Washington’s State Core Measures

#### *Employment or Further Education*

- a. **Programs Serving Adults:** Percentage of former participants with employment recorded in UI and other administrative records during the third quarter after leaving the program.
- b. **Programs Serving Youth:** Percentage of former participants with employment or further education as recorded in UI, student, and other administrative records during the third quarter after leaving the program.

#### *Earnings*

Median annualized earnings of former participants with employment recorded in UI and other administrative records during the third quarter after leaving the program, measured *only* among the former participants not enrolled in further education during the quarter.

## **Skills**

Percentage or number of program participants leaving the program who achieved appropriate skill gains or were awarded the relevant educational or skill credential based on administrative records.

## **Customer Satisfaction**

**Former Participant Satisfaction:** Percentage of former participants who report satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses.

## **Return on Investment**

- a. **Taxpayer Return on Investment:** The net impact on tax revenue and social welfare payments compared to the cost of the services.
- b. **Participant Return on Investment:** The net impact on participant earnings and employer provided benefits compared to the cost of the services.

Federal acts, such as the Carl Perkins Act and Workforce Investment Act, specify certain mandatory measures of program results. Mandatory federal core measures, unfortunately, are different for each program. States have the discretion to identify additional state indicators. The above state core measures are additional indicators for Washington.

The methodology for the state core measures relies as much as possible on administrative records as opposed to program staff or participant self-reports. This data source is used to enable as much consistency and objectivity across programs as possible and because it is relatively inexpensive. To measure employment and earnings, the methodology takes advantage of the UI wage files maintained by the Employment Security Department (and the equivalent agency in other states). These files hold information on all employment covered by the UI system—approximately 90 percent of all employment. Where available, the UI records are supplemented by other administrative records of employment, such as Department of Defense records.

Another important feature of the methodology is the use of the time period of seven to nine months after a participant has left his or her program as the key period for measuring post-program results. The Workforce Board and its partner agencies reviewed the results for five of the state's largest workforce programs, analyzing results quarter by quarter for three and a half years following program exit. We found that the third quarter after exit is the best possible single representation of a program's relative and lasting results without waiting years to obtain long-term results.

## Measures at Each Level of the System

Figure 1 shows the PMCI performance measures at each level of the workforce development system. The five levels are:

- **Systemwide:** The workforce development system as defined in statute and executive order.
- **Statewide Programs:** Workforce development programs, such as Secondary CTE and Vocational Rehabilitation, that are statewide in scope.
- **WorkSource:** WorkSource centers and affiliate sites providing one-stop services as required under WIA Title I-B.
- **Workforce Development Area:** The local geographical area defined under WIA Title I-B.
- **Providers:** Individual institutions and entities that provide workforce development services. Examples include high schools, community and technical colleges, and private career schools, among others.

As Figure 1 shows, PMCI uses the state core measures, for the most part, from local providers to the system as a whole. There are some exceptions, however, to minimize costs. PMCI does not require customer satisfaction surveys of every statewide program or each local provider, and return on investment is only measured at the statewide level. There are also some additional measures as explained below.

**Figure 1 State Core Measures**

Level	Employment or Further Education	Earnings	Skills	Customer Satisfaction	Return on Investment	Other Measures
<b>Systemwide</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>WorkSource</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Statewide Programs</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Workforce Development Areas</b>	X	X	X	X	X	
<b>Providers</b>	X	X	X			

While the state core measures provide the most fundamental information on the outcomes that policy leaders want to see, they do not by themselves paint a complete picture of program performance. PMCI has, therefore, identified a larger set of program measures to provide a more comprehensive look at statewide program results. The longer list of measures includes, for example, measures of poverty rates and results for subpopulations. The Workforce Board uses the longer list of program measures every two years in producing the report, *Workforce Training Results*. The longer list of measures may be seen in that report.

