

Program Year 2012 Annual Report

**Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Youth Activities
Workforce Investment Act of 1998, Title I-B**

November 15, 2013

**submitted by the
Commonwealth of Massachusetts**

**to the United States Department of Labor
Employment and Training Administration**

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Deval L. Patrick, Governor

**Joanne F. Goldstein, Secretary
Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development**

**Alice Sweeney, Director
Department of Career Services**

**Nancy Snyder, President
Commonwealth Corporation**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
A. PY12 Review of Massachusetts' Statewide WIA Title I Performance Measures	1
B. Cost of Workforce Investment Activities	6
C. Evaluation and Research	8
D. Waivers	10
E. Business Engagement	14
Appendix A: WIA Title I-B PY11 Annual Report Form (ETA 9091)	19
Appendix B: WIA Title I-B PY11 Local Workforce Area Performance	24
Appendix C: Common Measures At-A-Glance (<i>Definitions</i>)	30

INTRODUCTION

The Massachusetts Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development (EOLWD) is the state level agency responsible for the oversight of the workforce investment funding received through the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration (DOLETA). The Department of Career Services and Commonwealth Corporation are designated by EOLWD to implement specific initiatives related to the workforce development system.

Since the inception of the federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA) in 1998, Massachusetts has adopted a statewide strategy to maximize and leverage workforce development resources through our 16 local Workforce Investment Boards and 34 One-Stop Career Centers. In Massachusetts, the One-Stop Career Center system is the cornerstone of service delivery for job development and job search assistance, training referrals and placements, and employer outreach for workforce development services. Our goal is to ensure coordinated delivery of information and services throughout the system.

A. PY12 REVIEW OF STATEWIDE WIA TITLE I PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

State performance goals for Program Year 2012 (July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013; also PY12 or FY2013) were established with the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration (DOLETA). Beginning with PY2011, Massachusetts began reporting under the Common Measures waiver. Funds supporting program services during this period were regular WIA Title I Adult program, Dislocated Worker program, and Youth program grant funds provided through an annual allotment from DOLETA. This report covers performance for adults, dislocated workers, and youth who exited these programs between April 2011 and September 2012, as well as youth participants measured in the Literacy/Numeracy measure between July 2012 and June 2013.



Following is an overview of performance on each of the nine Common Measures. The required statewide Annual Report ETA 9091 tables that are submitted to DOLETA via the on-line reporting system are included in Appendix A and a summary of local area performance is provided in Appendix B. Definitions of the Common Measures are presented in Appendix C.

The adult and dislocated worker performance measures report on the employment experiences of program participants during the three calendar quarters after the quarter in which they exited the program. The data are derived from quarterly wage records reported by employers. The measures examine job placement during the first quarter after program exit, employment retention during the second and third quarters after program exit, and six-month earnings during the second and third quarters after program exit.

Performance results in this report cover participants who exited programs into an improving, but still recessionary climate. Charts 1 and 2 below present the unemployment rates and nonfarm employment levels for Massachusetts for the period from January 2011 through July 2013.

For the group of adult and dislocated worker program exiters covered in the PY 2012 report, the period of review extends from April 2011, when the unemployment rate was 7.1%, through September 2012, when unemployment had dropped to 6.8%. The statewide employment level

over this period rose from 3,244,500 to 3,277,200, showing a gain of 32,700 jobs or 1.0% over the period.



1. Performance Goals

State Common Measures goals for Program Year 2012 were negotiated with and approved by the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration (DOLETA). DOLETA approved performance goals that were considerably higher than the Commonwealth's goals for the prior year. The table below compares approved goal levels for PY11 and PY12.

Table 1: Negotiated Performance Levels			
Common Measure	Negotiated Performance Level		
	Program Year 2011	Program Year 2012	Percent Change
Adult Program			
Entered Employment Rate	72.0%	82.0%	13.9%
Employment Retention Rate	79.0%	90.0%	13.9%
Average Six-Month Earnings	\$9,750.00	\$11,800.00	21.0%
Dislocated Worker Program			
Entered Employment Rate	75.0%	85.0%	13.3%
Employment Retention Rate	86.0%	95.0%	10.5%
Average Six-Month Earnings	\$16,000.00	\$20,000.00	25.0%
Youth Program			
Employment or Education Rate	74.0%	80.0%	8.1%
Degree/Certificate Attainment	61.0%	70.0%	14.8%
Literacy/Numeracy Gain	25.0%	40.0%	60.0%

For WIA Title 1-B programs, the floor for acceptable performance is 80 percent of the negotiated level. Performance on an individual measure is interpreted according to the criteria below.

Assessment of Performance on Individual Negotiated Goals

- Fails: Actual Performance is less than 80.0% of the negotiated level.
- Meets: Actual Performance is between 80.0% and 100.0% of the negotiated level.
- Exceeds: Actual performance is greater than 100.0% of the negotiated level.

Massachusetts met or exceeded performance on all measures for Program Year 2012. The following sections report on performance for individual measures.

2. Adult Program Performance Results

Table 2 presents performance results for PY12 for the Adult program. The entered employment rate (80.0%) was improved over the 73.9% level in PY11. The 82.7% retention rate at six months fell below the previous year's level of 83.9%. Six-month average earnings (\$12,467) exceeded the \$11,800 goal and were higher than the \$11,847 level reported in PY11.

Table 2: Adults

Measure	Negotiated Goal	Actual Performance	Percent of Goal	Performance versus Goal
Entered Employment Rate	82.0%	80.0%	97.6%	Meets
Employment Retention Rate	90.0%	82.7%	91.9%	Meets
Average Six-Month Earnings	\$11,800.00	\$12,467.00	105.7%	Exceeds

As shown on Table 3, adults who received training experienced a higher entered employment rate (80.9%), retention rate (83.3%), and average earnings (\$12,783) than those who received only core and intensive services. Rates for individuals with disabilities were lower than the overall levels, and six-month average earnings at \$15,376 were highest for veterans.

Table 3: Adult Program - Special Populations

Measure	Individuals Who Received Training	Individuals Who Only Received Core and Intensive Services	Veterans	Individuals With Disabilities
Entered Employment Rate	80.9%	78.0%	68.0%	66.0%
Employment Retention Rate	83.3%	80.1%	80.0%	64.0%
Average Six-Month Earnings	\$12,783.00	\$10,931.00	\$15,376.00	\$10,062.00

3. Dislocated Worker Program Performance Results

Table 4 presents performance results for PY12 for the Dislocated Worker program. The entered employment rate increased slightly from 82.0% in PY11 to 83.2% in PY12, and the retention rate also increased over the year from 89.6% in PY11 to 90.2% in PY12. Average six-month earnings of \$17,727.10 were lower than the \$19,461.80 level reported for PY11.

Table 4: Dislocated Workers

Measure	Negotiated Goal	Actual Performance	Percent of Goal	Performance versus Goal
Entered Employment Rate	85.0%	83.2%	97.9%	Meets
Employment Retention Rate	95.0%	90.2%	94.9%	Meets
Average Six-Month Earnings	\$20,000.00	\$17,727.10	88.6%	Meets

Data on Table 5 shows that similar to the adult program, dislocated workers who participated in training experienced a higher entered employment rate (85.7%), employment retention rate (90.8%), and average six-month earnings (\$17,927.90) than dislocated workers who received

only core and intensive services. Individuals with disabilities experienced a slightly higher retention rate of 91% than dislocated workers who received only core and intensive services and dislocated veterans. Veterans recorded the highest earnings of \$20,334.00.

