



**Issues and Policies Committee
Performance Ad Hoc Committee**



MEETING NOTICE

**Tuesday, June 11, 2013
9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.**

Mike Rossi, Chair

Tim Rainey
Executive Director

**California Workforce Investment Board
Conference Room
777 12th Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 324-3425**

Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor

Additional Meeting Locations

Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Chairman's Conference Room, 2nd Floor
350 S. Bixel St.
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213-580-7566

Jewish Vocational Services
225 Bush St. Suite 400 - West Lobby
San Francisco, CA 94104
415-782-6244

San Bernardino Employment Resource Center Office
658 E. Brier drive, #100
San Bernardino, CA 92408
909-382-0400

The meeting will be accessible through a teleconference webinar; please see details below.

AGENDA

- 1. Welcome and Opening Remarks**
- 2. Approve**
 - March 21, 2013 Meeting Summary
- 3. Review**
 - State Board's May 8, 2013 Performance Action Item
- 4. Discussion**
- 5. Other Business**
- 6. Public Comment**

Meeting conclusion time is an estimate; meeting may end earlier subject to completion of agenda items and/or approved motion to adjourn. In order for the State Board to provide an opportunity for interested parties to speak at the public meetings, public comment may be limited. Written comments provided to the Committee must be made available to the public, in compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, §11125.1, with copies available in sufficient supply. Individuals who require accommodations for their disabilities (including interpreters and alternate formats) are requested to contact the California Workforce Investment Board staff at (916) 324-3425 at least ten days prior to the meeting. TTY line: (916) 324-6523. Please visit the California Workforce Investment Board website at <http://www.cwib.ca.gov> or contact Daniel Patterson for additional information. Meeting materials for the public will be available at the meeting location.



**Issues and Policies Committee
Performance Ad Hoc Committee**



MEETING NOTICE

**Tuesday, June 11, 2013
9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.**

Mike Rossi, Chair

Tim Rainey
Executive Director

**California Workforce Investment Board
Conference Room
777 12th Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 324-3425**

Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor

Topic: CWIB Performance Ad Hoc Committee
Date: Tuesday June 11, 2013
Time: 9:30 am to 11:30 am, Pacific Daylight Time
Meeting Number: 748 580 553
Meeting Password: cwib777

To join the online meeting

1. Go to <https://edd-wsb.webex.com/edd-wsb/j.php?ED=203692047&UID=1390352327&PW=NMDY4YWM1Njdi&RT=MiMO>
2. If a password is required, enter the meeting password: cwib777

To join the teleconference only

Call-in toll-free number: 1-866-748-2780
Attendee access code: 6132541

For assistance

1. Go to <https://edd-wsb.webex.com/edd-wsb/mc>
2. On the left navigation bar, click "Support".

IMPORTANT NOTICE: This WebEx service includes a feature that allows audio and any documents and other materials exchanged or viewed during the session to be recorded. By joining this session, you automatically consent to such recordings. If you do not consent to the recording, discuss your concerns with the meeting host prior to the start of the recording or do not join the session. Please note that any such recordings may be subject to discovery in the event of litigation.

Meeting conclusion time is an estimate; meeting may end earlier subject to completion of agenda items and/or approved motion to adjourn. In order for the State Board to provide an opportunity for interested parties to speak at the public meetings, public comment may be limited. Written comments provided to the Committee must be made available to the public, in compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, §11125.1, with copies available in sufficient supply. Individuals who require accommodations for their disabilities (including interpreters and alternate formats) are requested to contact the California Workforce Investment Board staff at (916) 324-3425 at least ten days prior to the meeting. TTY line: (916) 324-6523. Please visit the California Workforce Investment Board website at <http://www.cwib.ca.gov> or contact Daniel Patterson for additional information. Meeting materials for the public will be available at the meeting location.

Item 1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

Item 2. Approve

- March 21, 2013 Meeting Summary

Issues and Policies Committee Performance Ad Hoc Committee March 21, 2013 Meeting Summary

Members Present

Alma Salazar, Committee Chair
Abby Snay
Jeremy Smith
John Brauer
Tim Rainey
Stewart Knox
Joseph Williams

Kimberly Meyer, Employment Development Department
Liz Waiters, Social Policy Research (SPR)
Carol Padovan, Department of Labor Region VI

Public

Anne McGonagall, California Labor Federation
Brian Moyer, NoRTEC
Kerry Anne Brown, NoRTEC
Dale Kunich, EDD\WSB
Jan Takamoru, California Labor Federation
Ralph Giddings, SETA

Introduction

Alma Salazar opened the meeting by stating that the Board has been challenged by the Chair of the State Board during its last meeting to continue to push on with the Strategic Plan, to implement a system of change so we can move from where we are currently to what is envisioned in the State Plan. Mr. Rossi charged the Committee to explore other quantitative and qualitative ways to measure the principles that are driving the State Plan. Our role is to brainstorm what that looks like and identify a way to assess our success and integrate additional measures that will capture the systemic work that we plan to endeavor in.

