



February 20, 2026 | 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. | Meeting No. 281

Virtual Meeting

Remote access: Please register for a unique link [here](#).

9:00 a.m.	Call to Order Welcome and roll call	
9:05 a.m.	Chairs Report (ACTION) Consent Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Minutes from January 23, 2026, Board Meeting▪ Perkins V State Determined Performance Level (SDPL) Executive Director Recruitment Update	Tab 1
9:20 a.m.	Legislative Update Nova Gattman, Workforce Board	Tab 2
9:50 a.m.	Performance Framework and Expected Performance Levels Dave Wallace, Workforce Board Cami Feek, Employment Security Department	Tab 3
10:30 a.m.	Federal WIOA Combined Program Plan Emily Persky, Workforce Board	Tab 4
11:00 a.m.	Adjourn	

Tab 1

Consent Agenda

PRESENTED BY: Workforce Board Co-chairs April Sims and Morgan Irwin

CHECK ONE:

Action Item

Possible Action

Discussion Only

SUMMARY:

The consent agenda enables the Board to approve items listed below without discussion or individual motions. If any Board member believes an item does not belong on the consent agenda, they may at any time request the item be removed and considered for an individual discussion and vote at a later time, at the discretion of the Co-chair(s).

BACKGROUND:

This consent agenda includes:

- Minutes from the Jan. 23, 2026, Board meeting.
- Perkins V State Determined Performance Levels (SDPL).

STAFF GUIDANCE & RECOMMENDATION:

Without dissent, the consent agenda items will be approved as drafted.



MINUTES OF MEETING NO. 280
January 23, 2026

Board Members Present:

Gary Chandler, Co-chair (in-person)
Cherika Carter for Larry Brown, Labor Co-chair (in-person)
Wade Larson, Representing Business (in-person)
Jane Hopkins, Representing Labor (remote)
Todd Mitchell, Representing Labor (in-person)
April Sims for Cherika Carter, Representing Labor (in-person)
Commissioner Cami Feek, Employment Security Department (ESD) (in-person)
Marie Bruin for Nate Humphrey, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) (in-person)
Becky Wallace for Superintendent Chris Reykdal, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) (in-person)
Miriam Halliday, Workforce Southwest Washington, Representing Local Elected Officials (in-person)
Dana Phelps for Secretary Angela Ramirez, Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) (in-person)
Andrea Chartock for Interim Director Sarah Clifthorne, Department of Commerce (in-person)

Call to Order

Co-chair Cherika Carter called the meeting to order at 9 a.m. The meeting was a hybrid meeting using Zoom for remote attendees. In-person attendees convened at the Workforce Board office at 128 10th Ave SW, Olympia, in the second floor Board room. Quorum was established after roll call.

Executive Director Transition

Business Co-chair Gary Chandler discussed the Executive Director transition and shared gratitude for former Executive Director Eleni Papadakis's service to the state.

Chandler discussed the process for recruitment to replace the Executive Director, thanking Acting Executive Director Maddy Thompson for stepping into the role to lead the agency and noting he had full confidence in her ability to support the board through the transition. Chandler asked Thompson to share the state statute related to the appointment of the Executive Director of the Workforce Board [[RCW 28C.18.020 Section 2\(m\)](#)] for clearer detail.

Miriam Halliday, Workforce Southwest Washington, requested clarity on the status of board membership before the board proceeds with the recruitment of the next Executive Director,

noting that there is not yet a full complement of business members on the board. Chandler shared that he is working with Association of Washington Business (AWB) to appoint seats prior to the recruitment process and to staff the business caucus fully.

Halliday asked for further clarification around the hiring process. Thompson shared that a committee of the business and labor members of the board would agree upon names to provide to the Governor for consideration.

Further questions centered around recruiting private sector board members and the selection process for remaining open positions on the board. The response clarified that the board doesn't play a further role in appointments; once candidates are identified, it is up to the Governor to appoint individuals to the board.

April Sims, Washington State Labor Council (WSLC), stated Labor's commitment to a fully seated board prior to moving forward with the list of names for the Executive Director position, noting the importance of having full membership in place to support the unique opportunity to recruit the next Executive Director.

Marie Bruin, State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, requested a timeline for hiring a new Executive Director. Four potential options were discussed. It was noted that, with new Co-chairs recently appointed, the business and labor members will need to reach agreement on how the board will select three finalists to submit to the Governor for consideration. The four options are:

- Option 1: The business and labor members determine a process to identify and submit three names without conducting a formal recruitment process, if qualified candidates are already known.
- Option 2: Conduct a formal recruitment process, including posting a job announcement, and sharing the opportunity with state and national workforce networks.
- Option 3: Retain a recruitment firm using board funds, with follow-up needed to confirm available funding.
- Option 4. Delay recruitment until the completion of an independent review of Washington's higher education and workforce training systems referenced in the Governor's proposed budget.

Dana Phelps, Department of Social and Health Services, asked about a timeline for how long Thompson is willing to serve as Acting Executive Director, as the Board should understand her timeline and commitment. Thompson confirmed that she is committed to this work and serving in this role during the recruitment process.

Thompson recognized Co-chairs Carter and Chandler for supporting the Workforce Board in their roles as Co-chairs, noting Carter has been reappointed to the Board's Labor caucus and inviting Chandler back for a future meeting for a formal proclamation and thank you. Thompson welcomed new board members and thanked the Governor's Office for working swiftly to

appoint them. Thompson noted her honor in serving in the position and shared plans to ensure work going forward will adhere to the agency's mission and essential work directed in statute.

Co-chair Carter thanked Thompson for stepping into the Acting Executive Director role. Carter noted the board would pause any decisions regarding the recruitment options discussed until Morgan Irwin, AWB, and April Sims, WSLC, assume their roles as Co-chairs at the next board meeting. Halliday requested clarification on the timeline. Carter responded that since a decision has not been made yet on how to move forward with recruitment, the timeline for hiring a permanent Executive Director will be extended. Cami Feek, Employment Security Department (ESD), supported waiting for the new Co-chairs to come on board before discussions about plans are made and asked to hear updates on the process in future board meeting agendas, anticipating that the business and labor members will keep the board informed about the goals and ask for feedback on timeline updates. Thompson stated she will work with board members to ensure the recruitment process for a permanent Executive Director meets their needs.