## WorkSource Measures

~~WorkSource is Washington's one-stop system for employment and training programs. WorkSource participants include individuals and employers who receive services through a WorkSource Center or an affiliate site providing services funded under WIA Title I, WIA Title III (Wagner-Peyser), or the state's WorkFirst program's employment-related services. Participants in other programs are counted for a particular service when the program dedicates resources for that service to WorkSource. Together, these populations are considered the WorkSource participant population for purposes of accountability.~~

~~For registered participants, the WorkSource measures include most of the Washington workforce core measures, except return on investment and the federally required measures for WIA Title I. To capture the performance of WorkSource in serving all participants, not just those who register, and to help measure how Washington is doing in creating a one-stop system, there are the following additional indicators:~~

- ~~• Percentage of employers using WorkSource services.~~
- ~~• Percentage of total workers using WorkSource services.~~
- ~~• Number of job openings filled among job orders placed with WorkSource.~~
- ~~• Customer perception of seamlessness.~~
- ~~• Staff perception of seamlessness.~~

~~In 2009, the state's Employment Security Department and the Workforce Board will examine the relationship between the measurements that each requires from WorkSource to determine how this measurement scheme can be simplified.~~

## Systemwide Measures

To measure Washington's progress in achieving the desired outcomes for the workforce development system, PMCI includes systemwide indicators. Some of these are measures of the state's whole workforce, not just individuals who have gone through the programs. We want to know how well the whole state is doing, not just the part of our population who have been program participants. The Workforce Board reports the results each year in *Measuring Our Progress*. Below are the latest results, in many cases compared to the results for the year 2000—a year of very strong economic growth.

## Systemwide Measures and Most Recently Available Result

### Employment

- The number of new jobs created in Washington per year (does not include agricultural

jobs, the count for which is unavailable): 62,600 in 2000; 72,200 in 2007.

- Percentage of workforce development program participants self-reporting employment seven to nine months after leaving their program: 79 percent for 2000 participants; 80 percent for 2006.

### **Earnings**

- Mean annual earnings of Washington workers (stated in constant 2007 dollars): \$43,653 in 2000; \$45,023 in 2007.
- Median annual earnings of workforce development program participants seven to nine months after leaving their program (stated in constant 2007 dollars): \$17,262 for 2004 participants; \$18,287 for 2006 participants.
- The number of Washington residents living in poverty for every 100 U.S. residents living in poverty: 2.01 in 2000; 1.77 in 2007.

### **Skills**

- Percentage of students entering ninth grade class who graduate with their class: 66 percent in 2002; 70 percent in 2006.
- Percentage of the demand for workers with between one and four years of postsecondary training (the number of annual net job openings) that can be filled by the annual supply of community and technical college students, private career school students, and apprentices prepared for work: The supply was 77 percent of demand in 2000; 92 percent in 2006.
- Percentage of workforce training participants who report their job-specific skills improved a lot: 69 percent for 2000 participants; 72 percent for 2006.
- Percentage of employed former workforce training participants who report their training was related to the job held nine months after leaving their program: 83 percent for 2000 participants; 65 percent for 2006.

### **Customer Satisfaction**

- Percentage of former workforce training participants satisfied overall with the program: 91 percent for 2000 participants; 88 percent for 2006.
- Percentage of Washington employers satisfied with the overall quality of former training participants' work: 89 percent in 2001; 95 percent in 2006.

### **Return on Investment**

- The average ratio of training participants' net gain in earnings and benefits (projected to

age 65) to program public costs: \$3.57 to \$1 for 2004 participants.

## **PERFORMANCE TARGETS AND CONSEQUENCES**

### **Performance Targets for State Core Measures**

#### ***Statewide Programs***

For statewide programs, the Workforce Board identifies expected levels of performance on each of the state and federal workforce core measures with the exception of return on investment. (Targets are not set for return on investment because the methodology is not sufficiently precise and is too costly to conduct frequently.) These expected levels of performance are for secondary and postsecondary Career and Technical Education (CTE), Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Title I-B, and WIA Title II Adult Education and Family Literacy. The Board also identifies performance targets on relevant state workforce core measures for Wagner-Peyser, WorkSource, the Department of Social and Health Services' Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and Department of Services for the Blind.

