

Pages 64 -70

Assessment and Performance

Using the table provided in Appendix 1, include the State's expected levels of performance relating to the performance accountability measures based on primary indicators of performance described in section 116(b)(2)(A) of WIOA. (This Strategic Planning element only applies to WIOA Core programs.)

The Baker-Polito Administration supports enterprise-wide performance management as a tool for both process and outcome improvement. As such the Administration embraced the new federal Indicators of Performance, as well as the latitude afforded states to create their own distinct indicators stemming from WIOA. A Performance Management Workgroup was established as part of the MWIB WIOA Steering Committee structure. The group consisted of internal and external members of the workforce development system and core partners under WIOA.

The Performance Measurement workgroup is currently exploring:

- Data each measure is meant to capture and what it would communicate;
- Available data sources / agency capacity to capture the data;
- Balance between exhaustive list and meaningful list;
- Whether the performance measures will apply to all core WIOA partners
- How the measures would be compared (i.e. by area, statewide, etc.);
- Developing baseline data on program performance;
- Future targets for performance measures.

Federally Required WIOA Measures

The federal indicators of performance focus on employment outcomes in the second and fourth quarter after exit, median earnings in the second quarter after exit, credential attainment, and measurable skill gains for job seekers and adult education participants. For the first time, all partners and their federally funded programs will be measured in the same way for these same outcomes. While they are only a slight departure from the indicators captured and reported on by Workforce Investment Boards and One-Stop Career Centers, they represent a wholesale change for the other core partners. Moreover, a penalty could be applied to WIOA discretionary funds for repeated missed performance targets, which may create a new sense of shared accountability for shared customers and their outcomes. There is also a new federal indicator focused on "effectiveness in service to employers" that all partners would be measured on and required to report. As of the writing of this draft, this indicator is still under development with our federal regulators.

REQUIRED FEDERAL MEASURES (WIOA Legislation)

Evaluation Question	Federal Measures	Who is Included in Measure?	Targets
Are programs achieving results for program participants?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employed 2nd Quarter after Exit (federal measure) • Employed 4th Quarter after Exit (federal measure) • Median Earnings 2nd Quarter After Exit (federal measure) • Credential Attainment Rate (federal measure) • Measureable Skill Gains (based on training/education gains) – (federal measure) • Effectiveness in Serving Employers - (federal measure to be defined) 	<p>All measures applied to participants in each WIOA funding stream (reports separate by agency):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All One-Stop Career Center Customers (<i>Specific One-Stop Career Center report or statewide rollup</i>) • Title II participants (<i>adult education</i>) • Title IV vocational rehabilitation participants (<i>MRC and MCB</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal Government sets target for federal measures. • First report period begins July 1, 2016. • The first year will serve as the baseline period as it is the first time any partner will be collecting this information in this format.

Given the significant change to performance measurement for several of the WIOA partners, there were efforts internal to each system (adult education, vocational rehabilitation, etc.) to better understand the impact of the required WIOA measures for each unique system as well. For example, in addition to the cross-agency WIOA Workgroup on Performance Measurement, the Adult and Community Learning Services (ACLS) department in Massachusetts created a stakeholder engagement process for providers in the field to better understand the implications and impact of the federal measures on adult education. The WIOA performance measures provide one strategy for assessing the quality of the adult literacy services provided. In FY16, ACLS convened a WIOA Performance Measures Task Force comprised of five Massachusetts adult education directors and ACLS staff to:

- Review the WIOA performance measures and program performance data;
- Decide whether the federal measures should be part of a new state performance accountability system for awarding past performance points to local programs;
- Decide whether additional measures should be added;
- Weight and rank the measures;
- Address implications; and
- Create a plan for rolling out the new system including a performance measures pilot for FY17.

ACLS continues to integrate the feedback and work with the adult education field into the cross-agency Performance Workgroup and the WIOA Steering Committee.

State-Designed Performance Measures

Although these federal indicators represent a significant step toward systems alignment and shared accountability, the various workgroups and the Steering Committee felt it was important to consider additional indicators that would specifically speak to our achievement of the goals previously outlined.

As such, the Steering Committee and Performance Workgroup developed measurement concepts that reflect the vision, goals and strategies outlined in prior sections. In particular, the Performance Workgroup identified gaps in the federal measures related to the results for specific job seeker populations, business customers and the long-term impact of education, training and supports on an individual's career pathway toward self-sustaining wages.

Currently, the Performance Measurement Workgroup is reviewing the following types of state-designed measures.

RESULTS FOR KEY POPULATIONS

A significant focus for WIOA and for the Baker Administration is to ensure that individuals who face barriers to employment benefit from public education, training and workforce programs in order to shift patterns of chronic unemployment for specific demographic populations and job seekers. While the WIOA federal measures look at job placement, states are not required to further review job placement data by population type. Massachusetts is considering state-designed measures that track job placement and results for specific populations WITHIN the required, federal data sets for each funding stream. Currently, the group is reviewing the proposed measures as shown in the table below.

Evaluation Question	State-Designed Job Seeker Performance Measures	Who is included in the Measures? [Data collection and measurement initiative by each agency administering the program.]		
		All Career Center Participants (WIOA Title I, III, Vets, TRADE, etc.)	Adult Education Participants (WIOA Title II)	Vocational Rehabilitation Participants (WIOA Title IV)
Are programs achieving results for key populations?	Number and Percent of customers enrolled in training and employed in a training related job 2 nd Quarter After Exit	<i>Only Career Center Customers enrolled in a training program. (obtained by follow up with customer)</i>	<i>Only Title II individuals enrolled in a training program. (obtained by follow up with customer)</i>	<i>Only Title IV individuals enrolled in a training program. (captured in MIS) MCB is working with its software vendor to modify its software to capture the data for FY 2017.</i>
	Number and Percent of Veterans Employed 2 nd Quarter After Exit	<i>Only Career Center Customers who self-declare Veterans status included in measure.</i>	<i>Only Title II individuals who self-declare Veterans status included in measure. (Will need to add to intake – expect very few)</i>	<i>Only Title IV individuals who self-declare Veterans status included in measure. MCB is working with its software vendor to modify its software to capture the data for FY 2017.</i>
	Number and Percent of	<i>Only Career Center</i>	<i>Title II individuals with</i>	<i>Only Title IV individuals</i>