Table 5: Dislocated Worker Program - Special Populations

Measure	Individuals Who Received Training	Individuals Who Only Received Core and Intensive Services	Veterans	Individuals With Disabilities
Entered Employment Rate	85.7%	78.7%	81.3%	78.4%
Employment Retention Rate	90.8%	89.0%	87.2%	91.0%
Average Six-Month Earnings	\$17,927.90	\$17,292.90	\$20,334.00	\$14,642

4. Youth Program Performance Results

Table 6 presents performance results for PY12 for the Youth program. Under Common Measures there no longer are separate goals for older youth (18-21) and younger youth (14-18). The Common Measures youth goals cover all WIA program youth between the ages of 14 and 21. Massachusetts exceeded all goals for PY12 and performance on each measure was improved from reported results for PY11 on employment/education rate (82.6% compared to 79.2% in PY11), degree/certificate attainment rate (75.4% compared to 69.5% in PY11), and literacy/numeracy gains (45% compared to 43% in PY11).

Table 6: Youth (14 -21)

Measure	Negotiated Goal	Actual Performance	Percent of Goal	Performance versus Goal
Employment or Education Rate	80.0%	82.6%	103.3%	Exceeds
Degree/Certificate Attainment Rate	70.0%	75.4%	107.7%	Exceeds
Literacy/Numeracy Gain	40.0%	45.0%	112.5%	Exceeds

5. Performance Summary

In Program Year 2012, actual performance over the year improved on seven of the nine measures from Program Year 2011 actual performance levels. At the local level, all of the Commonwealth's 16 workforce areas met or exceeded their overall goals for the Adult and Dislocated Worker program groups, and fourteen met or exceeded overall goals for the Youth group. Performance for the local workforce areas on each of the Common Measures is presented in Appendix B.

6. Customer Satisfaction

The state does not calculate the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) score under Common Measures. Nevertheless, customer satisfaction is assessed through on-going surveys and direct customer feedback.

Results of a survey of customer satisfaction with services provided at the One-Stop Career Centers completed by 955 job seekers statewide are shown below.

Rating	Service Expectation	Employment Assistance	Learning Skills	Customer Treatment
Very Satisfied	93.8%	92.1%	91.5%	98.1%
Somewhat Satisfied	3.2%	6.5%	6.4%	1.4%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%
Very Dissatisfied	0.5%	0.9%	1.6%	0.4%
No Response	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%

B. COST OF WORKFORCE INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts received a WIA Title I-B allotment of approximately \$46.7 million for Program Year 2012, a decline of 9% from the prior year's allotment of \$51.4 million. In PY12, funds for statewide activities again were capped at 5% of the total allotment, instead of the traditional 15%, with the 10% difference re-allocated to the local areas. The amount for statewide activities in PY12 at \$2.3 million represented a 9% reduction from \$2.6 million in PY11.

Of the annual allotment for PY12, \$39.8 million was allocated for local programs, a decline of \$3.7 million or 9% from the PY11 level. The over-the-year decline was not shared equally among the programs. Local formula allocations for Dislocated Worker program services declined by 14% or \$2.0 million, with Youth program allocations down by 6% or \$930,000 and Adult program funding also down by 6% or \$806,000. Approximately \$4.5 million was reserved for Rapid Response services in PY12, a decline of 14% or \$727,512 from PY11.

Table 7 shows WIA Title I expenditures for PY12. Including carry-in funds across all categories and fund sources, the total available for PY12 WIA Title I-B activities was \$57.1 million. This was a significant drop of 17% in available funding from the \$68.7 million available in PY11.

Approximately 86% of available local Adult funds were spent in PY12, with an additional 12% obligated, and 88% of available local Dislocated Worker funds were expended and 10% obligated. Approximately 83% of available Youth funds were expended and an additional 15% obligated. Expenditures for out-of-school youth accounted for 67% of Youth funds spent, the same level as in PY11. These rates of expenditure demonstrate an effective utilization of these funds by the Commonwealth.

Table 7: WIA Title I Expenditures (PY12/FY13 Allocations and Carry-In)

Total All Fund Sources	Available	Expended	Percent Spent	Additional Obligations	Percent Spent or Obligated
Adult Local Program	\$15,146,234	\$12,959,487	85.6%	\$1,861,735	97.9%
Dislocated Worker Local Program	\$15,242,723	\$13,346,922	87.6%	\$1,572,567	97.9%
Youth Local Program	\$17,141,522	\$14,157,389	82.6%	\$2,496,652	97.2%
Out-of-School Youth (non-add)	--	\$9,485,451	(67% of youth expenditures)		
Statewide Rapid Response Funds	\$5,836,922	\$3,768,209	64.6%	\$945,243	80.8%
Statewide 5% Activity Funds	\$3,711,290	\$3,076,761	82.9%	\$1,705	83.0%
Combined Totals	\$57,078,691	\$47,308,768	82.9%	\$6,877,902	95.0%

Statewide Rapid Response funds, including funds made available for additional assistance to local areas, were expended at the rate of 65% of availability, compared to 60% in PY11. The Governor's 5% Reserve for statewide activities and state oversight expended 83% of availability, a higher rate than the 73% expended for the Governor's 5% Reserve in PY11.

Of the total \$57.1 million available, approximately 83%, or \$47.3 million had been expended by June 30, 2013. An additional \$6.9 million in obligations brought the Commonwealth's end-of-year total of expenditures and obligations to \$54.2 million, representing 95% of total available PY12 funds. This compares to PY11, with \$64.4 million end-of-year total expenditures and obligations, representing 94% of total available PY11 funds (\$68.7 million).

Continuing a trend since the conclusion of ARRA (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009) at the end of PY10 and the reduction in the federal allocations, fewer participants were served in WIA Title I programs in PY12 than in PY11 (refer to Table 8). There were an estimated 2,665 adult participants and 5,460 dislocated worker participants in PY12 Title I local programs. Overall, adult enrollments were down by 11% from PY11, while dislocated worker enrollments fell 19% below the prior year level. These annual declines were not as large as occurred from PY10 to PY11 when enrollments declined by 43% in the adult program and by 24% in the dislocated worker program.

Investment in training services remained strong with 73% (1,945) of WIA Title I adult participants receiving training services. The number of dislocated worker participants receiving training services was 3,550 or 65% of program participants. The percent in training for both adults and dislocated workers dropped slightly from PY11, when 75% of adults and 67% of dislocated workers were receiving training services. There were 2,795 youth participants in year-round programs, 59% of whom were out-of-school youth, slightly lower than the 60% share in PY11.

Estimates of per participant costs for adults increased in PY12, with an average per participant cost of \$4,998, compared to \$4,098 in PY11, \$4,045 in PY10, \$4,665 in PY09, and \$4,560 in

PY08. The estimated cost per adult who received training services was \$5,532, about \$1,973 more than the cost for an individual receiving only core and intensive services (\$3,559).

Table 8: Estimated Costs per Participant

Program Strategies	PY2012		PY2011	
	Total Participants	Est. Cost per Participant	Total Participants	Est. Cost per Participant
Adult Program	2,665	\$4,998	3,005	\$4,098
<i>Training/Education Services</i>	1,945	\$5,532	2,244	\$4,477
<i>Core/Intensive Services Only</i>	720	\$3,559	760	\$2,983
Dislocated Worker Program	5,460	\$4,058	6,725	\$3,746
<i>Training/Education Services</i>	3,550	\$5,104	4,510	\$4,756
<i>Core/Intensive Services Only</i>	1,910	\$2,117	2,215	\$1,690
Youth Program	2,795	\$5,062	3,085	\$4,468
<i>Out-of-School Youth</i>	1,640	\$5,784	1,845	\$4,983
<i>In-School Youth</i>	1,155	\$4,038	1,240	\$3,704

The estimated cost per dislocated worker participant in PY12 increased, with an average cost of \$4,058, compared to \$3,746 in PY11, \$3,116 in PY10, \$2,879 in PY09, and \$3,070 in PY08. The cost for training participants in PY12 was \$5,104 about \$2,987 more than the average for dislocated workers receiving core and intensive services only (\$2,117). Estimated training costs for dislocated workers in PY12 were higher than in prior years, where per participant training costs were \$4,756 in PY11, \$4,103 in PY10, \$3,412 in PY09, and \$3,980 in PY08.

