

## PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY

### An overview of Washington's workforce development performance accountability system

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

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

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

### Performance Management for Continuous Improvement

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

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

In 2013 Congress may consider reauthorizing both the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) and the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act. As part of reauthorization, Congress is reconsidering the measures to use for the federal core indicators. Options under consideration include the measures recommended in the IPI Blueprint; this would codify consistent measures across federal workforce programs.

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

### **Performance Management for Continuous Improvement (PMCI) Overview**

The PMCI accountability system consists of four parts:

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

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

PMCI has a different focus, one that complements GMAP: PMCI focuses on common measures across workforce development programs that share certain desired outcomes (and many of the same customers). Consistent with the Workforce Board's role as policy coordinating body, the measures are designed for policy leaders operating at the "30,000 foot level." The PMCI

measures enable policy leaders to know the lasting results of programs so they can make appropriate policy decisions, as opposed to administrative changes and changes in practice to ensure accountability and a focus on results that managers can make at the ground level. Together the PMCI and GMAP accountability systems provide a full array of policy and management measures.

Operating agencies have responsibility for their GMAP measures. The state's Employment Security Department has GMAP responsibility for WorkSource, including establishing real-time measures (and targets) that can be reported frequently to the Governor. The Workforce Board has the responsibility to maintain strategic measures (and targets) of the results for the entire workforce development system, including WorkSource, the state's one-stop career center system.

### **Desired Outcomes**

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

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

### **Performance Measures**

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

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

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

### Criteria for Good Performance Measures

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

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

Based on the above criteria, and after a long consensus process, PMCI identifies the following as the **Washington's State Core Measures** for workforce development:

### ***Employment or Further Education***

**Programs Serving Adults:** The percentage of former participants with employment recorded in UI and other administrative records during the third quarter after leaving the program.

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

### ***Earnings***

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

### ***Skills***

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

### ***Customer Satisfaction***

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

**Employer Satisfaction with Former Program Participants:** Percentage of employers who report satisfaction with new employees who are program completers as evidenced by survey responses.

### ***Return on Investment***

**Taxpayer Return on Investment:** The net impact on tax revenue and social welfare payments compared to the cost of the services.

**Participant Return on Investment:** The net impact on participant earnings and employer provided benefits compared to the cost of the services.

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

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

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

### Measures at Each Level of the System

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

**Systemwide:** The workforce development system as defined in statute and executive order.

**Statewide Programs:** Workforce development programs, such as Secondary CTE and Vocational Rehabilitation, that are statewide in scope.

**WorkSource:** WorkSource centers and affiliate sites providing one-stop services as required under WIA Title I-B.

**Workforce Development Area:** The local geographical area defined under WIA Title I-B.

**Providers:** Individual institutions and entities that provide workforce development

services. Examples include high schools, community and technical colleges, and private career schools, among others.

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

**Figure 1 - State Core Measures**

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

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

## Performance Targets for State Core Measures

### Statewide Programs

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

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

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

The tables at the end of this chapter show the state core measures, targets, and results. (The operating plan for each program has the targets for the federally required measures.) Included in those tables are the actual results for the last three years and the expected levels of performance for the next year.

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

## **Workforce Development Areas**

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

### **Providers**

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

### **Performance-Based Consequences**

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

### **Systemwide**

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

When Washington receives such an incentive award, the state allocates the funds to local areas that exceeded their expected level of performance in these programs, including performance on the state core measures, as well as on the federal core indicators. The

Workforce Board identifies the size of the award for each year, and the state’s Employment Security Department allocates the funds. The funds must be used for system building activities, not activities that pertain only to a particular program, such as WIA Title I-B, Adult Education and Family Literacy, or CTE.

**Figure 2 - Performance-Based Consequences**

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

**Statewide Programs**

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

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

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

**Workforce Development Areas**

For WIA Title I-B, the Governor may earmark a portion of the state set-aside to reward local areas that exceed 100 percent of the average of the expected levels of

performance for the state and federal core measures. The Workforce Board establishes the policy for incentive awards, and the Employment Security Department (ESD) allocates these funds to local areas.

