

## Appendix C

### Results of other WSEC studies

#### Study #4. The "performance support plan for intensive services contractors"

WSEC evaluation staff, with guidance from MOED, met with representatives of three service providers and attended a performance support session. It was found that the problem was not one of provider process-efficiency, but instead was a "front-door entry problem" related to difficulties in establishing eligibility for potential clients from difficult target groups typically lacking documentation. This resulted in a memo with several recommendations (*see sidebar*) and launched: (i) a review of WIA rules and criteria for creative alternative ways of enrolling clients; and (ii) a coordinated system-wide approach to recognizing, highlighting, and easing the inadvertent barriers posed by unfortunate combinations of different agencies' actions.

##### Recommendations for intensive services providers

###### *For proactive performance management:*

- More frequent in-person meetings, with the emphasis on performance problems and solutions.
- More frequent "touch-base" phone calls for early identification and intervention.
- Move to an automated, web-based, data collection system.

###### *For system integration and seamless delivery:*

- Discuss with Social Security Administration how to expedite requests
- Earlier starts on applications for documentation, prior to release from incarceration.

###### *For barrier removal:*

- Instant provisional eligibility pending later completion of documentation
- Require grantee matching funds be available for clients' immediate short-term cash needs.

By drawing on this pilot experience to expanding this project to cover the performance and position of non-governmental service providers, we will, upon completion of this project, have a template for future contracts with outside service providers, a model for data collection and for monitoring eventual system-wide performance measures for workforce service providers, enhanced performance self-measurement capabilities in Tier 2 providers, and a data collection system and agreed methodology in place for BWIB to evaluate Tier 2 intensive service provider grantees.

#### Study #7. The survey of LWIB responses to fiscal stress:

This survey's 142 LWIB respondents come from 38 different states, and represent about 28% of the nation's LWIBs. Responding areas vary in size from 23,000 people over 4 million. In total, these LWIBs are responsible for over 1,100 one-stop employment and career centers, and their local workforce investment areas serve over 70 million people.

The main findings about LWIB funding situations for PY '03 from this survey are:

- 67% of responding LWIBs are expecting *some* level of decrease in WIA funds compared to the previous year, and 37% of LWIBs expect this decrease to be a cut in funds of 20% or more.

- 84% of LWIBs rate their PY03 WIA budget situation to be in some degree worse than all previous years, and just over one-third rate it *“much worse”*. Just over one in five LWIBs rates it *“the worst year”* they have ever experienced.
- Almost 45% of LWIB respondents are also expecting some level of *decrease* in their *non-WIA* funding. Just over one in five expects that cut to be more than 20% of their previous year's non-WIA funds.

The survey also found the “top ten” responses to fiscal stress (out of 58 possible responses listed for them). (*These are ranked by the number of LWIBs “currently undertaking” or “planning to undertake” each, in the left sidebar below*). The survey was also able to document other individually innovative responses being tried by LWIBs that the survey instrument itself had *not* posed (*see second sidebar*).

#### **Top Ten LWIB responses to fiscal stress**

1. Increase information and publicity to the state legislature and other elected officials about programs.
2. Focus on partnering to meet gaps.
3. Cross-train staff to handle increased responsibilities.
4. Use unspent money from previous program years.
5. Find other new sources of revenue.
6. Approach other federal government sources for funding.
7. Ask private Board members to advocate for additional funding on behalf of the workforce system.
8. Reduce overhead/indirect costs.
9. Streamline services by reducing paperwork, number of steps/contacts, etc.
10. Approach other state government sources for funding.

#### **Other innovative LWIB responses to fiscal stress**

1. Hiring professional full-time fund-raisers, grant-writers, and development specialists.
2. Developing profit-making service lines, enterprises, or joint ventures with temporary staffing agencies.
3. Setting up workforce funds with employer contributions.
4. Offering services to otherwise un-served, out-of-area employers, for a fee.
5. Offering paid “memberships” or subscriptions to employers in return for additional levels of service.
6. Shifting to a non-profit status for the LWIB.
7. Consolidating service operations into a single mega-one-stop serving a whole distributed network of reduced-service satellite offices.