In calculating the costs for dislocated worker programs, funding from partner programs that co-enrolled participants was added to the WIA funds. These programs include Rapid Response additional assistance, as well as training and services provided through the Trade program and National Emergency Grants.

The average estimated cost per year-round youth participant increased to \$5,062 from the PY11 level of \$4,468. The per participant youth cost for the out-of-school population was \$5,784 compared to \$4,983 in PY11, and the in-school youth per participant cost was \$4,038 compared to the PY11 level of \$3,704. The percentage of out-of-school youth served was 59% of total youth participants, compared to 60% in PY11, 57% in PY10, 55% in PY09, and 58% in PY08. Expenditures on out-of-school youth were 67% of PY12 local youth expenditures. These levels far exceed the DOL requirement of spending at least 30% of funds on out-of-school youth.

C. EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

The Commonwealth has undertaken evaluation and research projects that reflect a commitment to promoting research and evaluation as integral parts of the design and delivery of workforce development services, and as the foundations of well-informed, evidence-based policy. Research and evaluation activities include:

The *Job Vacancy Survey* (http://lmi2.detma.org/Lmi/JVS_a.asp) is a semiannual survey conducted by the Massachusetts Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development. A representative sample of employers provide information on the number and types of positions for which they are currently recruiting, the expected education and training requirements for applicants, and the pay and benefits offered to job applicants. Results from the Job Vacancy Survey data are used to identify imbalances between the supply and demand for labor, to help business managers develop effective recruiting strategies, to identify industries and occupations in which jobs are available, and to detect emerging labor and skill shortages. EOLWD has expanded its capacity to analyze job vacancy information with use of the Conference Board Help Wanted On Line (HWOL) data of on-line job openings, a measure of demand, and an index that computes the supply/demand rates using state BLS estimates of number unemployed for labor supply.

For the *Skills Gap: Supply and Demand in the Massachusetts Economy* series, Commonwealth Corporation partnered with the New England Public Policy Center (NEPPC) at the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston to develop reports that profile eight regional labor markets within the Commonwealth. Using the most recent data available, each profile provides a detailed picture of a region's current and future labor supply, as well as information about labor demand in that region over the past decade. These profiles are designed to help guide workforce development professionals, policy makers, and civic, education, and business leaders as they make decisions about education and training opportunities. Starting in June 2012 and continuing over the summer and fall of 2012, the findings of each profile were presented and discussed at a summit hosted in each region. Each region's profile and the summit's presentation are available at the Commonwealth Corporation's website (www.commcorp.org/resources/category.cfm?ID=36) and additional detailed reports are available at the NEPPC site (www.bostonfed.org/economic/neppc/labor-market-trends-in-massachusetts-regions/index.htm).

In April of 2013, CommCorp issued *Closing the Massachusetts Skills Gap: Recommendations and Action Steps* (www.commcorp.org/resources/documents/statewide%20final_4-22.pdf) as the culmination of this 18-month project to better understand labor demand and labor supply across the state. All over the state, within each of its distinct regional economies, significant gaps exist between the skills and education of the workforce and the labor market demands of employers. This report aims to understand and address this issue in a way that is most useful to educators, businesses, employers in all industry sectors, and policy makers, and to recommend future policy and action steps. Building on the regional analyses, this report documents statewide trends and places the Massachusetts experience in the national context. It concludes with a set of recommended systems, innovation and policy action steps that local and state leaders can take.

Commonwealth Corporation issued an update of the *Massachusetts Healthcare Chartbook* (www.commcorp.org/resources/documents/Healthcare_6-4.pdf) in June of 2013. The purpose of this updated edition is to inform workforce development professionals, educators, employers, and jobseekers about the status and recent history of healthcare careers and the healthcare and social assistance sector in the Commonwealth. The first part of this Chartbook provides an overview of the healthcare sector with the goal of documenting recent changes in the field and the current staffing patterns in the sector. The second part of the Chartbook focuses on healthcare occupations and the employment of individuals at a variety of educational levels. The *Massachusetts Healthcare Chartbook* was funded by the Massachusetts Department of Higher

Education through the Nursing and Allied Health Initiative. For more information about the Nursing and Allied Health Initiative, please visit: www.mass.edu/nursing.

Commonwealth Corporation recently issued several publications developed under its Workforce Development in Practice Series, an ongoing initiative designed to share tools and examples of effective practice with workforce development practitioners in Massachusetts and beyond.

Commonwealth Corporation released *Signaling Success: Boosting Teen Employment Prospects* (www.commcorp.org/resources/detail.cfm?ID=988) in April of 2013. CommCorp and the Drexel University Center for Labor Markets and Policy conducted a study to improve the understanding of the underlying causes of the dramatic decline in teen employment rates over the past decade. The study included a survey, interviews and focus groups with nearly 200 businesses. The research questions focused on perceptions of teens' hard skills and work behaviors as well as on other factors affecting hiring decisions. The report summarizes key findings of the research and provides policy and practice recommendations that have the potential for improving the ability of teens to find unsubsidized private-sector jobs.

Strategic Employer Engagement: Building Dynamic Relationships with Employers in Teen and Young Adult Employment Programs (<http://www.commcorp.org/resources/detail.cfm?ID=990>) was also issued in April of 2013. This guidebook for workforce practitioners offers resources to aid teen/young adult-focused professionals in planning and executing successful employer engagement activities and related youth employment programming. This guide is designed around a strategic employer engagement model to help workforce development professionals in their efforts to increase the number and quality of training and employment experiences available to teens and young adults.

Commonwealth Corporation published *Partnerships: A Workforce Development Practitioner's Guide* (<http://www.commcorp.org/resources/detail.cfm?ID=999>) in June of 2013. The guidebook identifies the different types of workforce development partnerships, the steps to establishing a partnership, its leadership and staffing, and processes for running a successful partnership. It features case studies, tools, tips, and templates that can be readily copied and used by practitioners. The Boston Foundation provided support for the development and publication of this Guide.

D. WAIVERS

The U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) approval of the Massachusetts State Integrated Workforce Plan, Program Years 2012–2016 (July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2017), includes the favorable disposition of the Commonwealth's waiver requests through June 30, 2017. Complete waiver content may be viewed at www.massworkforce.org Issuances, MassWorkforce Policy Issuance #13-43.

As of July 1, 2012, the following waivers have been approved to continue through June 30, 2017.

1. Use of Formula Funds for Incumbent Worker Training
2. Use of Rapid Response Funds for Incumbent Worker Training
3. Expanded Transfer Authority - Adult and Dislocated Worker Funds

4. Waiver of Requirement for Competitive Procurement of Youth Follow-Up Services
5. Sliding Scale Employer Match for Customized Training
6. Sliding Scale Employer Match for On-the Job Training
7. Common Measures Implementation

1. Use of Formula Funds for Incumbent Worker Training

The waiver enables local workforce investment regions to expand training activities for individuals, including incumbent workers, to better meet the needs of a regional economy. This waives language limiting use of local formula funding for adults and dislocated workers in order to allow local areas to utilize up to 10% of these resources for allowable statewide employment and training activities, including flexible training design for unemployed and incumbent worker training activities, as described by WIA Section 134(a)(3)(A). Funds are tracked by funding stream.

Under this waiver:

- use of adult funds must be restricted to serving low-income adults;
- incumbent worker training must be a part of a layoff aversion strategy;
- all training delivered in conjunction with the waiver is restricted to skill attainment activities; and
- performance outcomes for individuals served under this waiver are reported in WIASRD.