MOTION-2025-280-01

A motion was made by Todd Mitchell to approve the consent agenda. Feek seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Workforce Pell Implementation Update

Co-chair Chandler noted that the federal budget bill, House Resolution 1 (HR 1), created the Workforce Pell federal financial aid grant program. In the bill, state workforce boards are specifically named to consult with the Governor about program criteria. Workforce Board staff have been partnering with SBCTC, the Washington Student Achievement Council (WSAC), ESD, and other partners in developing concepts for consideration for this new program.

Opening the presentation, Thompson shared that Workforce Pell is a new program, established by federal act H.R. 1, passed in July 2025. Thompson noted that the statute sets forth several strict parameters for implementation. Since December, partner agencies have engaged in negotiated rulemaking, coordinating across state agencies to provide feedback and gather input. Outreach has also included public baccalaureate institutions and the Independent Colleges of Washington. Thompson noted that Washington, along with other states, is awaiting final federal regulations to guide implementation of the program. She added that while the statute provides the overall framework, it grants states significant latitude to determine specific design and operational details.

Heather Hudson, Deputy Policy Advisor for Childcare, Education, and Workforce with Governor Ferguson's office, expressed gratitude for the board's leadership and staff support for the Executive Director transition. Hudson noted changes around higher education, conversations focused on the value of higher education and credentials, and discussions on how to integrate registered apprenticeships. She noted Washington has a strong foundation and is engaging with national organizations like the National Governors Association as several states are grappling with how to address this new form of federal financial aid. She shared that Workforce Pell modifies traditional financial aid, which has historically supported two- and four-year college

degree programs, to now include short-term (8-15 week) training that leads to high-wage, in-demand careers. She emphasized that aligning these new federal guidelines with existing state systems requires coordinating multiple bodies of work within a short timeframe. If implementation proceeds as anticipated, Workforce Pell grants could be available to students as early as July.

Hudson noted the Governor's office will convene a more focused steering committee with many workforce and education partners, planning a broader stakeholder meeting in April that will engage business, labor, and community partners more directly, soliciting input and feedback. This guidance will be used as a recommendation to the Governor's Office to support the roll out of the program. Hudson anticipated a tiered approach for Workforce Pell, to continue to grow over the years rather than a full launch of eligible programs, starting small and then growing them over time.

Co-chair Chandler asked if there is a state statute that needs to change. Hudson answered that it's possible and the state is waiting for final rulemaking from the federal government.

Phelps shared she recently attended a presentation from the state's Education Research & Data Center (ERDC) regarding wage progression with a focus on professional education after high school. She asked if some of that data could help inform decisions around which non-academic postsecondary programs should be considered for inclusion, noting significant differences in wage outcomes for people in special education programs. She emphasized the importance of more deeply analyzing existing ERDC data to guide these decisions. Hudson responded that this input would be considered as the Governor's Office works with partners on the steering committee to compile and evaluate options.

Andrea Chartock, Department of Commerce, shared that the agency is committed to engaging with target industry sector to provide their input on the implementation of the Workforce Pell.

Sims asked for clarification on eligibility requirements, and the scope of the board's authority, including whether Washington would consider approving new certificate programs based on industry needs. Thompson specified that new programs may apply after completing one year of operation. Bruin noted there is also flexibility to develop new programs, creating the opportunity to respond to emerging industry needs and potentially prioritize those new programs within a Workforce Pell framework.

Sims also asked who would be responsible for ensuring compliance with the proposed 70% completion and 70% employment thresholds. Thompson noted that the state already has a framework for measuring completion rates, employment and earning and the Workforce Board conducts these activities for the Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL). For ETPL the Workforce Board staff match program data to wage records.

Sims asked about the timeline of the Governor's Office work group, and Hudson noted that they would be sharing more information in the coming week.

Bruin and Jamie Traugott, SBCTC, presented more specifics on Workforce Pell and highlighted SBCTC's role.

Under Workforce Pell, program eligibility must be approved by the Governor and aligned with the state's in-demand occupations and employer workforce needs. To qualify, programs must meet the following performance benchmarks:

- At least 70% completion rate, measured within 150% of the program's published length.
- At least 70% job placement rate, measured within 180 days of program completion.

In addition, the total cost of the program must not exceed the value-added earnings of graduates, calculated based on increased earnings three years after completion compared to their earnings prior to enrollment.

Traugott explained that the July date does not mean that institutions will be prepared to award funds as reductions in force might impact the response to demand. She noted that since Workforce Pell is not a new funding stream and is considered another part of Pell grants, then budget shortfalls could impact overall availability of Pell grant funds.

Dr. Shannon Venezia, WSAC, described Workforce Pell as one of the most significant changes ever made to the federal Pell Grant program. She cautioned that the anticipated implementation date of July 2026 is not guaranteed, given the absence of finalized federal rules and that the Department of Education has indicated it intends to move deliberately.

Venezia also noted that financial aid administrators are already experiencing high levels of burnout due to low compensation and extensive compliance requirements. Additional federal changes may further strain capacity, contributing to continued turnover. As a result, not all institutions may be positioned to participate in Workforce Pell, and participation will be optional. Programs will require approval at various levels: the institutional and program level, the state level, and at the federal level, even as the Department of Education faces staffing limitations to support implementation.

Anneliese Vance-Sherman, ESD, shared brief remarks about a commitment to robust research data and partnerships with the Workforce Board to recommend how to define statewide and regional "high demand occupations" for the purposes of the Workforce Pell. She noted that labor market information could be found at [ESD's labor market information website](#).

State Response to Federal Work Requirements for SNAP

The panel included: Babs Roberts, DSHS; Jennifer Dellinger, SBCTC; Ismaila Maidadi and Sandy Crews, ESD; Amy Martinez, South Central Workforce Development Council; Board member Halliday, Workforce Southwest Washington; and John Traugott, Washington Workforce Association (representing the local workforce boards). The panel discussed the state response to updated federal work requirements for SNAP beneficiaries.