Tim Rainey helped lay the foundation for the meeting by adding that we do not want to have a technical meeting on WIA measures and what they mean, we want to have a much higher level discussion. For example, what system measures do we want there to be, thinking big, and including all the other workforce systems that are part of our system here in California. The Department of Labor

(DOL) and national associations that are advocates for our system are all been discussing this topic. As a starting point, they are looking to increase the earning of industry valued skills credentials. Region VI is supporting our effort and provided the use of the consulting firm SPR, who has been engaged in WIA for many years. Liz Waiters from SPR spoke about the work they are doing with DOL and the State Board, confirmed that this is a national discussion taking place regarding the common measures and the desire to update them to more accurately reflect the WIA system's work. Tim provided a brief time line (Executive Committee and State Board meetings) as an opportunity to provide some initial framework and obtain some direction from the full board in the area of performance measures.

Tim reviewed WIA Performance Measures and the Strategic Vision, Goals and Priorities from the WIA State Strategic Plan as a basis of the kind of data we have and what we know about the outcomes. The point of the meeting is to have a high level discussion about what we know and what we want to know about the outcomes the system is producing and is not currently being adequately captured.

The input of the Committee, regarding "what" should be measured is categorized as:

- Emerging Guiding principles
- Performance Measures: 1) Outcome measures and 2) process measures
- Additional Policy Considerations; which will be required to be addressed to implement the new performance measures.

The following chart arrays the Committee's input under these broad categories, which will be utilized to move its work forward. The Committee's raw data is included on page 4 of 4 of this document. ***Please note that this is an initial grouping and organization by staff; which will need to be validated by the Committee.***

Categorized Comments

Emerging Guiding Principles

- *Sustainability*; metrics should result in sustainable practices; which can be viewed as a call for efficiency and effective programs.
- *One-Stop Redesign*; performance measures should result in systemic change; such as, one-stop undergo change.
- *Regional Coordination*; the committee should incentivize regional approaches; as supposed artificial boundaries that don't reflect the economy and labor markets.
- *Elements in System Link Services to Outcome*; Metrics should result in more resources being expended on services that have quantifiable outcomes
- *Emphasis on training/providers– training completion*; Metrics must support the state's vision and goals that aim to increase the number of people being trained in quality programs.
- *Importance placed on CTE*; Metrics must support the state's goal to support the development and utilization of quality career technical education programs (CTE).
- *Economic development – credential attainment – growing our own companies and meeting employer needs*; California's workforce development system must become a clear economic development asset.

| Outcome Measure—A specific result / benefit or change in a condition of well-being for workers, learners, and/or industry. | |
|--|--|
| Individual/Quality Jobs | Regional |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of job a person gets – benefit/pay package • Living Wage • Quality Job Placement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability • Braided Funding • Priority sectors – employment • Economic development – recruitment (EE) |
| Process Measure - measures of the performance of a process. Process measures can provide real time feedback | |
| System Alignment/High Performing WIB | More Training (Quantity & Quality) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure amount of (systemic) change – Baseline measurement, pilot, hold harmless • Reporting system alignment: Braided Funding, leveraging funds, Track Partnership Investment in one-stop (EE) • How are we assessing role of conveners and employers • Employer utilization – market penetration (EE) • Data-driven decision making – LMI data (EE) (Industry identification) • Employers giving us occupational information – data validity • Regional Coordination | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures individuals being placed in demand occupations • Measure over time participants economic self-sufficiency (LE) • Career Pathways • Blue collar/white collar – what meets industry needs • Measure credential attainment linked to job placement and wages (LE) • Track upward mobility/training toward pathway (LE) • Track placement with employers as supposed with temporary agency (e.g., indicator- place in jobs that are represented placement with employer) • Measures career pathways components and their impact on youth career guidance (LE) • Measure students who leave ccc with occupational credential and who is entered into related employment (LE) • Certificates of outcome related to placement – yet be realistic (relevant training) • Linking employer engagement to what works – placement, outcomes, and job quality • Emphasis on training/providers– training completion rate • Tracking retention longer than 6 months |

| Potential Policy and Implementation Considerations | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Implementation Strategy | Definitions | Evaluation (Longitudinal Study) | Other Policies |
| <p>Measure amount of (systemic) change</p> <p><i>The Committee and State Board may wish to consider developing a baseline in its initial year of implementation (e.g., piloting measures or an initial hold harmless approach)</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability • Demand Occupations • System Alignment • Priority Sectors • Quality Job • Convener • Career Pathway • Living Wage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracking retention longer than 6 months • How are we assessing role of conveners and employers • Track upward mobility/training toward pathway (LE) • Track represented placement with employer (Labor) • Measures career pathways components and their impact on youth career guidance (LE) • Measure students who leave ccc with occupational credential and who is entered into related employment (LE) • Certificates of outcome related to placement – yet be realistic (relevant training) • Linking employer engagement to what works – placement, outcomes, and job quality | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated Service Delivery • Tracking retention longer than 6 months |