To date, this waiver has not been utilized.

2. Use of Rapid Response Funds for Incumbent Worker Training

The waiver allows the use of up to a 10% portion of rapid response funding described in WIA Sec. 133(a)(2) funding for incumbent worker training as part of the state resources to assist regions, workers and companies anticipating layoffs to retain workers or retrain workers for new companies for layoff aversion and skill development purposes. Under the waiver:

- all incumbent worker training delivered under the waiver must be part of a layoff aversion strategy;
- all training delivered under the waiver is restricted to skill attainment activities;
- performance outcomes for individuals served under this waiver are reported in WIASRD; and

To date, this waiver has not been utilized.

3. Expanded Transfer Authority – Adult and Dislocated Worker Funds

The waiver enables local workforce investment regions to transfer up to 50% of Adult and Dislocated Worker funds between the two programs. The waiver provides local boards with greater flexibility to respond to changes in their local labor markets, and helps ensure that WIA funds allocated to each local area are being utilized in a way that maximizes customer service.

This waiver was initially authorized for Massachusetts in 2005. For those workforce investment areas that have chosen to utilize the waiver, the expanded transfer authority has provided the added flexibility necessary to enable these local areas to more effectively meet training service demand levels resulting from the increased numbers of dislocated workers. As the economy continues to recover, it is important that the Commonwealth retain the increased flexibility in order to assure the most effective response to changes in local labor market conditions and ensure that funds allocated to each local area are utilized in a manner that best meets customer service needs.

Use of this waiver by local areas has been limited; those areas that have requested to transfer funds from the Adult fund stream to the Dislocated Worker fund stream have done so in order to provide additional training opportunities to Dislocated Workers. No evidence currently exists that indicates that use of this waiver has impacted either state or local performance outcomes.

4. Waiver of Competitive Procurement Requirement for Youth Follow-Up Services

The waiver allows follow-up services to be combined with youth program design framework services, without a need for a competitive procurement process.

Under the regulations, all ten elements of youth services, including follow-up services, must be provided by youth service providers that have been procured in separate competitive bidding processes. Framework services may be provided either by the fiscal agent without a competitive procurement, or by another organization subsequent to a competitive award. Providers of framework services are in a better position to provide follow-up services to youth, and the requirement of an additional competitive bidding process for follow-up services is duplicative and burdensome.

This waiver, initially authorized for implementation by the Commonwealth in 2005, enables a more streamlined approach to case management by allowing providers of youth framework services to provide personal attention on a consistent basis to each youth as they access the many different programs available for education and training.

In accordance with implementing the waiver, the Commonwealth issued WIA Communication No. 05-69, WIA Title I Youth-Related Waiver Authority and MassWorkforce Issuance No. 07-26, Implementing the Waiver for Youth Framework and Follow-up Services providing instruction to the One-Stop Career Center system.

5. Sliding Scale Employer Match for Customized Training

The waiver permits a sliding scale for a participating employer contribution based on the size of the employer. For employers with 50 or fewer employees, no less than a 10 percent match is required. No less than a 25 percent match is required for employers of 51 to 250 employees. For employers with more than 250 employees the 50 percent contribution will continue to apply.

The sliding scale provides an incentive for increased employer participation in customized training and expands employer involvement with the State's workforce system, particularly among small and medium-sized businesses. The waiver also encourages enhanced capacity and

relationship building among a region's business, education and workforce development communities as a means of focusing resources on emerging skill acquisition and sustainability. The Commonwealth has not issued a formal implementation policy for use of this waiver; however, local areas are aware of the availability of this waiver and have been instructed to contact DCS for assistance with waiver implementation. To date, the waiver has not been utilized.

6. Sliding Scale Employer Match for On the Job Training (OJT)

The waiver permits a sliding scale of reimbursement to the employer based on employer size. Under the waiver, the following sliding scale will be implemented: up to 90% reimbursement for employers with 50 or fewer employees; up to 75% reimbursement for employers with 51 – 250 employees; and for employers with more than 250 employees, the statutorily defined 50% limit will continue to apply. The waiver was approved for use with all WIA formula funds: Adult, Dislocated Worker, and on a limited basis, Youth funds.

The sliding scale provides an incentive for increased employer participation in On-the-Job Training and expands employer involvement with the State's workforce system, particularly among small and medium-sized businesses. The waiver also encourages enhanced capacity and relationship building among a region's business, education and workforce development communities as a means of focusing resources on emerging skill acquisition and sustainability.

Massachusetts is currently operating an OJT National Emergency Grant, for which the U.S. Department of Labor approved a similar waiver per TEGL No. 38-09. The formula funds waiver was sought in order to ensure consistency across programs in the Commonwealth. Local areas have utilized formula funding on a limited basis to provide OJT.

The Commonwealth issued MassWorkforce Policy #11-28, which provides guidance in the implementation of On-the-Job Training, including sample forms and an accompanying Q & A. The policy requires that local areas develop a local OJT policy that is compliant with all WIA requirements and consistent with state guidance.

8. Common Measures Implementation

The waiver is consistent with national policy to develop a workforce system that is responsive to the demands of both individual and employer customers. The Commonwealth anticipates the following goals will be achieved with this waiver:

- Establish a simplified and streamlined performance measurement system.
- System-wide integration of performance accountability.
- Commonality of performance measurement across a broader spectrum of workforce development programs.
- Reduce paperwork and labor costs associated with performance data collection.
- Provision of clear and understandable information to the general public, Congressional and legislative leaders, the State Workforce Investment Board (SWIB), and to other system stakeholders with regard to the use of public funds and subsequent return on investment.
- Provision of a more effective program management tool.

- Focus on customer-driven rather than program-driven outcomes.
- Enhanced service coordination and information sharing among program operators.
- Improved efficiency in program delivery.

Local workforce investment partners have provided feedback with regard to implementation of Common Measures. A simplified methodology that uniformly measures performance across a significantly broader spectrum of programs and institutions results in a more cohesive workforce development system focused on serving the needs of Massachusetts workers and employers with significantly greater effectiveness.

Use of the Common Measures has positively impacted customers, practitioners and stakeholders of the workforce investment system by providing a more broadly focused system of accountability while improving and streamlining program management and performance. To date, the Common Measures have had minimal impact in affecting performance for Adults and Dislocated Workers. The Common Measures are proving to be better aligned with key service goals for Youth.

E. BUSINESS ENGAGEMENT

1. Rapid Response Services

The Rapid Response staff works closely with the Department of Unemployment Assistance, local One-Stop Career Center management and business service representatives, the 16 local Workforce Investment Boards, state and local business and economic development professionals, employer associations and organizations, unions, and local educational institutions. The Rapid Response deployment approach is closely coordinated with the Department of Career Services with respect to harnessing administrative, programmatic, systems and reporting support for local efforts. Rapid Response information gathering begins the essential processes for submittal of National Emergency Grant applications and identification of state and local resources to effect layoff aversion wherever possible. Additionally, Rapid Response provides employers assistance with Trade program certification.

The Rapid Response Team served 277 companies experiencing closings or layoffs affecting 18,145 employees in PY12. Ninety percent of the companies served by Rapid Response in PY12 were centered in the following industrial sectors: manufacturing (35%), health care and social assistance (12%), retail trade (12%), professional, scientific and technical services (10%), finance and insurance (7%), accommodation and food services (4%), educational services (4%), information (4%), transportation and warehousing (3%).

Massachusetts uses a portion of its Rapid Response funds as Rapid Response Set-Aside Grants to provide additional assistance to local areas that experience dislocation events that substantially increase the number of unemployed in the area. Between 2012 and 2013, eight Rapid Response Set-Aside Grants were awarded totaling \$1,300,000 to assist 700 employees affected by plant closings and layoffs.