Evaluation Question	State-Designed Job Seeker Performance Measures	Who is included in the Measures? [Data collection and measurement initiative by each agency administering the program.]		
		All Career Center Participants (WIOA Title I, III, Vets, TRADE, etc.)	Adult Education Participants (WIOA Title II)	Vocational Rehabilitation Participants (WIOA Title IV)
	Individuals with Language Barriers at Registration Employed 2 nd Quarter After Exit	Customers who self-declare ESOL status included in measure.	ESOL status included in measure. (results only for customers who provide SSN and sign a Release of Information Form)	who self-declare ESOL status included in measure. MRC will be able to measure this effective July 1 st , 2016 with WIOA data changes to our Case Management System MCB is working with its software vendor to modify its software to capture the data for FY 2017.
	Number and Percent of Individuals without High School Equivalency at enrollment that obtained a HS equivalency and who are Employed at 2 nd Quarter After Exit (May use federal time requirement – within one year of exit – instead of 2 nd quarter)	All Career Center Participants without HS Equivalency at intake (WIOA Title I, III, Vets, TRADE, etc.)	All Adult Education Participants (WIOA Title II) (Need to determine the cohorts to be included in this measure. Results only for customers who provide SSN and sign a Release of Information Form)	All Vocational Rehabilitation Participants without HS Equivalency at intake (WIOA Title IV) MRC can measure this once individual wage matching is available MCB is working with its software vendor to modify its software to capture the data for FY 2017.
	Number and Percent of Individuals with a Disability 2 nd Quarter After Exit	Only Career Center Customers who self-declare included in measure.	Only Title II individuals who self-declare included in measure.	Only Title IV individuals who self-declare included in measure. (This would be all MRC and MCB participants – 100%)
	Number and Percent of Individuals receiving TANF or SNAP Employed 2 nd Quarter After Exit (related to services provided to DTA participants)	All Career Center Participants receiving TANF or SNAP required to enroll in job assistance services (WIOA Title I, III, Vets, TRADE, etc.)	All Adult Education Participants receiving TANF or SNAP (WIOA Title II) How to identify ACLS students who are SNAP/TANF?	All Vocational Rehabilitation Participants receiving TANF or SNAP (WIOA Title IV) (MRC can only measure VR participants receiving TANF benefits, not SNAP)

CAREER PATHWAY RESULTS FOR INDIVIDUALS

The individual completion or job placement results for individuals by funding stream stop short of providing information on how a person progresses across systems or resources as they (hopefully) make progress along a career pathway. As the Commonwealth builds new IT systems to track cross-agency referrals and to match individuals to wage record data from different systems, the state will move toward more in-depth analysis of the impact of education, training and support systems on an individual's long-term success.

A handful of leading states have developed longitudinal data systems and practices of answering important questions about public services and investments. These states work with the Workforce Data Quality Campaign. The Campaign has identified a group of 10 states working together as “The Alliance for Quality Career Pathways” (Arkansas, California, Illinois, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Oregon, Virginia, Washington and Wisconsin) that is developing shared metrics for career pathway systems. Career pathways reorient existing education and workforce services into a structure that focuses on the workforce needs of employers and on the education and training needs of individuals as they pursue their career paths. [The effort](#) is led by the ten states and facilitated by the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), a WDQC national partner. States are currently testing a set of metrics that include educational outcomes (e.g. credit accumulation, certificate attainment) and labor market outcomes (e.g. employment placement rates, initial earnings). These metrics would give multiple programs shared outcome measures and similar definitions, such as measuring “initial earnings” as the median earnings in the second and third quarters after career pathway exit. Several of the states are integrating the metrics testing into state data system development projects.

Massachusetts leadership across the Administration, the State Workforce Development Board, WIOA Partners, the WIOA Steering Committee, and stakeholders hopes to learn from how these states have developed IT systems across existing infrastructure and the key drivers to building this capacity.

The Steering Committee has discussed ideas to follow individuals (not funding streams) across programs/services to look at longer term impact. The concepts and vision to develop career pathways measures in Massachusetts are captured in the table below.

Evaluation Question	DRAFT Measure (State-Designed)	Who is Included In Measure?	Targets
---------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------

<p>Are programs assisting individuals to move along a career pathway toward self-sustaining wages?</p>	<p>Track an <u>individual</u> across programs over multiple years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on pattern of “bundled” services or service use across Career Centers, adult education, vocational rehab, higher education etc. services • Number and percentage of individuals who complete a Career Action Plan (CAP) with assessments (education, TORQ, CRI, inventory) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number and percentage with CAP who complete education and training credentials called for in CAP (e.g. HiSET, ESOL, ITA, CEIS, community college through financial aid, NEG., TRADE, etc.) in JobQuest (even if partner agency) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Average length of time for credential completion</i> ▪ <i>Types of supports provided (daycare, transportation, coaching, etc.)</i> • Number and percentage of career pathways participants who attain self-sufficiency wages after credential completion (for various quarters post completion) 	<p>Cohort-based, longitudinal report.</p> <p>Build cohort based upon individuals found across data systems with from agency referrals.</p>	<p>Targets: TBD</p> <p>NOTE: These measures will entail additional IT system development and costs to collect data for the measures.</p>
---	--	--	---

BUSINESS CUSTOMER RESULTS

The required WIOA measure to look at the “effectiveness in service to employers” needs additional definition and refinement. The Steering Committee, Performance Workforce and Business Strategies Workgroups also identified a need to greatly improve the data collection and ability to report out on results for business customers, in particular those business customers working with One-Stop Career Centers. The WIOA partners outside of the One-Stop Career Center system do not serve the same volume of business customers and therefore need to continue to identify ways in which these types of measures would be meaningful and doable.