LE = Longitudinal Evaluation
EE = Employer Engagement

What Outcomes Do We Want?

| | |
|--|--|
| Measure amount of change | Career Pathways |
| Sustainability | Leveraging funds – used with high performing workforce boards |
| Type of job a person gets – benefit/pay package | Blue collar/white collar – what meets industry needs |
| Measures individuals being placed in demand occupations | Measure credential attainment linked to job placement and wages |
| Reporting system alignment | Partner investment in one-stop – tracking |
| One-stop redesign | Tracking upward mobility – training toward a pathway |
| Regional coordination | Placed with an employer or temp agency – is there representation in the workplace |
| Priority sectors – employment | Elements in the system that links services to outcomes |
| Living Wage | Employer utilization – market penetration |
| Quality of job placement | Measures around pathways – youth guidance |
| How are we assessing role of conveners and employers | Measure students who leave ccc with occupational credential and who is entered into related employment |
| Measure over time participants economic self sufficiency | Leveraging/blending resources |
| Career Pathways | Data driven decision making – labor market information data |
| Integrated service delivery | Certificates of outcome related to placement – yet be realistic |
| Importance placed on Career Technical Education | Economic development – recruitment |
| Linking employer engagement to what works – placement, outcomes, and job quality | Emphasis on training/providers– training completion rate |
| Economic development – credential attainment – growing our own companies | Tracking retention longer than 6 months |
| Employers giving us occupational information – data validity | |

Item 3. Review

- **State Board's May 8, 2013 Performance Action Item**

Item 4. Discussion

- **List of Additional Performance Measures**
 - **Definitions and Considerations**

Action Requested:

Approve the California Workforce Investment Board Executive Committee's recommendation to implement additional performance indicators for tracking performance of local Workforce Investment Act programs and services.

Background:

At its February 13, 2013 meeting, the State Board prioritized development of performance measures for the State's workforce education, training, and employment services investments. The Board approved the formation of an ad hoc committee chaired by State Board Member Alma Salazar\LA Chamber of Commerce. On March 21, 2013 the ad hoc held its initial meeting and discussions to identify performance measures that are consistent with, and support the vision, goals and strategies of the State's Strategic Workforce Development Plan. To support this work, the U.S. Dept. of Labor, Region 6 provided consulting assistance from Social Policy Research Associates. The summary of the ad hoc's discussion was presented to the Executive Committee on April 2, 2013.

There are performance measures for WIA Title I, but they are not adequate.

- Common measures do not reflect many of the outcomes we want from the system.
- Not all participants that receive services through the WIA system are tracked.
- There is no mechanism to track participants across systems or across common outcome measures.

The Strategic Workforce Development Plan drives the system to:

- Engage employers and labor
- Align systems regionally
- Adopt and use sector partnerships
- Develop career pathways for occupations with job openings
- Align multiple funding streams
- Prioritize quality training & attainment of industry-recognized skills credentials
- Incent employers to invest in programs that bridge to good jobs (i.e. approved apprenticeship, quality paid work experience and internships, On-the-Job-Training, etc.)

Emerging Guiding Principles - Measures should be:

- Easily explainable to a lay audience
- Applicable to different geographical and institutional areas of interest
- Create a level playing field among programs and service strategies
- Promote behaviors that lead to the desired outcomes
- Result in sustainable practices and efficient use of resources without compromising quality

- Methodologically sound
- Difficult to game or manipulate

The Executive Committee voted to recommend that the following additional outcomes measures be defined and baselines determined:

1. Attainment of Industry-valued credential
2. Quality Job Placement -- living wage jobs
3. Placement in targeted industry sectors
4. Return on investment
5. Employer Engagement\Employer Investment
6. Industry Sector Partnerships
7. Alignment of Funding Streams with Performance Measures

The Committee further recommended that the measures be implemented for all local areas simultaneously, and the ad hoc committee should focus its efforts on measures for the Workforce Investment Act programs.