2. Layoff Aversion Strategic Services

The United States Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration (DOLETA) considers a layoff averted when either a worker's job is saved with an existing employer that is at risk of downsizing or closing, or when a worker at risk of dislocation transitions to a different job with the same employer or a new job with a different employer experiencing little or no unemployment. The key to successful layoff aversion is identification of at-risk companies and early intervention by Rapid Response.

Rapid Response proactively seeks to identify at-risk companies, intervene early and propose alternatives to layoffs. The team advises companies of available federal, state and local assistance programs, such as WorkShare; the Economic Development Incentive Program (EDIP); the Employee Ownership (ESOP) program; and the Workforce Training Fund Program (WTFP); and matching soon-to-be dislocated workers with growing companies. The Massachusetts WorkShare Program allows workers in a company, a department or smaller unit within the company to work reduced hours while collecting unemployment insurance benefits to supplement their reduced wages. ESOPs are employee-owned businesses where the employees buy the business from the owner. Tools, such as the Layoff Aversion Services Database, match businesses and nonprofit organizations to various programs and opportunities based on the company's parameters.

The Rapid Response team began introducing an improved Layoff Aversion Strategic Plan in PY12 under the Expanding Business Engagement Initiative (see below) that features a robust marketing program and an expanded partnership with stakeholders in and outside of state government.

3. National Emergency Grants

National Emergency Grants (NEGs) temporarily expand the service capacity of Workforce Investment Act Dislocated Worker training and employment programs at the state and local levels by providing funding assistance in response to large, unexpected economic events which cause significant job losses. Massachusetts is operating thirteen (13) National Emergency Grant (NEG) projects statewide with a total funding of \$28,297,916 and serving over 4,000 dislocated workers from 65 companies. The table below shows new funding received during PY12.

NEG funding received during PY12/FY13

NEG	Local Operator	Award Amount	# of Participants	Companies
Unilever	Metro South West	\$1,263,339 (increment; total award: \$2,261,417)	366	International Power America, Reveal Imaging Technologies, Inc., Unilever-Bryers Ice Cream-Conopco, Biogen IDEC, Aerotek, Commercial Sheet Metal, Covidian, EDO Fiber Innovations/ITT Corp., Henkel, Kelly Services, Randstad, Total Technical Services

Ameridose	Metro South West	\$1,145,679 (increment; "up to" amount: \$2,545,954)	320	Ameridose, LLC, New England Compounding Pharmacy, Inc. d/b/a New England Compounding Center (NECC), Medical Sales Management, Inc.
Evergreen	Central MA	\$408,403 (increment; total award: \$738,179)	320	Evergreen Solar, Kelly Services @Evergreen Solar, Advantage Technical @Evergreen Solar
Dislocated Worker Training Pilot	14 Local Areas	\$2,872,496	450	The DWT NEG is a special pilot grant awarded to provide training to long-term unemployed individuals (> 27 weeks).
Total		\$5,689,917	1,456	

4. Massachusetts Workforce Training Fund Programs (WTFP)

The Massachusetts Workforce Training Fund Programs (WTFP) provide Massachusetts businesses with resources to invest in the skills of their workforce. These services are offered through Commonwealth Corporation. Financed by Massachusetts employers, WTFP offers matching grants up to \$250,000 to offset training costs of workers. WTFP consists of three programs:

- The *Hiring Incentive Training Grant Program* (HITG) assists companies in paying for training of new employees that are Massachusetts residents and who have been unemployed for 6 months or more; the period of unemployment is waived for Veterans. HITGs provide \$5,000 per employee retained 120 days, up to \$75,000 per company over a 12 month period.
- The *Express Program* provides grants of up to \$30,000 to companies with 100 or fewer employees and to labor unions to plan and implement employee training through use of pre-approved training vendors and courses. Applicants are eligible to receive up to \$30,000 over a 24 month period.
- *General Program Training Grants* provide up to \$250,000 to employers, employer organizations, labor organizations, intermediary organizations, training providers, or a consortium of such entities, for up to two years, to train incumbent workers.

Workforce Training Fund Program	Grants	Trainees	Grant Funds Awarded in PY12	Percent of Total Grant Funds
Express	209	1,412	\$984,557	7%
HITG	193	306	\$568,000	4%
General	148	11,840	\$12,388,471	89%
Total	550	13,558	\$13,941,028	100.00%

5. Expanding Business Engagement Initiative

Massachusetts is one of thirteen states involved in the federal Expanding Business Engagement (EBE) Initiative receiving a grant of \$75,000 for the Department of Career Services from the U.S. Department of Labor. The goal of EBE in Massachusetts is to enhance and align services offered to Massachusetts businesses through the State's Workforce Development, Economic Development and Education entities to help businesses grow and thrive. To achieve this goal, efforts will be directed to (1) building strong relationships across agencies and with businesses, (2) developing staff business service knowledge and competencies across the relevant state agencies, and (3) coordinating and linking resources and information so that businesses are aware of and utilize state resources and incentives effectively and efficiently.

Massachusetts has established several key committees to harness and coordinate resources to meet its goals.

- The Advisory Board developed the EBE Mission/Vision Statement and continues to meet on a regular basis to direct and implement activities of the 3 subcommittees and 5 regional operations teams. The Advisory Board also is overseeing the creation of business focus groups.
- The Marketing Committee developed a comprehensive Resource Guide for workforce and economic development professionals that identifies the resources, both organizations and programs, which offer benefits and services to address workforce development and expansion needs of Massachusetts businesses. This resource guide will be used by staff providing guidance and support to businesses and employers on a regular basis. A companion *Massachusetts EBE Resource Card* was developed as a quick reference for distribution to employers. The Guide and Resource Card will be formally issued in January 2014 and will also be available as on-line reference tools.
- The Systems Development Sub-Committee developed a statewide dashboard that captures services and outcomes from the various programs and agencies that serve businesses and is updated on a quarterly basis. A survey under development is being tested with a select group of staff that work with businesses to obtain feedback on current systems functionality as relates to business services. The survey will be expanded to all EBE members and their input will be used in development of a database system to capture results of EBE activities.
- The Staff Training Development Sub-Committee, along with the business service representatives reviewed the first module of USDOL's EBE Workforce3One website to tailor an EBE Business Certification program for Massachusetts. The module included the following topics: *Four Primary Roles for Business Service Staff*, *Recruitment and Hiring has Changed*, and *Building Relations with the Business Community*.
- The Regional Teams will assist the Advisory Board in facilitating and developing the business focus groups.
- EBE/Merlot Business Services Conference: The first EBE conference was held in May 2013 in collaboration with the Massachusetts Employer Relations Learning Opportunities Team (MERLOT), comprising business services representatives at the Career Centers that work

directly with businesses. The Conference was a huge success with over 140 attendees. The conference was supported through a small EBE grant at a cost of \$3,100. Survey feedback from participants was positive.

6. Employer Services at One-Stop Career Centers

Employers are directly assisted at the State's network of One-Stop Career Centers by assigned Business Service Representatives (BSRs), veterans' service representatives, who also assist with Federal contract compliance, and Rapid Response team members stationed at the One-Stop Career Centers. The Department of Career Services centrally manages the Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC) program and the Foreign Labor Certification programs for temporary agricultural (H-2A) and for non-agricultural (H-2B) workers. These services are supplemented by other administrative and professional staff at the One-Stop Career Centers and the local Workforce Investment Boards.