The Workforce Board identifies performance targets based on past performance and expectations for future improvement. The expected level of performance is not the same for each program. Programs serve different populations for different purposes. Programs that serve youth, for example, should not be expected to have the same performance as programs serving adults. Also, the expected increase is not the same for each measure. Some areas of performance are more difficult to change than others. In some areas, programs are already performing at or near peak levels, so little if any improvement can be expected, while in other areas, substantial improvements can and should be made. The Workforce Board's performance targets emphasize improving employer satisfaction, participant earnings, and educational attainment.

The Workforce Board sets the targets for the state core measures and negotiates and reaches agreement on the targets for the federal indicators with the U.S. Department of Labor for WIA Title I and the U.S. Department of Education for Carl Perkins (CTE).

The appendix to this chapter shows the state core measures, targets, and results. (The operating plan for each program has the targets for the federally required measures.) Included in the appendix are the actual results for the last three years and the expected levels of performance for the next two years.

Performance, of course, is affected by the demographic characteristics of program participants, as well as economic conditions. Should the economic conditions and demographic characteristics change, the Workforce Board will revise the performance targets on the state indicators and negotiate revisions with the U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Labor for Carl Perkins and WIA Title I-B, respectively.

### **Workforce Development Areas**

The Workforce Board establishes performance targets for each of the state and federal core measures for WIA Title I-B for the state's 12 Workforce Development Councils. The expected levels of performance depend on local economic conditions and the demographic characteristics of participants served. To adjust for such factors, the Workforce Board applies multiple regression models to expected local levels of performance. For example, the Board lowers the performance targets for a local area to the extent that its program participants have demographic characteristics indicating that participants are harder to serve than the state average. The local council and Chief Local Elected Official(s) may request changes to the performance targets and may introduce data not considered by the models.

### **Providers**

The Workforce Board maintains the state's Eligible Training Provider (ETP) list at [www.careerbridge.wa.gov](http://www.careerbridge.wa.gov). This is the list of training programs that are eligible to train participants funded by Workforce Investment Act Individual Training Accounts or dislocated workers receiving extended UI benefits under the state's Training Benefits Program. To be on the list, a training program must satisfy the Workforce Board's performance criteria. Each year, the Workforce Board establishes minimum standards that programs must meet for completion rates, employment rates, and earnings of past participants. The ETP list identifies the training programs that meet the standards.

### **Performance-Based Consequences**

At each level of the workforce development system, there are consequences if performance targets are not met, and incentives when they are.

### **Systemwide**

The Workforce Investment Act (WIA) authorizes incentive funding for states that exceed the "adjusted levels of performance" in WIA Title I-B, Adult Education and Family Literacy, and Career and Technical Education (CTE). A state that achieves 100 percent on the average for all the federal core indicators for each program is considered to have exceeded the adjusted levels of performance, so long as performance does not fall below 80 percent on any indicator.

When Washington receives such an incentive award, the state allocates the funds to local areas that exceeded their expected level of performance in these programs, including performance on the state core measures, as well as on the federal core indicators. The Workforce Board identifies the size of the award for each year, and the state's Employment Security Department allocates the funds. The funds must be used for system building activities, not activities that pertain only to a particular program, such as WIA Title I-B, Adult Education and Family Literacy, or CTE.

**Figure 2 Performance-Based Consequences**

Level	Performance-based Consequences
Systemwide	WIA Section 503 Incentive Awards
Statewide Programs	U.S. DOL and DOE Required Improvement Plans and Sanctions
Workforce Development Area	WIA State Incentive Awards, Improvement Plans, Sanctions, Reorganization
Providers	ETP Eligibility, DOE Required Improvement Plans, Carl Perkins Sanctions, and Market-Based Reactions

**Statewide Programs**

If the state fails to meet the adjusted levels of performance on the federal core indicators for WIA Title I-B for two consecutive years, DOL can withhold up to 5 percent of the state’s WIA Title I-B funds. DOL considers states to have failed to meet the levels if performance falls below 80 percent of the target levels.