Evaluation Question	DRAFT Measure (State-Designed)	Who is Included In Measure?	Targets
---------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------

Are programs meeting business need?	Measures reported by OSCC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Customer Satisfaction (survey tool) • Number of businesses served <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of new businesses served ○ Number of repeat businesses served ○ Number of businesses served by industry type ○ Number of Business Visits Weekly • Number (and percent) of businesses registered with OSCC (JobQuest) who hire customers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of hires per industry • Retention rate for individuals hired by businesses registered with OSCC (JobQuest) who hire customers • Number of business utilizing talent pipeline development services (Workforce Training Fund, OJT, apprenticeship, etc.) 	Business customers of One-Stop Career Centers	Create a Business Engagement/OS CC Dashboard Targets: TBD NOTE: These measures will entail additional IT system development and costs to collect data for the measures.
-------------------------------------	--	---	--

Pages 91 - 107

Assessment of Core Programs

Assessment of Core Programs. Describe how the core programs will be assessed each year based on State performance accountability measures described in section 116(b) of WIOA. This State assessment must include the quality, effectiveness, and improvement of programs broken down by local area or provider. Such state assessments should take into account local and regional planning goals.

The state is committed to implementing a highly effective workforce development system. Given this, all core partners have been working in a collaborative fashion to achieve benchmark outcomes for both the defined federal indicators and have agreed to hold the workforce system accountable to additional indicators which align with the Commonwealth's vision and goals (as described in Section II, Assessment and Performance). While each indicator may not be applied to each core partner, collectively, they will demonstrate the effectiveness of the workforce

system as a whole. The performance indicators will be analyzed by local area or providers, as appropriate. As previously referenced in the Performance and Assessment Section, the state is committing to the developing targets or benchmarks as the state-designed measures are developed. Although TANF and SNAP funding is not subject to the federal indicators discussed below, the state is working to ensure that assessments of how well programs impact TANF/SNAP-affiliated individuals are considered as part of the additional state-focused indicators.

Federal indicators of performance are provided by state and local workforce area quarterly and annually are included in the following charts.

Chart 28 – Federal Indicators of Performance

Agency and Program	FEDERAL INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE					
	Employed 2 nd Quarter After Exit	Employed 4 th Quarter After Exit	Median Earnings 2 nd Quarter After Exit	Credential Attainment Rate	Measureable Skill Gains	Effectiveness in Serving Employers
DCS Title I Adult	X	X	X	X	X	X
DCS Title I Youth	X	X	X	X	X	X
DCS Title I Dislocated Worker	X	X	X	X	X	X
DCS Title III Wagner-Peyser	X	X	X	X	X	X
DESE/ACLS Title II Adult Education	X	X	X	X	X	NA
MRC Title IV Rehabilitation Services	X	X	X	X	X	X
MCB Title IV Rehabilitation Services	X	X	X	X	X	NA

Proposed Goals for each of the Indicators of Performance are provided in Attachment xx.
(GOALS NOT AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME – ATTACHMENT XX SHOWS FORMAT)

Required Reports: Produced at State, Workforce Area, and Provider level, as required.

1. Quarterly Reports: Participant Individual Records (PIRL) submitted by each agency.

2. Annual State Performance Report: Refer below to Question (6) A. (iv) and required report format in Appendix 2.
3. Annual Eligible Training Provider Report: See required report format in Appendix 3.

WIOA Core Program partners will be assessed each year by the required federal WIOA measures, included the federal process to establish local and regional planning goals. As the state moves forward on the state-designed measures, the state will expand the short and long term methods to evaluate the impact of the services provided through the Combined State Plan partners.

Previous Assessment Results

Previous Assessment Results. Beginning with the state plan modification in 2018 and for subsequent state plans and state plan modifications, provide the results of an assessment of the effectiveness of the core programs and other One-Stop partner programs and Combined State Plan partner program included in the plan during the preceding two-year period. Describe how the State is adapting its strategies based on these assessments. Describe how the state will conduct evaluations and research projects on activities under WIOA core programs; how such projects will be coordinated with, and designed in conjunction with, State and local boards and with State agencies responsible for the administration of all respective core programs; and, further, how the projects will be coordinated with the evaluations provided for by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education under WIOA.

Massachusetts leadership across the Administration, the State Workforce Development Board, WIOA Partners, the WIOA Steering Committee, and stakeholders hopes to learn from how other states have created evaluation and research projects on WIOA core programs.

Our goal is to utilize the WIOA steering committee and a new evaluation committee across Secretariats sponsored by a USDOE SDLS grant to coordinate and drive evaluation and research. The Steering Committee developed the idea to develop a new approach to WIOA performance through the development of “pathway” measurement and evaluation (most likely longitudinal) to understand the impact of programs on an individual (not the performance for all participants by funding stream). Developing this capacity will require a robust research and evaluation agenda shared by all the partners. The key concepts and vision to develop career pathways measures in Massachusetts were included in a chart in Section II, Assessment and Performance section. A handful of leading states have developed longitudinal data systems and practices of answering important questions about public services and investments. These states work with the Workforce Data Quality Campaign. As the Commonwealth builds new IT systems to track cross-agency referrals and to match individuals to wage record data from different systems, the state will move toward more in-depth analysis of the impact of education, training and support systems on an individual’s long-term success.

Presented below is data on performance for each partner program for the most recent two years.