Roberts opened the presentation with an overview of past, current, and anticipated changes to SNAP and Medicaid. For SNAP, she highlighted reduced benefit levels, expanded work requirements, and changes to citizenship eligibility. For Medicaid, she noted the addition of new work requirements.

She explained that a waiver remains in effect through January 31, 2026, for Section 10102 related to Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependents (ABAWD). The pending changes would mean more individuals have to meet work requirements, remove several existing exemptions, add one new exemption, and limit states' ability to waive requirements in certain geographic areas.

Roberts also outlined the expanded age range for work requirements, increasing from 18–54 to 18–64. She reviewed activities that may count toward participation, including SNAP Employment & Training (Basic Food Employment & Training, or BFET), job search activities, unpaid work, and other workforce program participation.

Finally, she summarized the SNAP funding match included in the Governor's proposed budget and how those funds would support program services, administrative staffing, caseload management, and critical system upgrades.

Jennifer Dellinger, SBCTC, shared a presentation from data gathered in surveys that demonstrate the impact that recent changes to benefits have had on students. The data showed that over half of students reported struggling with housing or food instability. For students who experienced foster care or homelessness in high school the percentages were much higher.

Dellinger noted navigators assisted students in a myriad of ways for basic needs including food assistance, benefits applications, homelessness services or preventions and utilities assistance, financial aid and emergency assistance, and childcare, health services, and transportation.

The anticipated impact of SNAP changes includes an increased administrative burden for both students and colleges, with a new level of demand for required participation which will cause a disproportionate impact on rural areas, and further challenges such as errors and missing reporting, and denial and closure of benefits.

Dellinger shared the outcomes of the Basic Food and Employment & Training Program (BFET), showing the services that the program supports (tuition & fees, books, case management, and support services like childcare and transportation) and the number of people served since 2005 (120,000). She highlighted outcome data of the program, with 66% of BFET participants employed within one year of exit from the program with a median hourly wage of \$24.62.

Dellinger noted that capacity and a shift in resources will impact changes and will weaken their network as well as student success. She noted that colleges are taking on a greater role for students in assisting with financial planning and expanding access to food on campus with food pantry coordination. In closing, she noted that colleges share more than just instruction, there is

now a greater administrative need for wraparound services, so continued collaboration and alignment is vital for future successes.

Ismaila Maidadi, ESD, stated that a key goal for the entire workforce jobseeker service system is to ensure that people do not lose their SNAP or Medicaid benefits due to lack of access to workforce services. He noted the second goal is to work in the background so that customers experience an aligned system when they need it.

Sandy Crews, ESD, shared information about the agency's employment and training programs. WorkSource office staff triage the needs of each individual, assisting with job search efforts and support services, connecting them with programs, including Economic Security for All (EcSA) and to veteran outreach specialists. ESD is working with Local Workforce Development Boards (LWDBs) to coordinate and collaborate to serve customers better and quantify impacts to the WorkSource system to track the impacts of those that seek services.

John Traugott, WWA, shared appreciation for the Workforce Board and the staff in facilitating this urgent conversation and promoted coordination between state and local partners. Traugott noted the need to go deeper on the processes that can help inform the work at WorkSource offices.

Halliday, Workforce Southwest Washington, and Amy Martinez, South Central Workforce Council, shared the challenges at the local level. In southwest Washington, Halliday shared that customer traffic is rising at centers and to all BFET providers in the area beyond the WorkSource offices. She stated that additional guidance is welcome for accountability, and the capacity of the system is being tested.

Martinez outlined differences in the South Central region and described how her teams implemented a tracker during the pandemic to monitor center returns. In December, they started tracking SNAP benefits as clients asked about work requirements following recent federal changes. Martinez noted a surge in intake related to these work requirements, creating demand beyond their service capacity. She noted they are working with DSHS Community Service Offices, but their concern is what will happen in July when funding lapses. Community partners – non-profits, parks, and pathways, food banks – are preparing for an influx of people seeking community service hours as volunteers. Yet the system lacks capacity to process all referrals. Martinez noted the danger of people marginally meeting work requirements, then getting hours cut at the end of the month; if this happens three times in a six-month period, people will lose their benefits.

Discussion focused on the compounding challenges for SNAP and Medicaid recipients, with no additional funding to cover the expected administrative burden. Roberts highlighted the intersecting pressures of reduced capacity, emphasizing the need for collaboration, behind-the-scenes problem-solving, and additional support. Maidadi noted funding is insufficient to meet demand. Expanding eligibility as broadly as possible was also discussed.

Governor's Office – Franklin Plaistowe

Franklin Plaistowe, Chief Operations Officer for Governor Ferguson's office, shared that their office will be working closely with the board as they submit names to fill the permanent Executive Director position. Plaistowe affirmed that workforce development is an instrumental part of how the state supports Washingtonians.

Federal Performance Briefing

Liz Gallagher and Dave Wallace, Workforce Board, shared a brief overview of Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) performance requirements. As a refresher, Gallagher shared that WIOA consists of federal grant programs that make up roughly one-quarter of the workforce programs overseen by the Workforce Board. They include Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Youth programs administered by LWDBs (often through contracted providers and primarily delivered through WorkSource Centers), Adult Education programs operated through the community and technical college system and focused on high school equivalency and employment outcomes; Wagner-Peyser employment services that provide job search assistance and reemployment support in WorkSource resource rooms; and Vocational Rehabilitation and the Department of Services for the Blind, which deliver specialized employment services for individuals with disabilities, often through WorkSource Centers.

Gallagher shared that the board's oversight role is especially important right now. Federal performance expectations have tightened, programs are now evaluated against 90% of targets (up from 50%), and a single weak indicator outcome can affect overall sanctions outcomes. She shared what is measured in individual indicators: employment, median earnings, credential attainment, and measurable skills gains with a new indicator of effectiveness serving employers.

Gallagher explained that beginning in July 2025, Measurable Skills Gains (MSG) and Employment in Quarter 2 became sanctionable measures for Title II. In practice, this means that even though the individual indicators technically only require 50%, programs must aim much closer to 90% to protect their overall score from triggering sanctions.

Gallagher then reviewed how federal sanctions policies have changed over time and explained how outcome scores are calculated, including the difference between a program's actual results and its final performance scores. She described how the Statistical Adjustment Model (SAM) works to adjust performance targets, so programs are evaluated fairly based on the conditions they face.