There are many unfilled job openings in the Commonwealth and the state has undertaken a primary effort to determine the best strategies to increase the rate of match between employers' staffing needs and unemployed individuals and others seeking employment. Increasing placements is a key strategic goal in the Commonwealth's five-year workforce plan. A first step is refocusing staff and resources toward expanding the job openings listed on-line by the One-Stop Career Centers through business outreach strategies. To supplement employer outreach efforts, the state has expanded job postings with the Conference Board's Help Wanted On Line listings. This has more than doubled the number of available jobs in JobQuest, the state's on-line job bank. Investments also are being made in tools, such as TORQ, that allow counseling staff and job seekers to assess skills transferability and identify better job matches that align with the needs of employers, as well as training staff to understand their local labor markets and the personnel requirements of local employers in high growth fields.

APPENDIX A

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

WIA Title I-B

Annual Report Form (ETA 9091)

Program Year 2012

NOTE FOR TABLES B – L ON PAGES 20 -23

The tables in Appendix A are the required state level data reported to the U.S. Department of Labor electronically on form ETA 9091. The data show statewide performance results on the nine mandated Common Measures and display additional performance results for selected populations.

Next to the actual performance levels and outcomes data displayed on Tables B - L are the data used in the calculations. The bottom number (denominator) is the total number of individuals in the cohort and the top number (numerator) is the number of individuals or earnings for individuals in the cohort with a positive outcome. Earnings data are derived from wage records. Data are rounded to the nearest tenth.

Beginning with PY2011, Massachusetts reports under the Common Measures waiver. As a Common Measures state, selected tables are no longer submitted on the ETA 9091 report.

Table A is not submitted by states reporting under Common Measures.

Table B - Adult Program Results At-A-Glance

Reported Information	Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level	
Entered Employment Rate	82.0%	80.0%	1,223
			1,528
Employment Retention Rate	90.0%	82.7%	1,939
			2,345
Six Months Average Earnings	\$11,800.00	\$12,467.00	\$22,589,942
			1,812

Table C - Outcomes for Adult Special Populations

Reported Information	Public Assistance Recipients Receiving Intensive or Training Services		Veterans		Individuals With Disabilities		Older Individuals	
Entered Employment Rate	79.0%	696	68.0%	34	66.0%	64	79.5%	93
		881		50		97		117
Employment Retention Rate	78.2%	794	80.0%	60	64.0%	87 150	78.9%	190
		1,015		75		136		
Six Months Average Earnings	\$9,903.00	\$7,219,531	\$15,376.00	\$830,308	\$10,062.00	\$815,051	\$13,395.00	\$1,848,568
		729		54		81		138

Table D - Other Outcome Information for the Adult Program

Reported Information	Individuals Who Received Training Services		Individuals Who Received Only Core and Intensive Services	
Entered Employment Rate	80.9%	854	78.0%	369
		1,055		473
Employment Retention Rate	83.3%	1,592	80.1%	347
		1,912		433
Six Months Average Earnings	\$12,783.00	\$19,212,165	\$10,931.00	\$3,377,777
		1,503		309

Table E - Dislocated Worker Program Results At-A-Glance

Reported Information	Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level	
Entered Employment Rate	85.0%	83.2%	3,021
			3,632
Employment Retention Rate	95.0%	90.2%	3,034
			3,364
Six Months Average Earnings	\$20,000.00	\$17,727.10	\$50,008,209
			2,821

Table F - Outcomes for Dislocated Worker Special Populations

Reported Information	Veterans		Individuals With Disabilities		Older Individuals		Displaced Homemakers	
Entered Employment Rate	81.3%	183	78.4%	69	72.8%	576	100.0%	4
		225		88		791		4
Employment Retention Rate	87.2%	163	91.0%	71	90.1%	589	87.5%	7
		187		78		654		8
Six Months Average Earnings	\$20,334.00	\$3,070,439	\$14,642.00	\$937,088	\$17,729.40	\$9,733,411	\$13,395.10	\$93,765
		151		64		549		7

Table G - Other Outcome Information for the Dislocated Worker Program

Reported Information	Individuals Who Received Training Services		Individuals Who Received Only Core and Intensive Services	
Entered Employment Rate	85.7%	1,998	78.7%	1,023
		2,332		1,300
Employment Retention Rate	90.8%	2,076	89.0%	958
		2,287		1,077
Six Months Average Earnings	\$17,927.90	\$34,582,941	\$17,292.90	\$15,425,268
		1,929		892

Table H.1 – Youth (14-21) Program Results

Reported Information	Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level	
Placement in Employment or Education	80.0%	82.6%	1,129
			1,367
Attained Degree or Certificate	70.0%	75.4%	888
			1,178
Literacy or Numeracy Gains	40.0%	45.0%	289
			639

Tables H-2, I, J, and K are not submitted by states reporting under Common Measures.

Table L - Other Reported Information

	12 Month Employment Retention Rate		12 Mo. Earnings Change (Adults and Older Youth) or 12 Mo. Earnings Replacement (Dislocated Workers)		Placements for Participants in Nontraditional Employment		Wages At Entry Into Employment For Those Individuals Who Entered Unsubsidized Employment		Entry Into Unsubsidized Employment Related to the Training Received of Those Who Completed Training Services	
Adults	83.3%	2,171	\$4483.00	\$10,688,062	3.7%	45	\$5,039.00	\$5,684,526	60.0%	512
		2,605		2,384		1,223		1,128		854
Dislocated Workers	88.5%	3,152	105.4%	\$54,808,233	4.4%	133	\$8,121.00	\$22,950,201	66.0%	1,318
		3,562		\$51,985,910		3,021		2,826		1,998

Table M - Participation Levels

Reported Information	Total Participants Served (July 2012 – June 2013)	Total Exiters (April 2012 – March 2013)
Total Adults	19,052	15,589
Adults Self-Service Only	11,125	10,340
WIA Adults (includes self-service)	13,790	12,167
WIA Dislocated Workers	5,460	3,589
Total Youth (14-21)	2,797	1,574
Younger Youth (14-18)	1,956	1,082
Older Youth (19-21)	841	492
Out-of-School Youth	1,640	1,010
In-School Youth	1,157	564

Table N - Cost of Program Activities

Program Activity (PY12/FY13 WIA & Carry-Over)			Total Federal Spending
Local Adults			\$12,959,487
Local Dislocated Workers			\$13,346,922
Local Youth			\$14,157,389
Rapid Response (up to 25%) §134 (a) (2) (A)			\$3,768,209
Statewide Required Activities (Up to 15%) §134 (a) (2) (B)			\$1,949,430
Statewide Allowable Activities §134 (a) (3) [excludes administration]		Providing capacity building to local areas.	\$591,060
		Conducting research and/or demonstration projects.	\$177,329
		Sector Programs	\$358,942
Total of All Federal Spending Listed Above			\$47,308,768

APPENDIX B

WIA TITLE I-B Program Year 2012

LOCAL WORKFORCE AREA PERFORMANCE

Tables 1-10 present WIA performance results on the nine Common Measures for each of the sixteen local workforce areas. (Refer to Section A, beginning on page 3, for a review of State performance.) State goals are negotiated and approved each year by the regional office of the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration (DOLETA). Local goals are negotiated each year with the Department of Career Services based on the approved state goals with adjustments to reflect local populations and local labor market factors.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	STATE PROGRAM YEAR 2012 GOAL LEVELS	LOCAL PERFORMANCE TABLE – PAGE
Adult Program Measures		
Entered Employment Rate	82.0%	Table 1 – Page 25
Employment Retention Rate	90.0%	Table 2 – Page 25
Six Months Average Wage	\$11,800.00	Table 3 – Page 26
Dislocated Worker Program Measures		
Entered Employment Rate	85.0%	Table 4 – Page 26
Employment Retention Rate	95.0%	Table 5 – Page 27
Six Months Average Wage	\$20,000.00	Table 6 – Page 27
Youth Program Measures		
Placement in Employment or Education	80.0%	Table 7 – Page 28
Attainment of Degree or Certificate	70.0%	Table 8 – Page 28
Literacy or Numeracy Gains	40.0%	Table 9 – Page 29
Performance Average for Program Groups		Table 10 – Page 29

Assessment of Performance on Individual Negotiated Goals (DOL Standards)

Fails: Actual Performance is less than 80.0% of the negotiated level.
 Meets: Actual Performance is between 80.0% and 100.0% of the negotiated level.
 Exceeds: Actual performance is greater than 100.0% of the negotiated level.