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

### **Providers**

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

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

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

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

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

## Data Collection

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

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

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

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

## Data Matching

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

Training providers that want to offer training funded through Individual Training Accounts

authorized under WIA Title I-B are required to submit cost and participant data to the Workforce Board. The Workforce Board uses the data matching system to match the participant records against other administrative records in order to measure provider performance.

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

### Survey Data

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

### Performance Reports

The following figure shows the schedule of reports on the performance of the workforce development system and programs.

Figure 4 - Performance Reports

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

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

### **Government Performance**

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

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

### **GMAP requires each agency to:**

1. Develop clear, relevant, and easy-to-understand measures that show whether or not programs are successful.
2. Demonstrate how programs contribute to the priorities that are important to citizens.
3. Gather, monitor, and analyze program data.
4. Evaluate the effectiveness of programs.
5. Hold regular problem-solving sessions within the agency to improve performance.
6. Allocate resources based on strategies that work.
7. Regularly report to the Governor on their performance.

In 2005, legislation codified GMAP in state statute and extended coverage to all state

agencies, including higher education institutions and agencies headed by other elected officials. As a result, all agencies that are part of the workforce development system have implemented GMAP. Agencies have identified key performance measures, are tracking the results, and holding regular management meetings to fix problems. Local WDCs are a part of this process in collaboration with ESD.

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

Lean: As part of the continuing effort to improve performance, in 2011, Executive Order 11-04 directed all executive cabinet agencies to begin implementing Lean. Lean provides proven principles, methods and tools for creating more efficient processes while developing a culture that encourages employee creativity and problem-solving skills. Lean can be applied at all levels of an organization to review processes from a customer's point of view and consider what adds value, and what can be eliminated. The Governor directed agencies throughout state government to use Lean principles and methods to improve value for taxpayers' money. Local WDCs are a part of the Lean journey in collaboration with ESD.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

WIA Youth	Performance					(Proposed)
	Previous Survey	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
<b>Employment or Further education:</b> Percentage of former participants who were employed, in the military, or enrolled in education or training, during the third quarter after the program.			73.1%	82.4%	78.4%	77.1%
<b>Earnings :</b> Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)			\$10,124	\$10,275	\$10,537	\$10,572
<b>Skills:</b> Percentage of participants who obtained an appropriate credential.						Pending
<b>Employer Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (For all WIA participants; not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	84.8% (2007)		87.3%			85.0%
<b>Participant Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	93.3% (2008)			96.0%		95.0%

WIA Adults	Previous Survey	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
<b>Employment:</b> Percentage of former participants who were employed during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)			76.4%	77.3%	74.9%	75.3%
<b>Earnings :</b> Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)			\$21,292	\$21,195	\$21,113	\$21,345
<b>Skills:</b> Percentage of participants who obtained an appropriate credential.						Pending
<b>Employer Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (For all WIA participants; not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	84.8% (2007)		87.3%			85.0%
<b>Participant Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	90% (2008)			90.0%		90.0%

WIA Dislocated Workers	Previous Survey	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
<b>Employment:</b> Percentage of former participants who were employed during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)			83.2%	83.1%	80.7%	80.9%
<b>Earnings :</b> Median annualized earnings of former participants during the third quarter after leaving the program. (Only former participants not enrolled in further education are counted for this indicator.)			\$29,941	\$32,566	\$31,727	\$31,800
<b>Skills:</b> Percentage of participants who obtained an appropriate credential.						Pending
<b>Employer Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of employers who reported satisfaction with new employees who were program completers as evidenced by survey responses to the biennial survey conducted by the Workforce Board. (For all WIA participants; not calculated separately for youth, adults, or dislocated workers.)	84.8% (2007)		87.3%			85.0%
<b>Participant Satisfaction:</b> Percentage of former participants who reported satisfaction with the program as evidenced by survey responses six to nine months after leaving the program.	90.9% (2008)			88.0%		90.0%