Chart 29 - Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development – Two-Year Performance

Program	PY 2013	PY 2014	PY 2013	PY 2014	PY 2013	PY 2014
	Entered Employment Rate		Employment Retention Rate		Six Month Average Earnings	
Title 1 Adult	83%	86%	89%	89%	\$11,558	\$11,790
Title I Dislocated Worker	84%	87%	90%	91%	\$17,749	\$18,621
Title III Wagner-Peyser	52%	57%	81%	83%	\$16,839	\$17,812
Trade (TAA)	80%	81%	89%	92%	\$18,497	\$17,872
Veterans (JVSG)	46%	52%	77%	80%	\$18,350	\$19,185
	Placement in Employment/Education		Attainment of Degree or Certificate		Literacy/Numeracy Gain	
Title I Youth	77%	81%	71%	70%	43%	39%

DCS publishes data quarterly on the programs listed in the above table. Detailed performance charts that present data on service provision at the One-Stop Career Centers and program performance at the state and local workforce area levels are available on the massworkforce website at <http://www.mass.gov/massworkforce/ccpr/>. Additionally, reports have been developed for operational management of each primary program operated at the career centers. Some reports are designed to be run by managers and staff on demand, such as the reports developed for the RESEA program. The MOSES system also provides access to a number of regularly available reports.

These reports form the basis for analysis of career center activities and outputs. Programs are monitored by the DCS program managers and by the DCS Quality Assurance (QA) team that assists career centers to evaluate their performance and identify the sources of any operational weaknesses. The QA team also addresses issues of timely, complete and accurate data entry. Workforce areas that exhibit performance below 80% of their local performance goals on the measures shown above for two consecutive years are placed on corrective action.

ACLS serves a wide range of learners with barriers to success in the labor market and/or postsecondary education. These barriers include low skills, basic skills deficiencies, Limited English Proficiency, lack of a high school diploma or its equivalent, and ex-offender status.

Chart 30 - Executive Office of Education Two-Year Performance

MASSACHUSETTS PREVIOUS TWO-YEAR PERFORMANCE				
Program	Entered Employment Rate ⁽¹⁾		Retained Employment Rate ⁽²⁾	
Title II Adult Basic Education	PY 2012	PY 2013	PY 2012	PY 2013
	36%	39%	73%	74%
	Obtain High School Equivalency ⁽³⁾		Entered Postsecondary Education/Occupational Training ⁽⁴⁾	
	PY 2012	PY 2013	PY 2012	PY 2013
	76%	76%	14%	13%
	Adult Basic Education (ABE) Educational Function Level (EFL) Completion Rate ⁽⁵⁾		English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Educational Function Level (EFL) Completion Rate ⁽⁶⁾	
	PY 2012	PY 2013	PY 2012	PY 2013
	25%	23%	46%	48%

(1) “Entered Employment Rate” was calculated based on a cohort of learners who were not employed at time of entry and in the labor force. Almost a third (33% or 418 out of 1274) of the students in this cohort face significant employability challenges due to low-level English language skills.

(2) “Retained Employment Rate” was calculated based on a cohort of learners who were employed at exit and remained employed in the third quarter after exit quarter.

The national reporting system assigns students to one of two cohorts: Obtain HSE or Entered Postsecondary.

(3) “Obtained High School Equivalency” percentage was calculated based on all learners who had taken all GED or HiSET tests, or were enrolled in adult high school at the high ASE level, or in the assessment phase of the EDP who exit during the program year and obtained high school equivalency credential.

(4) “Entered Postsecondary Education/Occupational Training” percentage was calculated by dividing the number of exited students who enrolled in postsecondary education/ occupational training by the total number of exited students with a high school credential; this denominator includes 2,090 students (or 58% of 3,600 students) who were beginning English language learners with a high school credential from outside of the US who do not have the English skills to enter postsecondary education in the US.

(5) EFL (Educational Functioning Level) completion is based on standardized tests. The majority of ABE students (2,705 or 34% of the 7,900 students in PY 2013 receiving ABE services) enrolled in the ABE High Intermediate EFL which has the largest grade-level equivalent range (GLE 6 to 8.9). Students who are at GLE 6 typically take more than one year to progress to the next EFL.

(6) NRS approved ESOL assessments do not measure gains beyond the advanced level (SPL 6) thus EFL completion rates for ESOL students at the advanced level are not fully captured.

For more information related to Educational Function Levels, please refer to the *National Reporting System (NRS) Implementation Guidelines* which can be found at http://www.nrsweb.org/docs/ImplementationGuidelines_005_updatedC25.pdf.

ACLS also has in place a number of strategies and initiatives to support local programs in improving their services by: implementing the College and Career Readiness Standards for Adult Education (a subset of the Common Core State Standards); adopting the Student Achievement in Reading (STAR) program which builds reading skills of intermediate-level adult learners; partnering with One-Stop Career Centers and Workforce Development Boards to implement the Adult Career Pathways programs that transition qualified ABE students to postsecondary education, training, and/or employment; and investing in rigorous research-based professional development.

- **Adult Career Pathways** – ACLS funds Adult Career Pathways (ACP) programs that partner with One-Stop Career Centers (OSCCs) and Workforce Development Boards (WDBs) with the goal of getting students on a pathway to college and a career. With curricula contextualized to industry-specific sectors, the goal of these programs is to transition students from adult education programs funded by ACLS to postsecondary education, training, and/or employment.
- **Education and Career Plans** - Adult education programs help students develop Education and Career Plans (ECP), a first step in a student’s pathway to a career; advisors and teachers work with students to build their ECPs based on the student’s skills and interests in a particular field. The ECP is a place to track what a student does to that end (e.g., students register at OSCCs).
- **Improved Professional Development (PD)** – The System for Adult Basic Education Support (SABES) provides the adult education field with rigorous, research-based PD aligned with the College and Career Readiness Standards in Adult Education (CCRSAE) in an effort to ensure that all adult education staff are equipped to help the state’s adult students become college and career ready.
- **Math Professional Development** – ACLS will continue its work on the following in relation to incorporating math into adult education programs:
 - Introducing math instruction to ESOL classes;
 - Increasing rigor (as defined in the CCRSAE) by emphasizing conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and broad contextualized application in equal measure; and
 - Incorporating the Mathematical Practices (habits of mind) into the new adult education classroom so as to develop the critical “foundation skills” valued by colleges and employers--embracing challenges, persisting in the face of setbacks, seeing effort as the path to mastery, learning from criticism, and finding lessons and inspiration in the success of others--as well as content knowledge and skills.
- **Student Achievement in Reading (STAR)** – A national PD program focused on building reading skills of intermediate-level adult learners, STAR is supported by research which found that mid-level learners struggle with one or more reading components: alphabetics, fluency, vocabulary, and/or comprehension. STAR requires teachers to use diagnostic assessments to identify learner strengths and weaknesses and target reading instruction accordingly.