Table 1: Adult Program - Entered Employment Rate				
Workforce Area	Local Goal	Actual Performance	Percent of Goal	Performance Versus Goal
Berkshire County	75.0%	84.2%	112.3%	Exceeds
Boston	77.0%	74.4%	96.6%	Meets
Bristol	76.0%	77.4%	101.8%	Exceeds
Brockton	71.0%	83.6%	117.7%	Exceeds
Cape Cod & Islands	77.0%	95.1%	123.5%	Exceeds
Central Massachusetts	80.0%	78.9%	98.6%	Meets
Franklin/Hampshire	82.0%	92.0%	112.2%	Exceeds
Greater Lowell	74.0%	88.2%	119.2%	Exceeds
Greater New Bedford	71.0%	68.6%	96.6%	Meets
Hampden County	72.0%	78.5%	109.0%	Exceeds
Merrimack Valley	70.0%	71.6%	102.3%	Exceeds
Metro North	75.0%	87.7%	116.9%	Exceeds
Metro South/West	82.0%	82.1%	100.1%	Exceeds
North Central Mass	75.0%	74.1%	98.8%	Meets
North Shore	82.0%	90.0%	109.8%	Exceeds
South Shore	74.0%	74.4%	100.5%	Exceeds

Table 2: Adult Program - Employment Retention Rate				
Workforce Area	Local Goal	Actual Performance	Percent of Goal	Performance Versus Goal
Berkshire County	80.0%	72.1%	90.1%	Meets
Boston	85.0%	89.7%	105.5%	Exceeds
Bristol	85.0%	84.2%	99.1%	Meets
Brockton	81.0%	90.5%	111.7%	Exceeds
Cape Cod & Islands	79.0%	87.8%	111.1%	Exceeds
Central Massachusetts	82.0%	81.9%	99.9%	Meets
Franklin/Hampshire	90.0%	76.9%	85.4%	Meets
Greater Lowell	81.0%	88.2%	108.9%	Exceeds
Greater New Bedford	75.0%	87.6%	116.8%	Exceeds
Hampden County	81.0%	84.7%	104.6%	Exceeds
Merrimack Valley	80.0%	84.7%	105.9%	Exceeds
Metro North	83.0%	79.2%	95.4%	Meets
Metro South/West	80.0%	83.8%	104.8%	Exceeds
North Central Mass	88.0%	96.6%	109.8%	Exceeds
North Shore	90.0%	91.0%	101.1%	Exceeds
South Shore	85.0%	93.0%	109.4%	Exceeds

Table 3: Adult Program - Six Months Average Earnings

Workforce Area	Local Goal	Actual Performance	Percent of Goal	Performance Versus Goal
Berkshire County	\$9,000.00	\$9,737.00	108.2%	Exceeds
Boston	\$11,800.00	\$11,146.00	94.5%	Meets
Bristol	\$10,000.00	\$12,581.00	125.8%	Exceeds
Brockton	\$12,431.00	\$15,763.00	126.8%	Exceeds
Cape Cod & Islands	\$10,284.00	\$11,149.00	108.4%	Exceeds
Central Massachusetts	\$11,800.00	\$16,608.00	140.7%	Exceeds
Franklin/Hampshire	\$10,488.00	\$12,584.00	120.0%	Exceeds
Greater Lowell	\$10,043.00	\$16,152.00	160.8%	Exceeds
Greater New Bedford	\$10,500.00	\$9,408.00	89.6%	Meets
Hampden County	\$9,736.00	\$10,387.00	106.7%	Exceeds
Merrimack Valley	\$10,000.00	\$10,341.00	103.4%	Exceeds
Metro North	\$9,800.00	\$10,827.00	110.5%	Exceeds
Metro South/West	\$9,300.00	\$16,519.00	177.6%	Exceeds
North Central Mass	\$10,000.00	\$8,101.00	81.0%	Meets
North Shore	\$11,800.00	\$11,796.00	100.0%	Meets
South Shore	\$11,800.00	\$12,862.00	109.0%	Exceeds

Table 4: Dislocated Worker Program - Entered Employment Rate

Workforce Area	Local Goal	Actual Performance	Percent of Goal	Performance Versus Goal
Berkshire County	78.0	82.8	106.2%	Exceeds
Boston	75.0	76.7	102.3%	Exceeds
Bristol	80.0	84.0	105.0%	Exceeds
Brockton	74.0	86.7	117.2%	Exceeds
Cape Cod & Islands	82.0	92.1	112.3%	Exceeds
Central Massachusetts	84.0	86.6	103.1%	Exceeds
Franklin/Hampshire	85.0	90.7	106.7%	Exceeds
Greater Lowell	77.0	95.2	123.6%	Exceeds
Greater New Bedford	80.0	84.3	105.4%	Exceeds
Hampden County	82.0	83.3	101.6%	Exceeds
Merrimack Valley	83.0	77.2	93.0%	Meets
Metro North	80.0	83.2	104.0%	Exceeds
Metro South/West	83.0	80.0	96.4%	Meets
North Central Mass	85.0	91.9	108.1%	Exceeds
North Shore	85.0	95.1	111.9%	Exceeds
South Shore	78.0	76.0	97.4%	Meets

Table 5: Dislocated Worker Program -Employment Retention Rate				
Workforce Area	Local Goal	Actual Performance	Percent of Goal	Performance Versus Goal
Berkshire County	88.0%	89.7%	101.9%	Exceeds
Boston	85.0%	82.9%	97.5%	Meets
Bristol	90.0%	88.2%	98.0%	Meets
Brockton	91.0%	94.3%	103.6%	Exceeds
Cape Cod & Islands	85.0%	97.2%	114.4%	Exceeds
Central Massachusetts	87.0%	89.8%	103.2%	Exceeds
Franklin/Hampshire	92.0%	89.6%	97.4%	Meets
Greater Lowell	89.0%	96.2%	108.1%	Exceeds
Greater New Bedford	95.0%	89.7%	94.4%	Meets
Hampden County	90.0%	93.5%	103.9%	Exceeds
Merrimack Valley	85.0%	85.4%	100.5%	Exceeds
Metro North	90.0%	91.0%	101.1%	Exceeds
Metro South/West	93.0%	90.4%	97.2%	Meets
North Central Mass	90.0%	92.5%	102.8%	Exceeds
North Shore	91.0%	95.0%	104.4%	Exceeds
South Shore	87.0%	87.5%	100.6%	Exceeds

Table 6: Dislocated Worker Program - Six Months Average Earnings				
Workforce Area	Negotiated Goal	Actual Performance	Percent of Goal	Performance Versus Goal
Berkshire County	\$15,000.00	\$13,170.60	87.8%	Meets
Boston	\$14,800.00	\$15,534.20	105.0%	Exceeds
Bristol	\$15,400.00	\$15,304.60	99.4%	Meets
Brockton	\$17,001.00	\$16,990.10	99.9%	Meets
Cape Cod & Islands	\$16,611.00	\$16,022.60	96.5%	Meets
Central Massachusetts	\$20,000.00	\$20,940.00	104.7%	Exceeds
Franklin/Hampshire	\$17,045.00	\$14,512.70	85.1%	Meets
Greater Lowell	\$16,480.00	\$21,335.30	129.5%	Exceeds
Greater New Bedford	\$14,500.00	\$13,520.80	93.2%	Meets
Hampden County	\$15,600.00	\$15,237.10	97.7%	Meets
Merrimack Valley	\$18,000.00	\$17,869.00	99.3%	Meets
Metro North	\$18,500.00	\$21,880.00	118.3%	Exceeds
Metro South/West	\$20,000.00	\$24,804.40	124.0%	Exceeds
North Central Mass	\$17,000.00	\$18,826.20	110.7%	Exceeds
North Shore	\$18,000.00	\$17,285.40	96.0%	Meets
South Shore	\$20,000.00	\$23,449.60	117.2%	Exceeds