Under the Carl Perkins Act, if the state fails to meet the “adjusted levels of performance” the “state eligible agency” (the Workforce Board), must develop and implement a program improvement plan in consultation with the state’s Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC), and other partners. If the state fails to meet the levels of performance for a second consecutive year, DOE may withhold all or a portion of Carl Perkins Act funds from the state.

If the state is sanctioned by DOE for poor performance, the Workforce Board will reduce the allocation of funds to the secondary and/or postsecondary systems proportional to the sanction and to the extent that the secondary and/or postsecondary systems contributed to the poor results.

**Workforce Development Areas**

For WIA Title I-B, **if** the Governor earmarks a portion of the state set-aside to reward local areas that exceed 100 percent of the average of the expected levels of performance for the state and federal core measures. The Workforce Board establishes the policy for incentive awards, and the Employment Security Department (ESD) allocates these funds to local areas.

If a local area fails to achieve 80 percent average performance across the state and federal core indicators for WIA Title I-B, ESD will require the local council to submit either a performance improvement plan or a modified local plan to the state. If such failure continues for a second consecutive year, the Governor may require the development of a reorganization plan. If the state is sanctioned by DOL for poor performance, ESD will withhold a proportional amount of funds from local areas based on their average performance across the state and federal core indicators.

## **Providers**

To be eligible to receive funding under WIA Title I-B or to train dislocated workers under the state's Training Benefits Program, all training providers must meet the performance standards established by the Workforce Board. If a training provider fails to meet the standards for any one year, the provider will not be an eligible provider for the year beginning the first quarter after the substandard performance is reported.

Under the Carl Perkins Act if a college or school district is not making substantial progress in achieving the expected levels of performance, SBCTC or OSPI, on behalf of the Workforce Board, will assess what is needed to overcome the performance deficiencies, approve a local improvement plan, and conduct regular evaluations of progress.

If the Workforce Board allocation of the Carl Perkins Act funds to the secondary or postsecondary system is reduced due to federal sanctions, OSPI and SBCTC will determine the resulting impact on school districts and colleges respectively, and allocate the funds accordingly.

SBCTC/Office of Adult Literacy has identified similar performance-based interventions for Adult and Family Literacy applications.

The Workforce Board operates a consumer report system of training provider results, as well as course descriptions and other key information for potential students at [www.careerbridge.wa.gov](http://www.careerbridge.wa.gov). This online consumer report system helps Washington residents make market-based decisions, moving their dollars from lesser to better performing providers.

## **DATA COLLECTION AND REPORTING**

### **Data Collection**

The Workforce Board provides information on the results of secondary and postsecondary CTE; WIA Title I-B; work-related Adult Education and Family Literacy and other workforce development programs; and the WorkSource one-stop system to the appropriate federal agencies, state policymakers, and the state's 12 Workforce Development Councils. To accomplish this, the Workforce Board ensures that participant data from each of these programs and from WorkSource are collected and matched with administrative records for the purpose of measuring the common and core indicators. The Workforce Board also conducts participant and employer surveys for these programs and for WorkSource.

The specific data source(s) for participant records for each program is identified in the program's operating plan. For WorkSource participants, the Services, Knowledge and Information Exchange System (SKIES) collects and maintains data. The following figure shows the data elements, at a minimum, that are to be collected and recorded for all WorkSource participants who request services other than self-service or information only services.

**Figure 3 Common Data Elements That are Collected at Intake on Program Participants**

1. Date	2. First Name	3. Last Name
4. Phone/FAX/E-Mail	5. Address	6. Social Security #
7. Services Requested	8. Gender	9. Limited English
10. Date of Birth	11. Disability Status	12. Highest grade
13. Highest level of certification or degree achieved		
14. Racial group, as defined by U.S. Census, most closely identified with.		
15. Intake Location	16. Currently Employed	
17. U.S. Veteran	18. Displaced Homemaker	
19. Out-of-School Youth	20. Family Size	21. Public Cash Assistance

### **Data Matching**

The Workforce Board, SBCTC, ESD, and OSPI oversee a shared system for matching participant records with other administrative records, including UI wage records and college and university student enrollment records. Washington uses this process for measuring the performance indicators that are based on administrative record matches. Using the shared matching system ensures common methodological protocols are applied in calculating the results of workforce development programs.