- **State Performance Measures Task Force** – ACLS has created a task force of adult education directors to recommend a state performance accountability system aligned with WIOA by which to measure programs' past performance during an open and competitive funding year. Four of the six WIOA measures relate to job obtainment and one of the two educational measures is an increase in student Education Functioning Levels (EFLs).
- **Educator Policy Team** – “The single biggest factor in student success is teacher quality,” *How to Fix our Schools: a Manifesto* by Joel Klein and Michelle Rhee *The Washington Post*. To this end, ACLS's Educator Policy Team is in its second year of a three-year pilot of the Massachusetts ABE Educator Evaluation System. Modeled after the K-12 evaluation system, adult education's system is grounded in a five-step continuous improvement cycle.
- **Standards in Action** – Massachusetts will continue to receive ongoing technical assistance through the College and Career Readiness Standards in Action project offered by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education (OCTAE). Through this work, state teams will learn how to effectively implement the CCRSAE in their programs.

Chart 31 - Executive Office of Health and Human Services Two-Year Performance, General

MASSACHUSETTS REHABILITATION COMMISSION MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION TWO YEAR PERFORMANCE		
MRC Vocational Rehabilitation Federal Standards and Indicators (Calculated on Federal Fiscal Year)	FFY2013	FFY2014
Increase in Successful Employment Outcomes in FFY compared to prior year	53	94
Total Number of Successful Employment Outcomes	3,744	3,790
Rehabilitation Rate (Ratio of Successful to Unsuccessful Closures) for Federal Fiscal Year (Primary Indicator)	58.5%	59.8%
% of Employment Outcomes in Competitive or Self Employment, Minimum Wage or greater (Primary Indicator)	97.2%	96.8%
% of Employment Outcomes in Competitive or Self Employment, Minimum Wage or greater who are individuals with Significant Disabilities (Primary Indicator)	95.7%	99.6%
Ratio of Average Hourly Wage of Successful Closures to Overall State Average Hourly Wage (Primary Indicator)	0.43	0.42
% Difference in Consumers with Primary Source of Support as Personal Earnings at Closure vs. Application	57.7%	59.4%

MASSACHUSETTS REHABILITATION COMMISSION MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION TWO YEAR PERFORMANCE		
MRC Vocational Rehabilitation Federal Standards and Indicators (Calculated on Federal Fiscal Year)	FFY2013	FFY2014
Ratio of Minorities Served to Non-Minorities Served	0.93	0.94
Overall Performance (Must Pass 4 of 6 Standard 1 Indicators and 2 of 3 Primary Indicators)	PASS	PASS

MRC monitors its performance through monthly continuous quality performance reports distributed to management through our MRCIS Case Management System plus a balanced scorecard dashboard reporting system known as EHSR results. MRC is currently in the process of transitioning its system from the former Vocational Rehabilitation Standards and Indicators to the new WIOA common performance measures. MRC has undertaken a number of strategies based on its past performance to improve Vocational Rehabilitation services to individuals with significant disabilities to assist them in obtaining and maintaining competitive employment based on their choices, interests, and needs. These include operation of a pay for performance employment service delivery model with providers, development of job-driven trainings with employers, and staff training, among others.

*Chart 32 - Executive Office of Health and Human Services Two-Year Performance,
Massachusetts Commission for the Blind*

MASSACHUSETTS PREVIOUS TWO-YEAR PERFORMANCE FOR THE MASSACHUSETTS COMMISSION FOR THE BLIND						
Program	PY 2013	PY 2014	PY 2013	PY 2014	PY 2013	PY 2014
	Entered Employment Rate		Employment Retention Rate		Six-Month Average Earnings	
Massachusetts Commission for the Blind	74%	66%	100%	100%	\$15,724	\$21,285

The Massachusetts Commission for the Blind (MCB) and the MCB Rehabilitation Council (MCB RC) members currently review the agency's performance on the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) standards and indicators annually. The agency's performance on RSA standards and indicators has at all times met the minimum level of overall performance established by RSA.

Agency-specific results for FY 2013 are:

- **Cases closed due to full rehabilitation.** MCB passed this standard with 18 more cases closed than required.
- **Rehabilitation rate.** Measures the percentage of clients whose cases were closed after receiving services that resulted in an employment outcome. RSA standard is 68.9%. MCB passed this standard with 73.5%.
- **Competitive outcomes.** Those placed in competitive jobs must earn at least minimum wage in 35.4% of cases. MCB passed; received 53.14% in this area.
- **Percentage of clients being served with significant disabilities.** RSA standard is 89%; MCB passed with 100%.
- **Average hourly earnings for competitive placements,** which exceed average State median hourly wage. RSA standard: 59%; MCB passed with 68%.
- **Reliance on earnings as primary source of income** among rehabilitation clients as opposed to other resources. RSA standard is 30.4%; MCB was measured at 24.8% and this was considered to be a failed standard. Since this result was due to a number of consumers who were able to retain their employment as a result of the services they received, the agency and the MCB Rehabilitation Council are not concerned with this result.
- **Compare number of successfully closed cases** that are in diverse minority populations to those closed who are non-minority. RSA requirement: 80%; MCB passed with 95%.