Gallagher explained that if state outcomes showed a failure to meet adjusted performance targets, there were risks of both local and state sanctions. At the local level, sanctions could have included banning service providers responsible for failure, removing and replacing local board members, or other actions the Governor deemed necessary to improve performance.

She described state sanctions as more severe. After two consecutive years of failure, the U.S. Department of Labor could reduce the Governor's Reserve by 5 percent.

Wallace then explained how federal staff, state staff, Workforce Board staff, and Local Workforce Development Boards (LWDBs) worked together to negotiate final performance targets. Gallagher also outlined corrective action efforts related to Youth Measurable Skills Gains (MSG) and Credential Attainment, as well as Vocational Rehabilitation MSG and Median Earnings.

Legislative Update

Nova Gattman, Workforce Board, shared a current snapshot of legislative activity for the start of the 2026 Legislative Session, noting staff are tracking almost 300 bills and there are almost 1,100 new bills introduced this session, including some bills from last year that are being reviewed.

Gattman directed the Board to the Workforce Board's Legislative Tracker (<https://wtb.wa.gov/about-us/workforce-board-legislative-tracker/>) which includes a list of workforce-related bills and status, the Board's legislative agenda, links to staff testimony before legislative committees, and the September 2025 agency budget requests. Gattman noted the session climate is one of austerity as the state's budget deficit, federal policy requirements, and human services program impacts are impacting all considerations.

Gattman shared an update on the specific areas where there has been movement on the Workforce Board's legislative agenda, either in the Governor's budget proposal or through introduction of legislation.

Gattman shared session themes, noting that highlighted bills do not indicate support on any legislation. The workforce-related bill themes highlighted were:

- Poverty reduction & worker supports.
- Workforce-education alignment.
- Financial aid, affordability, & access.
- Bills including recommendations from the board's clean energy workforce research.
- Alternative pathways to healthcare licensure.
- K-12 to postsecondary transitions.
- Live presentation sales tax relief bills.

Gattman shared that she is organizing a group of policy leads from various partners and agencies that work with the board to participate in a weekly legislative review meeting on Friday mornings to discuss legislation or other policy proposals in a strictly informational context.

TAP Update

Emily Persky, Workforce Board, gave an overview of the update for Talent and Prosperity for All, (TAP), noting the status of the WIOA combined program update, TAP Objectives, and an update on the board's Industry Advisory Committee, inviting board members to ask questions throughout the presentation.

Persky shared updates on the draft of the Federal WIOA Combined Plan and the timeline. The final submission is due April 30. Internal reviews are due by February 12 so that board staff can review and synthesize the information. Persky has shared office hours and coordination

meetings to stay involved in the conversation and receive updates. Persky noted a new Training & Employment Guidance Letter (TEGL) hasn't been received yet from the U.S. Department of Labor.

The five pillars from the federal America's Talent Strategy: Building the Workforce for the Golden Age are:

1. PILLAR I: Industry-Driven Strategies: Building reliable talent pipelines through a workforce system led by industry and aligned with America's economic priorities.
2. PILLAR II: Worker Mobility: Bringing more Americans into the labor force and helping them advance, including through the innovative use of technology and labor market data.
3. PILLAR III: Integrated Systems: Replacing a fragmented web of duplicative programs with a streamlined, coordinated system that delivers unified workforce services.
4. PILLAR IV: Accountability: Ensuring federally funded workforce programs deliver measurable results by linking investments to outcomes & enforcing performance discipline.
5. PILLAR V: Flexibility & Innovation: Creating new models of workforce innovation built to match the speed and scale of AI-driven economic transformation.

Persky noted we are currently aligned very closely with the five pillars as well as the original strategic priorities selected by the board.

Persky then reported on the Industry Advisory Committee, noting the group's purpose and which sectors are represented. She shared the committee's timeline to present recommendations to the board in July 2026.

Feek requested information on when the board could expect to see a draft of the federal update. Persky said the systemwide sections (not individual program plans) could be shared with board members before the Feb. 20 meeting, aiming for Feb. 17. Public comment is tentatively scheduled for the month of March.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Proposed Perkins Targets

PRESENTED BY: Joe Wilcox, Workforce Board

CHECK ONE:

Action Item

Possible Action

Discussion Only

SUMMARY:

To support the development of the state's strategic workforce plan, Talent and Prosperity for All (TAP), the Workforce Board is required by federal law to annually update the Washington Perkins State Plan. Perkins V, also known as the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, is the primary federal law governing career and technical education (CTE) and provides funding to states to improve program quality, expand equitable access, and align CTE with workforce and industry needs. A critical component of the Perkins Act is the flexibility it provides to states, allowing them to establish performance targets for each core indicator within secondary and postsecondary performance measures. As part of this process, states must develop and submit State Determined Performance Levels (SDPLs) to the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education each year. These SDPLs must undergo a public comment process and receive approval from the Workforce Board before submission.

BACKGROUND:

Perkins V is focused on enhancing the quality of career and technical education (CTE) programs across the United States. Within this act, State Determined Performance Levels (SDPLs) serve as benchmarks or standards that each state sets to measure the effectiveness and success of its CTE programs. These SDPLs are established by state education agencies and are tailored to meet the specific needs and goals of the state's workforce and economy.

The SDPLs encompass various metrics and indicators that evaluate different aspects of CTE programs, such as:

- student achievement,
- program quality,
- workforce readiness, and
- the alignment of educational offerings with industry demands.

In order to determine these performance levels, states typically consider factors like:

- graduation rates,
- post-program employment rates,
- industry-recognized credential attainment,
- academic proficiency, and
- student engagement.

By setting these standards, states aim to ensure that CTE programs are meeting the demands of the job market, preparing students for successful careers, and contributing to the overall economic development of the state.

Moreover, these SDPLs are not only a measure of program success but also serve as a means of accountability. States regularly assess and report on their CTE programs' performance levels to identify areas of improvement, allocate resources effectively, and make informed decisions to enhance the quality and relevance of CTE offerings. The SDPLs thus play a pivotal role in shaping the direction and evolution of CTE to better align with the dynamic needs of industries and the workforce.