Training providers that want to offer training funded through Individual Training Accounts authorized under WIA Title I-B are required to submit cost and participant data to the Workforce Board. The Workforce Board uses the data matching system to match the participant records against other administrative records in order to measure provider performance.

[The state's Education Data and Research Center is in the process of developing a P-20 longitudinal data system. Once that system is fully in place, the Workforce Board in collaboration with its partners will consider using that new system for matching records.](#)

### **Survey Data**

For survey-based research, the Workforce Board and its partner agencies have identified a pool of common survey questions. There are two pools of questions: one for individual participants and one for employers. The questions form the content of the Workforce Board's survey research. The questions are also a pool from which other workforce development programs and agencies may draw when surveying individuals or employers about their program experience or outcomes. The use of the common questions helps to ensure consistency in survey-based research throughout the system

### **Performance Reports**

The following figure shows the schedule of [Workforce Board](#) reports on the performance of the workforce development system and programs.

**Figure 4 Workforce Board Performance Reports**

<b>Name of Report</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Subject</b>
<i>WIA Title I-B Quarterly Report</i>	Quarterly	<b>WIA Title I-B:</b> Report to DOL on the performance of the state and local workforce development areas on WIA Title I-B on federal and state core indicators.
<i>WIA Title I-B Annual Report</i>	Annual	<b>WIA Title I-B:</b> Report to DOL on the performance of the state and local workforce development areas on WIA Title I-B.
<i>Consolidated Annual Report</i>	Annual	<b>Career and Technical Education:</b> Report to DOE on the performance of secondary and postsecondary CTE.
<i>Workforce Training Results</i>	Biennial	<b>Major Program Results:</b> Report on the performance of the major workforce development programs. See: <a href="http://www.wtb.wa.gov/WorkforceTrainingResults.asp">www.wtb.wa.gov/WorkforceTrainingResults.asp</a>

In addition, as mentioned before, the Workforce Board maintains an online consumer report system of training provider results at [www.careerbridge.wa.gov](http://www.careerbridge.wa.gov).

### **GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY AND PERFORMANCE**

In 2005, Governor Gregoire issued Executive Order 05-02 to establish a comprehensive Government Management Accountability and Performance system (GMAP). GMAP is a management system that focuses on measuring performance, regularly and frequently reporting results, quickly identifying problem areas, and identifying and implementing solutions. As stated in the Executive Order, GMAP calls upon the Governor and other agency leaders to:

1. Take personal responsibility and hold the agency and its management accountable for results.
2. Use strategies that work, and make corrections when they don't.
3. Base decisions not on guesswork or preference, but on accurate, up-to-date information.
4. Make decisions timely.
5. Follow up to make sure there's implementation after a decision has been made.
6. Take risks and learn from mistakes.
7. Communicate clearly to citizens about results.

GMAP requires each agency to:

1. Develop clear, relevant, and easy-to-understand measures that show whether or not programs are successful.
2. Demonstrate how programs contribute to the priorities that are important to citizens.
3. Gather, monitor, and analyze program data.

4. Evaluate the effectiveness of programs.
5. Hold regular problem-solving sessions within the agency to improve performance.
6. Allocate resources based on strategies that work.
7. Regularly report to the Governor on their performance.

Governor Gregoire also requested, and the Legislature passed, House Bill (HB) 1970. HB 1970 codifies GMAP in state statutes and extends its coverage to all state agencies, including higher education institutions and agencies headed by other elected officials. As a result, all agencies that are part of the workforce development system are now implementing GMAP. Agencies have identified key performance measures, are tracking the results, and holding regular management meetings to fix problems. Local WDCs are a part of this process in collaboration with ESD.