Agency-specific results for FY 2014 are:

- **Cases closed due to full rehabilitation.** MCB passed this standard with 12 more cases closed than required.
- **Rehabilitation rate.** Measures the percentage of clients whose cases were closed after receiving services that resulted in an employment outcome. RSA standard is 68.9%. MCB failed this standard with 66.4%.
- **Competitive outcomes.** Those placed in competitive jobs must earn at least minimum wage in 35.4% of cases. MCB passed; received 60.2% in this area.
- **Percentage of clients being served with significant disabilities.** RSA standard is 89%; MCB passed with 100%.
- **Average hourly earnings for competitive placements,** which exceed average state median hourly wage. RSA standard: 59%; MCB passed with 74%.
- **Reliance on earnings as primary source of income** among rehabilitation clients as opposed to other resources. RSA standard is 30.4%; MCB was measured at 24.8% and this was considered to be a failed standard. Since this result was due to a number of consumers who were able to retain their employment as a result of the services they received, the agency and the RC are not concerned with this result.
- **Compare number of successfully closed cases** that are in diverse minority populations to those closed who are non-minority. RSA requirement: 80%; MCB passed with 95%.

Another major indicator of effectiveness is the results of the agency's consumer satisfaction survey:

Results of the FFY 2014 survey of consumers rehabilitated in FFY 2013:

- % of consumers satisfied with the promptness of the services provided: 86%
- % of consumers satisfied with their overall experience in receiving services: 96%
- % of consumers who report that their counselor was willing to listen to their ideas and suggestions in developing the individual rehabilitation plan: 95%

Results of the FFY 2014 survey of consumers rehabilitated in FFY 2012:

- % of consumers satisfied with the promptness of the services provided: 94%
- % of consumers satisfied with their overall experience in receiving services: 95%
- % of consumers who report that their counselor was willing to listen to their ideas and suggestions in developing the individual rehabilitation plan: 98%

A notable difference between these two surveys is the lower satisfaction of consumers with the promptness of the services provided in FY 2014. There were a number of retirements and resignations of counselors and supervisors during this period and it was challenging to cover caseloads adequately during the process of hiring and training new staff. The vocational rehabilitation program is now fully staffed. MCB hopes that its FY 2015 survey will show an improvement with satisfaction with the promptness of services.

Distribution of Funds for Core Programs

Distribution of Funds for Core Programs. Describe the methods and factors the State will use in distributing funds under the core programs in accordance with the provisions authorizing such distributions.

For Title I programs, provide a description of the written policies that establish the State's methods and factors used to distribute funds to local areas for—

Title I programs

The Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development (EOLWD) in an effort to provide a forum for annual review of the data used for formula allocations under WIOA Title I established a Workforce Allocations Task Force in 2014. The Task Force includes a representative of the State Workforce Board (serving as the chair) and representatives from local workforce boards, local career centers, local Fiscal Officers, and staff at EOLWD's Department of Career Services (DCS) responsible for development and distribution of WIOA Title I program allocations. The Task Force makes its recommendations to the Governor through the Secretary of Labor and Workforce Development. The Task Force's recommendations are published through a WIOA Information Issuance. In addition, at the discretion of the Secretary, the Task Force may be called upon to recommend allocation methodologies for distribution of State funds appropriated for One-Stop Career Centers. DCS is responsible for computing the 16 local workforce area allocations for WIOA Title I programs based on the approved formula data and methodology and for providing the allocation levels to EOLWD's Finance Department. Local area allocations are published annually with the detailed input data and formulas through the Fiscal Year WIOA Local Annual Plan Guidance Policy, and are updated as necessary during the fiscal year if there are changes in federal allotment levels.

WIOA Title I Youth and Adult local area allocations are computed in accordance with instructions in the WIOA sections identified above and are distributed by percentage share to the sixteen local Workforce Development Areas (local areas) according to the formula shown below.

The state's unemployment rate for Program Year 2014/Fiscal Year 2015 (July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015) was 5.1% and, therefore, in PY2016/FY2017 Massachusetts will have sub-state Areas of Substantial Unemployment (ASUs) defined in accordance with the methodology proscribed by the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) and Employment and Training Administration (ETA). It is anticipated that the State will have sub-state ASUs for the four program years beginning July 1, 2016.

Chart 33 – Factors informing Title I Adult and Youth Formulas

Factor / Source	Weight	Title I Youth	Title I Adult
Average Number of Economically Disadvantaged Youths (Census Bureau, American Community Survey)	1/3	X	
Average Number of Economically Disadvantaged Adults (Census Bureau, American Community Survey)	1/3		X
Number of Unemployed in ASUs (EOLWD, Department of Unemployment Assistance, Economic Research, BLS methodology)	1/3	X	X
Number of Excess Unemployed in ASUs (EOLWD, Department of Unemployment Assistance, Economic Research, BLS methodology)	1/3	X	X

A hold-harmless provision ensures that each local area's percentage share of the State allotments designated for local **WIOA Title 1 Youth and Adult** program activities does not fall below 90% of the local area's average percentage share for the prior two fiscal years.

The Workforce Allocations Task Force reviews the formula for distribution of **Title I Dislocated Worker** funds to local workforce areas in accordance with requirements in WIOA section 133(b)(2)(B) and makes its recommendations to the Governor through the Secretary of Labor and Workforce Development. This review is done annually to ensure that the most current data are used for the formula allocations to local workforce areas.

The Task Force's final recommendations for Program Year 2016/Fiscal Year 2017 will be made by February 2016. The primary considerations for the Task Force with respect to the WIOA Title I Dislocated Worker formula are outlined on the table below. The Task Force is reviewing whether a viable data source exists for the *Plant Closing and Mass Layoff Data* factor to replace the BLS Mass Layoff Statistics data used in prior years. A final determination will affect the weighting of remaining formula factors.