States are required to set new SDPLs annually as part of their Perkins planning and updating process. OSPI and SBCTC have worked closely with their local educational agencies (LEA) and colleges to set new SDPLs for the Perkins year 2027. These performance levels must exhibit measurable gains each year they are set, meaning that the new SDPLs must exceed the average of the previous two years' performance levels. Upon completion of the public comment period ending Feb. 11, 2026, no public comments were received.

The secondary and postsecondary system's proposed targets for the 2027 reporting year, and corresponding definitions, methodology, and reasoning are included in the information following this coversheet.

STAFF GUIDANCE & RECOMMENDATION:

Action: The Board will vote on approving the proposed 2027 Perkins SDPL targets.

Washington's Perkins V State Determined Levels of Performance for CAR Reporting Year 2027

Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
State Board for Community and Technical Colleges

January 2026



Perkins V, State Determined Levels of Performance, CAR reporting year 2027, Washington State

The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act (Perkins V) was signed into law by President Trump on July 31, 2018. This bipartisan measure reauthorized the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (Perkins IV) and continued Congress' commitment in providing nearly \$1.4 billion annually for career and technical education (CTE) programs for our nation's youth and adults.

A key feature of Perkins is that states are given the responsibility for choosing their own performance targets for each core indicator in the secondary and postsecondary performance measures, which includes a required public comment period. States are also required to report disaggregated data on the performance of students by gender, race/ethnicity, special population categories, and career clusters.

States are now required to set and submit State Determined Levels of Performance annually to the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Career Technical and Adult Education.

If the prior two years of actual performance indicators do not meet the two-year average increase requirement, states must set revised targets for the coming program year.

Below are the secondary and postsecondary system's performance indicators and proposed targets for the 2027 CAR reporting year, and corresponding methodology and reasoning. These indicators were published for public comment from January 7, 2026 through February 11, 2026. No comments were received.

OSPI Proposed Secondary Indicators – 2027

Proposed Indicators Methodology: All targets are proposed averaging 2024 and 2025 Concentrator cohort data.

CTE Concentrator Definition: A CTE Concentrator will be any student who earns two credits in a single career cluster within their four-year cohort.

CTE Participant Definition: A CTE participant will be any student that earns a high school credit in a CTE course in a single school year as reported annually.

Indicator/Definition from Perkins	2027
<p>1S1: Four-Year Graduation Rate <i>Defined as: The percentage of <u>CTE concentrators</u> who graduate high school, as measured by the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).</i></p>	96.2%
<p>Numerator: CTE concentrators who graduate in the 4-year adjusted cohort. Denominator: All CTE concentrators in the four-year adjusted cohort.</p>	
<p>Methodology/Background: If a student withdraws at any point in their high school career, they will still contribute to the denominator. If a student achieves concentrator status at any time during high school, the student will be identified as a concentrator for the 1S1 indicator. Wherever the student is last served is where the student will show up in data, whether they achieved concentrator status at that location or not. This is consistent with OSPI’s adjusted cohort methodology used for the official federal graduation rate calculation.</p>	

Indicator/Definition from Perkins	2027
<p>1S2: Extended Graduation Rate <i>Defined as: The percentage of <u>CTE concentrators</u> who graduate high school, as measured by extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate defined in such section 8101.</i></p>	97.2%
<p>Numerator: CTE concentrators who graduate in the five-year adjusted cohort. Denominator: All CTE concentrators in the five-year adjusted cohort.</p>	
<p>Methodology/Background: If a student withdraws at any point in their high school career, they will still contribute to the denominator. If a student achieves concentrator status at any time during high school they will be identified as a concentrator for the 1S2 indicator. Wherever the student is last served is where the student will show up in data, whether they achieved concentrator status at that location or not. This is consistent with OSPI’s adjusted cohort methodology used for the official federal graduation rate calculation.</p>	

OSPI Proposed Secondary Indicators – 2027

Indicator/Definition from Perkins	2027
<p>2S1: Academic Proficiency in Reading/Language Arts <i>Defined as: CTE concentrator proficiency in the challenging State academic standards adopted by the State under section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as measured by the academic assessments in reading/language arts as described in section 1111(b)(2) of such Act.</i></p>	66.4%
<p>Numerator: Any CTE concentrators in the denominator who achieved proficiency on the ELA academic assessment, as defined in the Washington ESSA State Plan. Denominator: All CTE concentrators in the four-year adjusted cohort who were expected to take the ELA academic assessment.</p>	
<p>Methodology/Background: This indicator will represent proficiency based on a cohort of students rather than a snapshot in time. Students will be reported only once, in their expected on-time graduation year regardless of when they took their ELA academic assessment. If a student becomes a concentrator in their 5th, 6th, or 7th year, they will not be reflected in this measure. If a student drops out prior to their expected graduation year, they will still be reflected in this measure.</p>	

Indicator/Definition from Perkins	2027
<p>2S2: Academic Proficiency in Mathematics <i>Defined as: CTE concentrator proficiency in the challenging State academic standards adopted by the State under section 1111(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as measured by the academic assessments in mathematics as described in section 1111(b)(2) of such Act.</i></p>	33.5%
<p>Numerator: Any CTE concentrators in the denominator who achieved proficiency on the mathematics academic assessment, as defined in the Washington ESSA State Plan. Denominator: All CTE concentrators in the four-year adjusted cohort, who were expected to take the mathematics academic assessment.</p>	
<p>Methodology/Background: This indicator will represent the proficiency based on a cohort of students rather than a snapshot in time. Students will be reported only once, in their expected on-time graduation year regardless of when they took their math academic assessment. If a student becomes a concentrator in their 5th, 6th, or 7th year, they will not be reflected in this measure. If a student drops out prior to their expected graduation year, they will still be reflected in this measure.</p> <p>For 2S1 and 2S2: The academic indicators in Washington’s ESSA plan are related to proficiency on the statewide assessment for English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics. Washington uses the Smarter Balanced Assessment System, which is aligned to the Washington K-12 Learning Standards. Students currently take the statewide assessment for ELA and Mathematics in the 10th grade. The state ESSA plan articulates targets for all students, at all grade levels. Considering the definition of CTE concentrator, high school students in grades 9-12 will contribute to the concentrator definition.</p>	