The GMAP measures and the measures in this chapter are complementary. The measures in the PMCI system provide consistent information across programs on long-term results. This is very useful information to elected officials and agency leaders for policy initiatives, strategic planning, and other efforts. GMAP, on the other hand, provides measures that are more real-time and more useful to the managers on the ground as they make day-to-day decisions on program operations.

HB 1970 also continues and expands upon the efforts earlier established by Governor Locke to bring Malcolm Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence to state government. HB 1970 requires each agency, no later than 2008, to apply at least once every three years to the "Washington State Quality Award, or a similar organization, for an independent assessment of its quality management, accountability and performance system." The assessment will evaluate the Baldrige categories of: leadership, strategic planning, customer focus, analysis and information, employee performance management, and process improvement. "The purpose of the assessment is to recognize best practices and identify improvement opportunities." (See [http://www.wtb.wa.gov/AboutUs\\_GMAP.asp](http://www.wtb.wa.gov/AboutUs_GMAP.asp).)

Consistent with HB 1970 and WIA's call for continuous quality improvement, the WorkSource system has widely implemented quality principles. To be initially certified during 1999, the state required each WorkSource center and affiliate site to complete a self-assessment based upon the quality categories of the Malcolm Baldrige criteria. In addition to the self-assessment, WorkSource operators were required to sign a statement that confirms a commitment to continuous quality improvement and focus on priority areas of need.

Such quality efforts are expected to continue in the future. Under WIA, each local area must provide in its local WIA Title I-B plan "a description of how the local board will ensure the continuous improvement of eligible providers of services through the system (the one-stop delivery system) and ensure that such providers meet the employment needs of local employers and participants."

To meet this requirement, local councils are encouraged to continue to conduct annual self-assessments using a tool that uses the Malcolm Baldrige Quality Criteria. The self-

assessment process should involve all partner programs staff involved in WorkSource centers.

Measurements of the business results should include the state and federal core measures for WIA Title I-B.

A critical part of quality improvement is customer focus. WorkSource centers and affiliates should measure customer satisfaction during the time of service and at the time of exit from service. This information should be used to improve the day-to-day operation of WorkSource.

Finally, the state's 12 Workforce Development Councils should include a description of their quality efforts in either their strategic or operational plan.

DRAFT

**Appendix**

*State Core Measures and Statewide Program Performance and Targets*

**State Core Measures**

**Performance**

**Targets**

WIA Title I, Youth	2005	2006	2007
<b>Employment or Further education:</b> Percentage of former participants who were employed, in the military, or enrolled in education or training, during the third quarter after the program.	79.1%	81.6%	78.2%
<b>Earnings (2007 Dollars):</b> Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)	\$ 11,285	\$ 11,210	\$ 12,241
<b>Skills:</b> Percentage of participants who obtained an appropriate credential.	72.4%	74.1%	65.3%

2008	2009
78.5%	79.0%
\$ 11,031	\$ 11,363
65.0%	67.0%

<b>Employer Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the workforce Board. (For all WIA participants; not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	83.5%	NA	84.8%
--	-------	----	-------

NA	84.5%
----	-------

<b>Participant Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	95.3%	93.1%	93.3%
--	-------	-------	-------

95.0%	95.0%
-------	-------

**State Core Measures**

**Performance**

**Targets**

WIA Title Adults	2005	2006	2007
<b>Employment:</b> Percentage of former participants who were employed during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)	76.8%	73.9%	79.5%
<b>Earnings (2007 Dollars):</b> Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)	\$ 20,702	\$ 19,891	\$ 21,433
<b>Skills:</b> Percentage of participants who obtained an appropriate credential.	63.2%	59.6%	59.7%
<b>Employer Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the workforce Board. (For all WIA participants; not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	83.5%	NA	84.8%
<b>Participant Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	90.1%	88.9%	90.0%