Chart 34 – Data sources for Title I Dislocated Worker Formulas

Required Information Element/Factor (WIOA 133(b)(2)(B)(ii))	Data Used for PY15/FY16	Data Source	Factor Weight PY15/FY16	Preliminary Recommendation for PY16/FY17
Insured Unemployment Data	CY 2014 Average Monthly UI Claimants	UI Claimant Data DUA Economic Research	30%	Retain - Weight may change
Unemployment Concentrations	CY 2014 Average Annual Unemployment Rate	Labor Force Data DUA Economic Research	25%	Retain - Weight may change
Plant Closing and Mass Layoff Data	CY 2012 UI Claimants in Mass Layoffs	BLS Mass Layoff Statistics Program (Discontinued)	5%	Under review for viable data source
Declining Industries Data	3-Year Job Loss in Declining Industries	ES-202 DUA Economic Research	10%	Retain - Weight may change
Farmer-Rancher Economic Hardship Data	None	Agriculture farmer/rancher employment is not a significant economic factor in Massachusetts at 0.16% of total state employment (ES-202).		
Long-Term Unemployment Data	CY 2014 Average Long-Term UI Claims (15+ Weeks)	UI Claimant Data DUA Economic Research	15%	Retain - Weight may change
	CY2014 Annual Total of UI Claimants Exhausting Benefits	UI Claimant Data DUA Economic Research	15%	Retain - Weight may change

A hold-harmless provision ensures that each local area's percentage share of the State allotment designated for local Dislocated Worker program activities does not fall below 90% of the local area's average percentage share for the prior two fiscal years.

Title II

For Title II:

- (i) Describe how the eligible agency will award multi-year grants or contracts on a competitive basis to eligible providers in the State, including how eligible agencies will establish that eligible providers are organizations of demonstrated effectiveness.
- (ii) Describe how the eligible agency will ensure direct and equitable access to all eligible providers to apply and compete for funds and how the eligible agency will ensure that

it is using the same grant or contract announcement and application procedure for all eligible providers.

ACLS will issue an open and competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) and Request for Responses (RFR) in FY17 for the implementation of Title II services in FY18. Multi-year grants will be awarded based on regional allocations to successful applicants in order to establish a network of providers throughout the state to address the following considerations in each workforce region:

- Serve individuals identified as most in need of adult education and literacy activities including individuals with disabilities.
- Provide evidence of past effectiveness as specified in the RFP.
- Within each region fund programs that offer services aligned with the goals of the local plan as well as with the activities and services of the One-Stop Career Center partner(s).
- Ensure that program services offer sufficient intensity of instruction based on most rigorous research and evidence based reading instruction that includes the essential components of reading (e.g. STAR).
- Based on regional needs, ensure that programs offer (1) ABE preparation for high school equivalency credential instruction in math, reading, writing, and speaking based on rigorous research and effective educational practice; (2) and/or English language acquisition (English to Speakers of Other Languages) and civics education programs are based on second language acquisition (SLA) theories and the various hypotheses and explanations for how second languages are learned and factors that influence the process.
- Ensure that programs demonstrate effective uses of technology, including digital literacy distance education statewide.
- Ensure regional student access to contextualized instruction including education and training activities that facilitate student transition to and completion of postsecondary and training, obtainment and advancement in employment, and the ability to exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.
- Ensure that programs provide evidence that services are delivered by well-trained instructors, advisors and administrators who meet state and program qualifications and have access to high quality professional development.
- Programs provide evidence of how they will coordinate with other services offered in the region (e.g. connections to local workforce development boards, One-Stop Career Centers, higher education and other educational institutions) to establish career pathways for students.
- Programs offer activities that are flexible in order to accommodate student schedules and coordinate support services (e.g. childcare, transportation) to enable individuals, including those with disabilities, to attend.

- Ensure that programs have the capacity to collect and report participant outcomes.

(ii) Describe how the eligible agency will ensure direct and equitable access to all eligible providers to apply and compete for funds and how the eligible agency will ensure that it is using the same grant or contract announcement application procedure for all eligible providers.

Rebidding will be a multi-year procurement process that ensures alignment with the principles and requirements of WIOA and engages key stakeholders from the workforce development system. ACLS will:

- Develop an open and competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) and Request for Responses (RFR);
- Post and broadly disseminate the open and competitive RFP and RFR in order to ensure equitable access for all bidders;
- Conduct bidders' conferences in multiple locations across the state;
- Provide trainings for entities new to the state system to ensure equitable access to all bidders;
- Designate proposal review teams comprised of state adult education staff and regional LWDB representatives;
- Train proposal review teams;
- Review applications with LWDB representatives who will check proposals for alignment with regional priorities in the local plan during the review process; and
- Review funding recommendations from the reader teams.
- Notify programs about final funding decisions and post information on the ACLS website.

Title IV

Title IV Vocational Rehabilitation

In the case of a State that, under section 101(a)(2)(A)(i) of the Rehabilitation Act designates a State agency to administer the part of the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) services portion of the Unified or Combined State Plan under which VR services are provided for individuals who are blind, describe the process and the factors used by the State to determine the distribution of funds among the two VR agencies in the State.

By formula 85% of Massachusetts's VR funding goes to MRC and 15% of the VR funding goes to MCB.

- While Massachusetts Commission for the Blind vocational rehabilitation funds are allocated to local offices as necessary throughout the year, the agency's currently approved state plan requires that funds for needed services be available to any eligible consumer without regard to location within the state.

Program Data

Data Alignment and Integration

Data Alignment and Integration. Describe the plans of the lead State agencies with responsibility for the administration of the core programs, along with the State Board, to align and integrate available workforce and education data systems for the core programs, unemployment insurance programs, and education through postsecondary education, and to the extent possible, the Combined State Plan partner programs included in this plan. The description of the State's plan for integrating data systems should include the State's goals for achieving integration and any progress to date.

- (i) Describe the State's plans to make the management information systems for the core programs interoperable to maximize the efficient exchange of common data elements to support assessment and evaluation.
- (ii) Describe the State's plans to integrate data systems to facilitate streamlined intake and service delivery to track participation across all programs included in this plan.
- (iii) Explain how the State board will assist the governor in aligning technology and data systems across mandatory One-Stop partner programs (including design and implementation of common intake, data collection, etc.) and how such alignment will improve service delivery to individuals, including unemployed individuals.
- (iv) Describe the State's plans to develop and produce the reports required under section 116, performance accountability system. (WIOA section 116(d)(2)).