OSPI Proposed Secondary Indicators – 2027

Indicator/Definition from Perkins	2027
<p>2S3: Academic Proficiency in Science <i>Defined as: CTE concentrator proficiency in the challenging State academic standards measured by the academic assessments in science.</i></p>	39.7%
<p>Numerator: Any CTE concentrators in the denominator who achieved proficiency on the science academic assessment. Denominator: All CTE concentrators in the four-year adjusted cohort, who were expected to take the science academic assessment.</p>	
<p>Methodology/Background: This indicator will represent the proficiency based on a cohort of students rather than a snapshot in time. Students will be reported only once, in their expected on-time graduation year regardless of when they took their science academic assessment. If a student becomes a concentrator in their 5th, 6th, or 7th year, they will not be reflected in this measure. If a student drops out prior to their expected graduation year, they will still be reflected in this measure.</p> <p>There is no current academic indicator or metric in the ESSA plan for academic proficiency in science. The Washington Comprehensive Assessment of Science (WCAS) is aligned with the Washington State 2013 K-12 Science Learning Standards, which are the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). Students are assessed through the WCAS in the 11th grade.</p>	

Indicator/Definition from Perkins	2027 (2026 cohort data)
<p>3S1: Postsecondary Placement <i>Defined as: The percentage of CTE concentrators who, in the second quarter after exiting from secondary education, are in postsecondary education or advanced training*, military service or a service program that receives assistance under title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12511 et seq.), are volunteers as described in section 5(a) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 2504(a)), or are employed.</i></p> <p><i>*Washington does not collect data on "advanced training."</i></p>	78.7%
<p>Numerator: Those students in the denominator who are placed in the second quarter after being reported in the denominator of 1S1. This includes postsecondary education, advanced training, military service, or employment.</p>	
<p>Denominator: The number of CTE concentrators that exited (graduated or dropped out) from secondary education within the four-year adjusted cohort of the prior reporting year.</p>	
<p>Methodology/Background This data is driven by performance 2 quarters after the student is expected to leave the system as part of the four-year adjusted graduation cohort. OSPI relies on the Education Research & Data Center (ERDC) to provide the data on post-high school activities (post-secondary education, military service or employment). OSPI will provide ERDC with the cohort of students that make up the denominator so that they can create the numerator. Students who continue enrollment beyond four years will not be included in this measure.</p>	

OSPI Proposed Secondary Indicators – 2027

Indicator/Definition from Perkins	2027
<p>4S1: Non-traditional Program Enrollment <i>Defined as: The percentage of <u>CTE concentrators</u> in career and technical education programs and programs of study that lead to non-traditional fields.</i></p>	43.8%
<p>Numerator: Those students in the denominator who at any time during their secondary enrollment, but prior to their on-time four-year expected graduation year, was enrolled in a CTE course that was designated as preparing students for non-traditional fields based upon the indicator on the CIP code chart, and the student's gender. Denominator: All CTE concentrators in the four-year adjusted cohort. Students that identify as "Gender X" are not permitted to be reported at the federal level. Due to this issue, students that identify as "gender X" will not be represented in the gender categories reported for this indicator but gender X will be represented in all other reporting groups for this indicator.</p>	
<p>Methodology/Background: Students will be reported only reported once, in their expected on-time graduation year. If a student becomes a concentrator, or enrolls in a non-trad program only in their 5th, 6th, or 7th year, they will not be reflected in this measure. If a student drops out prior to their expected graduation year, they will still be reflected in this indicator.</p> <p>Washington understands the constraints associated with the federal definition of non-traditional being restricted to gender. This is problematic, as available data shows disproportional employment among many special populations, not solely restricted to gender. Additionally, Washington's secondary data system provides for students to be represented as "gender X". This will potentially impact the validity of data reported at the local and state level for this indicator. OSPI reviewed the previous state targets and state performance metrics for non-traditional participation and non-traditional completion to inform proposed targets.</p>	
Indicator/Definition from Perkins	2027
<p>5S1: Program Quality – Attained Recognized Postsecondary Credential <i>Defined as: The percentage of <u>CTE concentrators</u> graduating from high school having attained a recognized postsecondary credential.</i></p>	42.7%
<p>Numerator: Of students in the denominator, those that have attained an industry recognized credential through CTE coursework, as reported in the state data system. Denominator: All CTE concentrators in the four-year adjusted cohort.</p>	

OSPI Proposed Secondary Indicators – 2027

Indicator/Definition from Perkins	2027
<p>5S2: Program Quality – Attained Postsecondary Credits <i>Defined as: The percentage of <u>CTE concentrators</u> graduating from high school having attained postsecondary credits in the relevant career and technical education program or program of study earned through a dual or concurrent enrollment or another credit transfer agreement.</i></p>	97.4%
<p>Numerator: Of students in the denominator, students that completed courses that provided dual credit. Denominator: All CTE concentrators in the four-year adjusted cohort who graduated.</p>	
Indicator/Definition from Perkins	2027
<p>5S3: Program Quality – Participated in Work-Based Learning <i>Defined as: The percentage of <u>CTE concentrators</u> graduating from high school having participated in work-based learning.</i></p>	84.8%
<p>Numerator: Of students in the denominator, CTE concentrators that participated in work-based learning. Denominator: All CTE concentrators in the four-year adjusted cohort who graduated.</p>	

Proposed Perkins V Postsecondary Performance Indicators – CAR Reporting Year 2027

College Consultation and Input:

The 29 college districts, who submitted CLNAs and are eligible for Perkins Plan funding, were notified of these proposed targets on November 17, 2025. Colleges were asked to review the information and let SBCTC Perkins staff know if their college agreed or disagreed with the proposed state targets for reporting year 24-25. Responders were asked to provide questions and/or comments with their response.

As the formula for calculating the SDPLs was established in federal legislation, we acknowledged their concerns and questions, clarified the process and legislation, and committed to providing technical assistance. The performance indicators were set to conform to federal policy and to show our system's commitment to continuous improvement.