2008	2009
77.5%	78.0%
\$ 21,535	\$ 22,189
60.0%	62.0%
NA	84.5%
90.0%	90.0%

**State Core Measures**

WIA Title I Dislocated Workers	Performance			Targets	
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>Employment:</b> Percentage of former participants who were employed during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)	84.5%	85.0%	84.7%	82.0%	82.5%
<b>Earnings (2007 Dollars):</b> Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)	\$ 31,376	\$ 30,311	\$ 32,118	\$ 33,167	\$ 34,158
<b>Skills:</b> Percentage of participants who obtained an appropriate credential.	72.6%	71.8%	69.7%	71.0%	72.0%
<b>Employer Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the workforce Board. (For all WIA participants; not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	83.5%	NA	84.8%	NA	84.5%
<b>Participant Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	89.0%	91.0%	90.9%	91.0%	91.0%

**State Core Measures**

Secondary Career and Technical Education	Performance			Targets	
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>Employment or Further education:</b> Percentage of former participants who were employed, in the military, or enrolled in education or training, during the third quarter after the program.	74.1%	73.6%	73.2%	75.8%	76.3%
<b>Earnings (2007 Dollars):</b> Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator)	\$ 11,658	\$ 11,624	\$ 11,713	\$ 11,751	\$ 12,104
<b>Skills (Student Graduation Rate):</b> Percent of CTE concentrators who were included as graduated in the State's graduation rate as reported to NCLB <i>Note: Old measure was percentage of participants who obtained an appropriate credential.</i>	NA	78.8%	NA	69.0%	70.0%
<b>Employer Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the workforce Board. (For all WIA participants; not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	87.4%	NA	89.4%	NA	90.0%
<b>Participant Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	95.9%	NA	95.8%	NA	95.0%

**State Core Measures**

State Core Measures	Performance			Targets	
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>Postsecondary Career and Technical Education</b>					
<b>Employment or Further education:</b> Percentage of former participants who were employed, in the military, and <u>not</u> enrolled in education or training, during the third quarter after the program. <i>Note: Old measure included students enrolled in higher education.</i>	NA	65.4%	NA	65.9%	66.4%
<b>Earnings (2007 Dollars):</b> Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)	\$ 24,621	\$ 25,520	\$ 24,410	\$ 28,982	\$ 29,851
<b>Skills:</b> Number of CTE concentrators, exiting during the reporting year, who have attained an award (degree, certificate, apprenticeship, or an industry certification). <i>Note: Old measure was number of participants prepared for the workforce.</i>	NA	30,162	NA	30,313	30,465
<b>Employer Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the workforce Board. (For all WIA participants; not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	91.2%	NA	92.6%	NA	90.0%
<b>Participant Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	89.6%	NA	92.9%	NA	91.0%

**State Core Measures**

State Core Measures	Performance			Targets	
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
<b>Adult Basic Education</b>					
<b>Employment:</b> Percentage of former participants who were employed during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)	56.1%	NA	58.1%	TBD	58.0%
<b>Earnings (2007 Dollars):</b> Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program.	\$ 16,097	NA	\$ 16,958	TBD	\$ 17,991
<b>Employer Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the workforce Board. (For all WIA participants; not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	82.1%	NA	89.0%	TBD	87.0%
<b>Participant Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	83.7%	NA	87.3%	TBD	85.0%

**State Core Measures**

Division of Vocational Rehabilitation	Performance		
	2005	2006	2007
<b>Employment:</b> Percentage of former participants who were employed during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)	41.0%	NA	45.5%
<b>Earnings (2007 Dollars):</b> Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)	\$ 12,118	NA	\$ 10,832
<b>Participant Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	62.9%	NA	62.9%

Targets	
NA	45.0%
NA	\$ 11,492
NA	64.0%

**State Core Measures**

Department of Services for the Blind	Performance		
	2005	2006	2007
<b>Employment:</b> Percentage of former participants who were employed during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)	49.0%	NA	46.2%
<b>Earnings (2007 Dollars):</b> Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)	\$ 23,200	NA	\$ 17,520
<b>Participant Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	86.2%	NA	89.3%

Targets	
NA	46.0%
NA	\$ 18,587
NA	89.0%