

Maryland's WORKFORCE SYSTEM



Benchmarks of Success for Maryland's Workforce System

Data and Dashboard Committee

10:00 – 12:00 PM, July 2, 2018

DLLR

Attendees: Milena Kornyl, Andre James, Ellen Beattie, John Stem, Lisa Nicoli, Lynda Weber, Patricia Morfe, Rob Pinkard, Scott Dennis, Shamekka Kuykendall, and Natalie Clements

Handouts: Agenda

Minutes

I. News and Notes

- At the last WIOA Alignment Group meeting, questions were raised on when they can expect to start seeing data. They realize that they cannot expect to see all of the numbers, but they would like to see some data to indicate progress.
 - The Data and Dashboard Committee can work off of the previous collection status document to finalize the areas where partners are already collecting data.
 - The committee should strive to compromise on calculations that work and that are accurate.
 - The Data and Dashboard Committee may have more time at the next WIOA Alignment Committee meeting to present the calculation determination process and preliminary data.
- The Glossary of Terms will not go out for a public comment period, for it is heavily contextualized in the data world. Instead, it will be uploaded on the DLLR *Benchmarks* webpage, once the WIOA Alignment Group's comments have been incorporated. The WIOA Alignment Group understands that this glossary is a living document that will require updates once other data work has been complete.

II. Developing the Range of Options

- **Review/summarize discussion of last meeting (Strategic Goal 1 – Benchmarks #1, 2, and 3)**
 - “Customer” should be defined in the calculations as “participant” for the WIOA Titles I, III, and IV programs. Title II has three criteria for “reportable” but not “participant”, so this terms should be used instead. TANF may

substitute “work eligible”. Any deviations or limitations in data, such as this differentiation in “customer” should be captured in caveats/disclaimers in the data dictionary.

- Strategic Goal #4 captures the population by barrier to employment, so the committee does not necessarily need to make that distinction now.
 - Once the calculations are determined, the data can be paired down to identify the numbers for a specific population with a barrier, if needed.
 - Multiple sets of numbers can be presented to the WIOA Alignment Group (e.g. capturing different population sizes) for them to provide feedback.
- Benchmarks reporting should result in one number, not one for each program. The measures from the different programs need to be combined in some way (averaged, added, etc.?). More resources would be needed to make the data more accurate and avoid duplication.
- Benchmarks reporting is reliant on data timeframes, e.g. Unemployment Insurance (UI) wage match returns timeframes. This year (or couple years) should be used to set the baseline. However, if the shape of the data changes, then the baseline changes too.
- **Benchmark #1:** Increase the annual % of Maryland’s workforce system customers who obtain employment and earn at least 200% of the federal poverty level from X% to Y% by date
 - If this Benchmark is to include those underemployed, not just unemployed, then UI data and FEIN numbers can be used to make the distinction; however, tracking and matching these numbers represents a large time cost to those working with the data. Most programs and grants are not readily tracking incumbent workers increasing employment. Titles I and III will use the measure “entered employment”, only including participants that entered the program unemployed.
 - For Title II, adult education, social security numbers are not collected, but there is a checkbox that students can check whether they are in or out of the labor market. It is estimated that more than half of students use this checkbox. Title II partners should calculate this Benchmark to the best of their ability, noting data limitations.
 - For TANF, the distinction between under- and unemployed is so minimal (buried in data), that the whole population should be included in this Benchmark calculation. This note should be included as a caveat/disclaimer in the Data Dictionary.
 - The federal poverty level is an HHS measure. To calculate 200% of the federal poverty level, analysts should assume a family size of 1 and multiple the relevant federal poverty level by 2.
 - The level changes annually. Should the number change every year for measuring the Benchmarks, or should one number be selected? This is a question for the WIOA Alignment Group.

- WIOA Titles I and IV have a measure for credentialing, but this only includes what is countable as a credential under WIOA (TEGL 10-16, Change 1). This measure will not include High School Diplomas, for those are captured in Benchmark #3 of this Strategic Goal.
 - TANF data systems may capture this information, but this information is likely mostly captured in individual vendor reports.
 - Adult education has a self-report credential box, but students hardly use it.
 - The Benchmark will include any participant that got a credential during participation and for the year after exit.
 - The Data Dictionary should include a caveat/disclaimer listing the credentials that do not count in this measure.
- **Benchmark #2:** Increase the annual % of Maryland’s workforce system customers who increase in their Educational Functioning Level
 - Educational Functioning Level is a reporting element for Title II adult education; however, it is an option of Measurable Skill Gain reporting for other Titles. Educational Functioning Level requires pre- and post-tests.
 - The other Titles, to the extent possible, will capture this data only as it pertains to the Educational Functioning Level option of Measurable Skill Gain, unless the WIOA Alignment Group indicates that the full Measurable Skill Gain piece should be used.
 - The timeframe for this Benchmark is active and after exit.
- **Benchmark #3:** Increase the annual % of Maryland’s workforce system customers who earn a High School Diploma
 - This includes both High School Diplomas and GEDs (listed in data reporting, but all GEDs are rewarded with a High School Diploma in Maryland).
- **Benchmark #4:** Increase the annual % of Maryland’s workforce system customers who obtain an occupational skills training completion from X% to Y% by date
 - For TANF, this measure is likely tracked at the local level. How can the local data be incorporated at the state level? Is the vendor report data incorporated into the statewide data system?
 - DORS data captures this information.
 - DLLR can measure this data as a “successful completion of a service”.

III. Next Steps

- Natalie Clements and Milena Kornyl will develop a draft Data Dictionary of calculations based on today’s discussion.
 - Committee members will have a chance to comment on the draft, and then each partner agency should pilot calculating the Benchmarks for the first two Strategic Goals, noting any limitations in data for caveats/disclaimers.
 - Committee leadership will present the data, draft Data Dictionary, and caveats/disclaimers to the WIOA Alignment Group. This test run data should

not be shared widely, for it is more to show the different options in capturing the Benchmarks.

- Shamekka Kuykendall will investigate how TANF captures business engagement at the local and/or state level.
- Milena Kornyl will develop a one-page explanation of the calculations for the Benchmarks of Strategic Goals 1 and 2. This resource will be shared with the committee for comment then with the WIOA Alignment Group.
- The next committee meeting is scheduled for **Monday, August 6, 2018, from 10 AM to 12 PM**. This meeting will take place at the DLLR Baltimore office. There will be conference call capability. Meeting logistical information can be found in the calendar invite.
- The first Monday of September (9/3) is Labor Day. Natalie Clements will send out a Doodle Poll to committee members to gauge availability and reschedule the committee meeting for that month.