The Commonwealth's workforce system will be expanded and strengthened by aligning programs, services, and activities across core partners identified within WIOA. It is the goal of the state to create an integrated, technology-based intake and case management information system built around a main entry portal into the expanded Massachusetts Workforce Development System to be used by all staff and common customers (both job seekers and employers). This will entail designing and implementing the technological infrastructure to execute a common intake/registration application with real-time triage processes that features: strong skills and transferability assessments, job matching and job referral, common case management across all partners. This common intake and case management system is imperative to our ability to strengthen the consistency and quality of services provided by the system to job seekers and businesses.

Massachusetts is investigating creating a new online, "front end" interface built around a web-based platform such as JobQuest. JobQuest, currently in use by the One-Stop Career Centers, is the online application that connects to the MOSES database and is the front-facing web application used by members of the public (job seekers and businesses) to access programs and services such as job search and application, training programs research and, for employers, to locate job candidates. JobQuest can serve as a portal to register individuals working with WIOA

Program partners who will be co-enrolled in the OSCC system for career development, job search, educational and occupational assessments, occupational training and job placement. The registration will include all data points required by each partner program.

In this yet-to-be developed application, registration would trigger the process to establish eligibility across partner programs, allow customer access to all programs, services and activities offered through the partner agencies, and provide access to assessment and labor market information, as well as profiling tools. Access will be granted using a single user ID and password. The information captured at registration would be shared with partner agencies through file exchanges to populate appropriate fields within their respective data systems. The new IT system functionality will allow all program partners to easily register individuals at One-Stop Career Centers, track referrals and track the service results for those “shared” customers. Currently, no cross-program, cross-agency tracking process exists.

This new functionality will also serve to support the design of the new customer flows for shared customers described elsewhere in this plan and in the state MOU. Data interfaces with core agency partners will allow these agencies to integrate data within their own reporting databases.

The Department of Career Services will be responsible for coordinating production of the Annual Performance Report, the contents of which are described below and to be submitted on the specified report template (Attachment H).

The State commits to performance reports that adhere to the required described under section 116, Moreover, the reports will include a mechanism for electronic access to the State local area and ETP performance reports.

WIOA Section 116(d)(2): Performance Reports – Required report content for core programs:
(2) Contents of state performance reports. – The performance report for a State shall include, [subject to Data Validation] —

- (A) information specifying the levels of performance achieved with respect to the primary indicators of performance described in subsection for each of the programs described in subsection (b)(3)(A)(ii) and the State-adjusted levels of performance with respect to such indicators for each program;
- (B) information specifying the levels of performance achieved with respect to the primary indicators of performance described in subsection (b)(2)(A) for each of the programs described in subsection (b)(3)(A)(ii) with respect to individuals with barriers to employment, disaggregated by each subpopulation of such individuals, and by race, ethnicity, sex, and age;
- (C) the total number of participants served by each of the programs described in subsection (b)(3)(A)(ii);

- (D) the number of participants who received career and training services, respectively, during the most recent program year and the three preceding program years, and the amount of funds spent on each type of service;
- (E) the number of participants who exited from career and training services, respectively, during the most recent program year and the 3 preceding program years;
- (F) the average cost per participant of those participants who received career and training services, respectively, during the most recent program year and the 3 preceding program years;
- (G) the percentage of participants in a program authorized under this subtitle who received training services and obtained unsubsidized employment in a field related to the training received;
- (H) the number of individuals with barriers to employment served by each of the programs described in subsection (b)(3)(A)(ii), disaggregated by each subpopulation of such individuals;
- (I) the number of participants who are enrolled in more than 1 of the programs described in subsection (b)(3)(A)(ii);
- (J) the percentage of the State's annual allotment under section 132(b) that the State spent on administrative costs;
- (K) in the case of a State in which local areas are implementing pay-for-performance contract strategies for programs--
 - (i) the performance of service providers entering into contracts for such strategies, measured against the levels of performance specified in the contracts for such strategies; and
 - (ii) an evaluation of the design of the programs and performance of the strategies, and, where possible, the level of satisfaction with the strategies among employers and participants benefitting from the strategies; and
- (L) other information that facilitates comparisons of programs with programs in other States.

Assessment of Participants' Post-Program Success

Assessment of Participants' Post-Program Success. Describe how lead State agencies will use the workforce development system to assess the progress of participants who are exiting from core programs in entering, persisting in, and completing postsecondary education, or entering or remaining in employment. States may choose to set additional indicators of performance.

Massachusetts will consider development of a post-program follow-up capability on participant employment by use of wage record data and completion of education and attainment of degrees by use of higher education data. However, this capacity will not be pursued until more immediate data exchange and wage data matching processes are in place for all workforce partner agencies.

In addition, the new Administration applied for a longitudinal data grant through US Department of Education to build out the capacity to share wage record data and information across education and workforce systems. This data analysis designed under this grant will open up new doors to understand which initiatives and interventions are most successful.

Use of Unemployment Insurance (UI) Wage Record Data

Use of Unemployment Insurance (UI) Wage Record Data. Explain how the State will meet the requirements to utilize quarterly UI wage records for performance accountability, evaluations, and as a source for workforce and labor market information, consistent with Federal and State law. (This Operational Planning element applies to core programs.)

Based upon the WIOA requirements to utilize wage record data for performance review and evaluation, Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development lead a process with the Department of Unemployment Assistance to discuss WIOA wage record matching needs of partner agencies and to design MOUs with the partners to wage record match Core Program Partner participants to develop baseline data for the WIOA Plan. The Massachusetts Workforce Development Board DUA will work with each of the Core Program partners to continue to meet performance accountability reporting requirements. Specific MOUs for ongoing wage matching are in progress.

In addition, state legislation will be modified to allow the use of wage record data for WIOA reporting and to meet the evaluation and research goals set forth by the Massachusetts Workforce Development Board. The Commonwealth is setting up a Data Advisory Group across major Secretariats and agencies to help guide this process (building off the members of the WIOA Performance Workgroup) and to implement a recent US Department of Labor grant award to build out a longitudinal evolution of education and workforce programs.