Proposed Indicators Methodology:

The proposed targets reflect our review of data provided by research and data services. This data informed the proposed changes to 1P1 and 2P1, which have been modified based on the two-year averages of our system. The target previously established for 3P1 does not require modification.

We have established our SDPLs beyond the two-year averages in support of improving student success, progression, and career mobility.

Definitions

CTE Concentrator: At the postsecondary level, a student is an eligible recipient who has:

- (i) earned at least 12 credits within a career and technical education program or program of study; or
- (ii) completed such a program if the program encompasses fewer than 12 credits or the equivalent in total. Exiter: Not enrolled in the CTC system the following year excluding enrollments in baccalaureate programs.

Indicator/Definition from Perkins	2027
<p>1P1 Postsecondary Placement: The percentage of CTE concentrators who, during the second quarter after program completion, remain enrolled in postsecondary education, are in advanced training, military service, or a service program that receives assistance under title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12511 et seq.), are volunteers as described in section 5(a) of the Peace Corps Act (22 U.S.C. 20 2504(a)), or are placed or retained in employment.</p>	41.5%
<p>Numerator: Cohort that has received a postsecondary credential and is an exiter as well as one of the following: in the L&I apprenticeship completers or active files, enrolled in Bachelor Program in our CTC system, found in post-secondary (National Student Clearinghouse) outside of our CTC system, or employed.</p> <p>Denominator: CTE Concentrator Cohort</p>	
<p>Methodology/Background: For purposes of reporting 1P1 performance, SBCTC will include CTE completers who participated in registered apprenticeships, enrolled in postsecondary baccalaureate degree programs within the community and technical colleges system, those that enroll in postsecondary programs outside Washington’s two-year college system, and those who were employed the second quarter following the completion year. Like most states, Washington is unable to report the number of program completers who transitioned to military service, a service program that receives assistance under Title 1 of the National and Community Service Act, or who transitioned to the Peace Corps. Additionally, the state is not able to gather placement data of CTE concentrators who in the second quarter after exiting from postsecondary education, are in military service or are volunteers as described in section 5a of the Peace Corps Act. This is a FEDES issue and one that comes under the direction of the Department of Defense (DOD).</p>	

Indicator/Definition from Perkins	2027
<p>2P1 Earned Recognized Postsecondary Credential: The percentage of CTE concentrators who receive a recognized postsecondary credential during participation in or within 1 year of program completion</p>	52.5%
<p>Numerator: Earned a postsecondary credential in the current or following academic year.</p> <p>Denominator: CTE Concentrator Cohort</p>	
<p>Methodology/Background: SBCTC will include all CTE concentrators who completed a CTE credential and who were no longer enrolled at a community or technical college two quarters after their last credential award.</p>	

Indicator/Definition from Perkins	2027
<p>3P1 Nontraditional Program Concentration: The percentage of CTE concentrators in career and technical education programs and programs of study that lead to non-traditional fields.</p>	21%
<p>Numerator: Students who are in a non-traditional program and are not of the dominate gender are included in the numerator.</p> <p>Denominator: CTE Concentrator Cohort enrolled in programs that lead to employment in non-traditional fields.</p>	
<p>Methodology/Background: For purposes of reporting 3P1 performance, SBCTC will include CTE concentrators from underrepresented gender groups (25% or less of the gender represented in the field) who were enrolled in CTE programs that lead to employment in non-traditional fields.</p>	

Tab 2

2026 Workforce System Legislative Update

PRESENTED BY: Nova Gattman, Workforce Board

CHECK ONE:

Action Item

Possible Action

Discussion Only

SUMMARY:

Board staff will provide an overview of select topics under consideration by the Legislature that impact the workforce system, or other key priorities from the state's strategic plan for workforce development, Talent and Prosperity for All (TAP).

BACKGROUND:

Board staff will provide an update of workforce issues at the halfway point of the 2026 Legislative Session. Staff will focus on the major bill proposals and investments still under consideration that impact the workforce system.

Information about the Workforce Board's legislative activities, including the bills staff are tracking, are located [here](#).

STAFF GUIDANCE & RECOMMENDATION:

Information and discussion only. Board members may request additional information on items that relate to workforce development.

If time permits, Board members will be invited to share information on their legislative activities and draft legislation items of note.

Tab 3

Performance Framework and Expected Performance Levels

PRESENTED BY: Dave Wallace, Workforce Board, and Cami Feek, Employment Security Department

CHECK ONE:

Action Item

Possible Action

Discussion Only

SUMMARY:

Workforce Board Research Director Dave Wallace and ESD Commissioner Cami Feek will present an outline of the proposed Talent and Prosperity for All (TAP) system performance dashboard. The spring update to Washington's federal Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) combined program plan will include a summary of this work and expected performance levels.

BACKGROUND:

The TAP plan identified strategic priority groups including the TAP Performance and Evaluation Work Group. The group was tasked with monitoring workforce development activities and is proposing a system dashboard as part of that effort.

The Board will learn the background on why the TAP Performance and Evaluation Work Group is proposing the dashboard, what it is likely to include, and the purpose behind it. The expected levels of performance for (WIOA) Titles I and III will be presented in addition to the framework.

Staff will request Board member input on the overall direction and proposed data, indicators, and measures.

STAFF GUIDANCE & RECOMMENDATION:

This item is for discussion only and will allow the Board to weigh in on the proposed framework before it is included in the state plan update.

Briefing for the Proposed TAP Performance Dashboard

For presentation to the Board on Feb. 20, 2026

Background

The TAP Performance and Evaluation Work Group (PEG) was formed from a previously existing group focused on doing cross workforce system evaluations. It was tasked to carry out the data and performance tracking strategic priorities identified in the TAP Plan. The group decided that to track state progress, it would stand up a system performance dashboard.