Next Steps:

State Board staff will work with the ad hoc committee to further define these performance measures, determine benchmarking methods, identify tracking mechanisms (using existing database infrastructure), and solicit feedback from local areas on the implementation process. These new measures, once collected, will help inform the development of the new criteria for designation of high performing local board, required again in December 2015. The ad hoc committee will report to the State Board on its progress at its next meetings in August, 2013.

| Performance Measure | Definition | Key Questions | WIASRD Field(s) |
|---|---|---|-----------------|
| <p>Attainment of Industry Valued Credential</p> | <p>Certificates and credentials that enable students to enter middle skill jobs or career pathways.</p> <p><i>Credentials/certificates recognized by employers, trade associations, and licensing entities as meeting occupational requirements and used in hiring decisions.</i></p> | <p>Is there a minimum threshold of definition of credential? (# of units, achievement of certifications or licenses, achievement of competencies?)</p> <p>Do we count only those delivered through educational intuitions and other training providers? What about employer delivered credentials and apprenticeship?</p> <p>Do we measure stackable certificates, or short-term training along a career path?</p> <p>At what point in a client/student career cycle should this be measured? How might this be applied to incumbent workers?</p> <p>How do we define and measure “industry valued”? Should this be defined differently for different industries?</p> | <p>Yes</p> |
| <p>Placement in Quality Job (living wage jobs)</p> | <p>Jobs that meet a minimum threshold for wage and/or benefits.</p> <p><i>A living wage is a wage that is high enough to maintain a decent standard of living (adequate food, shelter, and other necessities). Living wage varies based on the area-specific cost of living</i></p> | <p>Should we consider wage alone or wage and benefits combined? Is it possible to calculate value of benefits consistently?</p> <p>Should we consider wage differences in sector/industry and/or occupations? (e.g. median wage by occupation)</p> <p>Should we consider wage progression over time?</p> <p>How should living wage be defined? Options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Level Income Standard Definition • Self Sufficiency Standard • Federal Poverty level • Percent of Federal Poverty Level (e.g. 200%) • Supplemental Poverty Measure | <p>Yes</p> |

| Performance Measure | Definition | Key Questions | WIASRD Field(s) |
|---|--|---|-----------------|
| Placement in Targeted Industry Sectors | <p>Occupations in priority industry sectors as identified by the State Board or local WIBs.</p> <p><i>Sectors may be high-demand (new jobs or replacement job openings), high-wage, or represent a critical or emerging role in the State/local economy.</i></p> | <p>How often should priority sectors be defined/determined?</p> <p>Should occupations within sectors be considered?</p> | Yes |
| Return on Investment | <p>Expenditures for workforce services as compared against outcomes achieved services.</p> <p><i>Options:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cost per participant for core, intensive and training funding streams.</i> • <i>Overall cost per participant (all program expenditures)</i> • <i>Cost per entered and/or retained employment.</i> • <i>Cost per \$\$ or % increase in earnings.</i> • <i>Cost per individual attaining a certificate or credential.</i> | <p>Should this be both a State and Local level calculation?</p> <p>What is “good”? How do we evaluate ROI progress and avoid unintended consequences?</p> <p>Should ROI be variable based on region or local area?</p> <p>Should (Can) ROI assess job quality (wage) and individual progress over time (wage gain?)</p> <p>Should (Can) ROI take into account employer investment for incumbent worker training or OJT?</p> | Yes |

| Performance Measure | Definition | Key Questions | WIASRD Field(s) |
|---|---|---|-----------------|
| Employer Engagement/Employer Investment | <p>Employers are active partners in and customers of workforce services, and provide meaningful contributions – financial and in-kind- to programs.</p> <p>Options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of employers engaged • \$ or % of employer contributions • (e.g. financial, hiring commitments, internships, OJT) | <p>How do we measure “employer engagement” (is this a quality or quantity definition).</p> <p>Can in-kind investment be measured, and should there be a standard by local area or for state?</p> <p>How can we measure the value of leveraged dollars?</p> <p>Should a dollar value be ascribed to participants hired by an engaged employer?</p> | NA |
| Industry Sector Partnerships | <p>Collaboration among workforce system providers, educational and training institutions, labor, and employers that target the supply and demand gaps (hiring, training, productivity, diversity, etc.) in targeted industries.</p> | <p>How to we measure “collaboration or sector partnerships” (is this a quality or quantity definition).</p> <p>Can the “strength” of partnerships be measured? What are the qualities and/or outcome indicators that indicate strong partnerships? (e.g. % hired from training programs, employer investment (see above), ability to quickly respond to changes in supply or demand, etc.)</p> <p>How do we consider variable labor markets and industry presence? (e.g. differences between urban, suburban, and rural account rural areas, highly concentrated industry sectors?)</p> | NA |
| Alignment of Funding Streams (with Performance Measures) | <p>Local and/or regional funding decisions are reflective of workforce system goals.</p> | <p>How can we measure aligned funding? Should this include coordinated investments or only those directly administered by the State or local WIBs?</p> <p>How can we ensure that distinct funding streams maintain population priority of service?</p> <p>Is this an annual “snapshot” or a longitudinal evaluation or progress?</p> | NA |

Item 6. Other Business

Item 7. Public Comment