Table 7: Youth Program - Placement in Employment or Education				
Workforce Area	Local Goal	Actual Performance	Percent of Goal	Performance Versus Goal
Berkshire County	75.0%	75.4%	100.5%	Exceeds
Boston	74.0%	70.8%	95.7%	Meets
Bristol	75.0%	85.2%	113.6%	Exceeds
Brockton	80.0%	87.8%	109.8%	Exceeds
Cape Cod & Islands	80.0%	90.5%	113.1%	Exceeds
Central Massachusetts	80.0%	87.6%	109.5%	Exceeds
Franklin/Hampshire	80.0%	73.5%	91.9%	Meets
Greater Lowell	76.0%	83.5%	109.9%	Exceeds
Greater New Bedford	75.0%	65.3%	87.1%	Meets
Hampden County	80.0%	89.8%	112.3%	Exceeds
Merrimack Valley	75.0%	86.0%	114.7%	Exceeds
Metro North	76.0%	84.4%	111.1%	Exceeds
Metro South/West	80.0%	97.8%	122.3%	Exceeds
North Central Mass	80.0%	68.5%	85.6%	Meets
North Shore	80.0%	84.0%	105.0%	Exceeds
South Shore	75.0%	80.0%	106.7%	Exceeds

Table 8: Youth Program - Attainment of Degree or Certificate				
Workforce Area	Local Goal	Actual Performance	Percent of Goal	Performance Versus Goal
Berkshire County	65.0%	66.2%	101.8%	Exceeds
Boston	61.0%	52.4%	85.9%	Meets
Bristol	64.0%	85.4%	133.4%	Exceeds
Brockton	62.0%	73.6%	118.7%	Exceeds
Cape Cod & Islands	70.0%	92.0%	131.4%	Exceeds
Central Massachusetts	70.0%	86.7%	123.9%	Exceeds
Franklin/Hampshire	62.0%	50.0%	80.6%	Meets
Greater Lowell	63.0%	73.2%	116.2%	Exceeds
Greater New Bedford	62.0%	55.4%	89.4%	Meets
Hampden County	68.0%	72.0%	105.9%	Exceeds
Merrimack Valley	65.0%	84.2%	129.5%	Exceeds
Metro North	68.0%	88.0%	129.4%	Exceeds
Metro South/West	70.0%	79.6%	113.7%	Exceeds
North Central Mass	70.0%	89.5%	127.9%	Exceeds
North Shore	70.0%	88.5%	126.4%	Exceeds
South Shore	62.0%	66.7%	107.6%	Exceeds

Table 9: Youth Program - Literacy or Numeracy Gains

Workforce Area	Local Goal	Actual Performance	Percent of Goal	Performance Versus Goal
Berkshire County	40.0%	75.0%	187.5%	Exceeds
Boston	26.0%	37.4%	143.8%	Exceeds
Bristol	30.0%	25.9%	86.3%	Exceeds
Brockton	35.0%	71.4%	204.0%	Exceeds
Cape Cod & Islands	26.0%	100.0%	384.6%	Exceeds
Central Massachusetts	40.0%	53.9%	134.8%	Exceeds
Franklin/Hampshire	26.0%	60.0%	230.8%	Exceeds
Greater Lowell	26.0%	87.5%	336.5%	Exceeds
Greater New Bedford	35.0%	31.0%	88.6%	Meets
Hampden County	40.0%	43.0%	107.5%	Exceeds
Merrimack Valley	26.0%	46.4%	178.5%	Exceeds
Metro North	36.0%	60.3%	167.5%	Exceeds
Metro South/West	26.0%	25.0%	96.2%	Meets
North Central Mass	40.0%	44.4%	111.0%	Exceeds
North Shore	40.0%	88.2%	220.5%	Exceeds
South Shore	26.0%	13.3%	51.2%	Fails

Table 10: Performance Average (Percent of Goal) for Program Groups

Workforce Area	Adult Group	Dislocated Worker Group	Youth Group
Berkshire County	103.5%	98.6%	129.9%
Boston	98.9%	101.6%	108.5%
Bristol	108.9%	100.8%	111.1%
Brockton	118.8%	106.9%	114.2%
Cape Cod & Islands	114.4%	107.7%	209.7%
Central Massachusetts	113.1%	103.7%	122.7%
Franklin/Hampshire	105.9%	96.4%	134.4%
Greater Lowell	129.6%	120.4%	187.5%
Greater New Bedford	101.0%	97.7%	88.3%
Hampden County	106.8%	101.0%	108.5%
Merrimack Valley	103.9%	97.6%	140.9%
Metro North	107.6%	107.8%	136.0%
Metro South/West	127.5%	105.9%	110.7%
North Central Mass	96.5%	107.2%	108.2%
North Shore	103.6%	104.1%	150.6%
South Shore	106.3%	105.1%	88.5%
STATE	98.4%	93.8%	107.8%

APPENDIX C

COMMON MEASURES AT-A-GLANCE

ADULT MEASURES	YOUTH MEASURES
<p>Entered Employment</p> <p><i>Of those who are not employed at the date of participation:</i></p> $\frac{\text{\# of adult participants who are employed in the first quarter after the exit quarter } (\div)}{\text{\# of adult participants who exit during the quarter}}$	<p>Placement in Employment or Education</p> <p><i>Of those who are not in post-secondary education or employment (including the military) at the date of participation:</i></p> $\frac{\text{\# of youth participants who are in employment (including the military) or enrolled in post-secondary education and/or advanced training/occupational skills training in the first quarter after the exit quarter } (\div)}{\text{\# of youth participants who exit during the quarter}}$
<p>Employment Retention</p> <p><i>Of those who are employed in the first quarter after the exit quarter:</i></p> $\frac{\text{\# of adult participants who are employed in both the second and third quarters after the exit quarter } (\div)}{\text{\# of adult participants who exit during the quarter}}$	<p>Attainment of a Degree or Certificate</p> <p><i>Of those enrolled in education (at the date of participation or at any point during the program):</i></p> $\frac{\text{\# of youth participants who attain a diploma, GED, or certificate by the end of the third quarter after the exit quarter } (\div)}{\text{\# of youth participants who exit during the quarter}}$
<p>Average Earnings</p> <p><i>Of those adult participants who are employed in the first, second, and third quarters after the exit quarter:</i></p> $\frac{\text{Total earnings in the second plus the total earnings in the third quarters after the exit quarter } (\div)}{\text{\# of adult participants who exit during the quarter}}$ <p><i>(Adult measures cover both WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker programs.)</i></p>	<p>Literacy and Numeracy Gains</p> <p><i>Of those out-of-school youth who are basic skills deficient:</i></p> $\frac{\text{\# of youth participants who increase one or more educational functioning levels } (\div)}{\text{\# of youth participants who have completed a year in the program (i.e., one year from the date of first youth program service) plus the \# of youth participants who exit before completing a year in the youth program}}$

Source: Training and Employment Guidance Letter No. 17-05, Common Measures Policy for the Employment and Training Administration's (ETA) Performance Accountability System and Related Performance Issues