Agreed Upon Principles for the Dashboard

The following principles were agreed upon by PEG to guide dashboard work:

- We will evaluate workforce system impacts using system-level data.
- We will select program metrics that align with our system-level performance measures as well as our TAP priorities and use those as supporting indicators.
- Where possible we will use metrics that are already collected to ensure efficient use of state resources. Where gaps exist, we will collaborate with partners to add additional measures.
- We will include a web page on the dashboard that shows how the metrics are organized according to the U.S. Department of Labor’s “five pillars”.
 - I. Industry-Driven Strategies
 - II. Worker Mobility
 - III. Integrated Systems
 - IV. Accountability
 - V. Flexibility and Innovation

Proposed Framework

Initially the group looked at a three-tiered dashboard with high-level statewide measures, workforce measures that the system had more direct influence over, and supporting indicators of TAP initiatives and outcomes. However, the group decided to start by focusing on the first two tiers:

- **Landscape Indicators**
 - Workers/job seekers: An example of this would be the self-sufficiency index for Washington. This shows the percentage of state households that meet the self-sufficiency standard.
 - Thriving state businesses: This could be, for example, the state gross domestic product.

- **Measures to track performance of statewide workforce system.**

These metrics are meant to focus on workforce development outcomes. Note that there is currently a lot of work evaluating specific programs, but the intent here is to measure across the system. Examples include:

- Workforce system participant statistics of employment and earnings, disaggregated by various demographics.
- For business, an example could be job openings or new business applications. Where possible, align with the [AWB Institute dashboard](#).
- Consider new measures that could be collected to support this work.

Work Plan and Actions to Achieve Main Goals

In the first half of 2025, PEG developed and adopted a work group charter. The charter identified the need for a dashboard, which was developed in the second half of 2025. The framework for the dashboard was outlined and adopted by the work group in October 2025.

The following workplan timeline identified activities required to stand up the dashboard and target dates for achieving them.

What	When
Present inventory findings	Apr-25
Review TAP Lead interviews	Apr-25
Adopt charter	Jun-25
Adopt work plan	Oct-25
Adopt metrics framework	Oct-25
Decide on dashboard metrics	Nov-25
Decide on minimum viable dashboard product	Nov-25
Report to the Board on dashboard progress	Feb-26
Determine if additional data is needed for Tier 2	Apr-26
Review IRB needs (annually)	Apr-26
Workforce System ID	Apr-26
Live dashboard	Aug-26

Metrics for Consideration

The group started out working on the highest level of metrics, known as Landscape Indicators. These are meant to give a statewide view of progress for the whole system. After discussion and debate the group proposed six indicators:

- Self-sufficiency Index
- State GDP
- State labor force participation rate
- State unemployment rate
- State employment level
- State median wage

State Workforce System Measures are meant to include metrics that the workforce system has some impact on. For the Statewide Workforce Measures, we propose the following for consideration. However, we still need to determine which programs this tier of measures should cover.

- Number of workforce training participants
- Number and rate of training program completions
- Count of registered apprenticeship participants
- Median wage for workforce program participants
- Measurable skill gain rate and count
- Credential attainment rates
- Job retention rate
- Count of businesses engaged with registered apprenticeship programs

Programs to be included in Workforce System Measures

The plan is for the Workforce Board to host the dashboard and collect the necessary data. Currently the agency collects sufficient information on the following programs:

- Four WIOA titles
- Registered Apprenticeships
- Professional-technical education
- Worker retraining
- Secondary career and technical education
- WorkFirst
- Trade Adjustment Assistance
- Jobs for Veterans State Grants

It is not yet settled what other programs would be included, but the following programs are under consideration for inclusion by the group:

- Economic Security for All
- Reemployment Services and Eligibility Assessment Grants
- Job Skills Program
- Training Benefits
- Community Reinvestment Program
- Customized Job Training
- Job Corps

Expected WIOA Performance Levels

While this isn't directly related to the proposed dashboard, the presentation will also include the Expected Levels of Performance that will be submitted to the Department of Labor. These expected levels are the first step in the biennial department negotiation process for Titles I and III performance targets. They essentially represent Washington State's "opening bid".

	Empl. Rate (Q2)	Median Earnings	Empl. Rate (Q4)	Credential Rate	Measurable Skill Gains
Title I Adults	65.1%	\$9,400	65.5%	72.3%	51.8%
Title I Dislocated Workers	68.8%	\$10,371	68.3%	74.1%	51.4%
Title I Youth	60.4%	\$4,623	62.1%	51.7%	38.4%
Title III Wagner-Peyser	65.4%	\$9,012	65.2%	NA	NA
Title III Wagner-Peyser JVSG	57.3%	\$10,113	55.6%	NA	NA
Title III Wagner-Peyser Veteran	57.2%	\$10,088	57.3%	NA	NA

Tab 4

Federal WIOA Combined Program Plan

PRESENTED BY: Emily Persky, Workforce Board

CHECK ONE:

Action Item

Possible Action

Discussion Only

SUMMARY:

Staff will walk Board members through the sections of the state's Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Combined Program Plan, which is submitted to the U.S. Departments of Labor and Education as well as other federal agencies. Members may ask questions and give input on sections about systemwide strategy, operations, and coordination.

BACKGROUND:

Washington is on track to submit its regular, required mid-cycle update to the state's federal, four-year WIOA combined program plan by the end of April 2026. During this agenda item board members will be able to review and familiarize themselves with the draft plan before it goes out for public input. Upon incorporating public input, staff will bring the plan back to the board at the April 3 meeting for final review before submitting to the federal government.

The first four sections of the plan cover systemwide strategy, operations, and coordination. They include an update on the economic landscape, labor market, and demographic data, which staff [presented](#) at the November 2025 Board meeting. These sections also reflect the Board's decisions to elevate and support partners' ongoing efforts while narrowing focus for plan implementation to four objectives:

1. Implement Workforce Pell.
2. Advance the No Wrong Door project (scope adjusted depending on funding) and support partners with HR1 implementation.
3. Implement strategic, systemwide performance reviews.
4. Deliver recommendations from the Board's Industry Advisory Committee.

The Board's decision-making spanned meetings in [August](#), [September](#) and [October](#) 2025. These objectives align with the [U.S. Department of Labor's five pillars](#) and the original strategic priorities outlined in the state's four-year plan, submitted in spring 2024.

As part of the update, state partners contribute to the systemwide information and submit individual plans for the programs they administer. We anticipate that the next new four-year plan will be due in spring 2028.

STAFF GUIDANCE & RECOMMENDATION:

Board members will have an opportunity to ask questions and discuss the first four sections of Washington's WIOA Combined Program Plan.