

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION ADVISORY SYSTEM U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR Washington, D.C. 20210	CLASSIFICATION WIA/Performance Goals
	CORRESPONDENCE SYMBOL PROTECH/OWI/ORIT
	DATE January 14, 2009

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT GUIDANCE LETTER NO. 9-08

TO: ALL STATE WORKFORCE AGENCIES
ALL STATE WORKFORCE ADMINISTRATORS
ALL STATE WORKFORCE LIAISONS

FROM: BRENT R. ORRELL *Brent R. Orrell*
Deputy Assistant Secretary

SUBJECT: Negotiating Performance Goals for the Workforce Investment Act Title IB Programs and Wagner-Peyser Act Funded Activities for Program Year 2009

1. Purpose. To inform states of the guidelines for negotiating Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Title IB performance and customer satisfaction goals and performance levels for the Wagner-Peyser Act funded activities for Program Year (PY) 2009, including the option to extend PY 2008 negotiated goals for PY 2009. These performance goals, once they are agreed upon between the state and the Employment and Training Administration (ETA), will be incorporated into the State's Strategic Plan for the WIA and Wagner-Peyser Act.

2. References. WIA Section 136; WIA regulations at 20 CFR Part 666 and Part 661; Training and Employment Guidance Letter (TEGL) No. 7-08, "Instructions for Workforce Investment Act and Wagner-Peyser Act State Planning and Waiver Requests for Year Five of the Strategic Five-Year State Plan (PY 2009)" TEGL No. 9-07, "Revised Incentive and Sanction Policy for Workforce Investment Act Title IB Programs"; TEGL No. 17-05, "Common Measures Policy for the Employment and Training Administration's (ETA) Performance Accountability System and Related Performance Issues"; and TEGL No. 11-01, "Guidance on Revising Workforce Investment Act State Negotiated Levels of Performance."

RESCISSIONS TEGL 19-06	EXPIRATION DATE Continuing
----------------------------------	--------------------------------------

3. Background. The information in this Guidance Letter supersedes and rescinds previously issued guidance related to performance negotiations in TEGL 19-06, "Negotiating Performance Goals for the Workforce Investment Act Title IB Programs and Wagner-Peyser Act Program for Program Years 2007 and 2008." The intent of this guidance is to clarify the performance measures for which states will be held accountable in PY 2009, provide an outline of the negotiation process, and provide descriptions of tools available for use during the negotiation process. The negotiation process across the system has been improved by the consistent use of these tools to do the required analysis, which are available as attachments to this guidance, as well as through ETA's performance Web site at:
<http://www.doleta.gov/performance/guidance/negotiating.cfm>.

4. Changes to the Negotiation Process. In general, the process for this current round of negotiations will not change much from the processes used in PY 2007 and PY 2008. Negotiations will continue to take place between the states and the corresponding ETA regional offices, and specific guidance regarding contacts and timeframes will be provided to the states by the appropriate regional office (the actual process steps are described in more detail in Section 7.C of this guidance). As was the case for the last round of negotiations, states will be required to establish PY 2009 performance levels for the Wagner-Peyser Act component of the State Plans at the same time they negotiate performance levels for the WIA Title IB programs. One option for PY 2009 is that states may extend their negotiated PY 2008 goals for an additional year. States that choose this option must notify their appropriate Regional Administrator no later than April 15, 2009.

5. Methodology for Assessing Performance Against Negotiated Levels. For both the WIA Title IB and the Wagner-Peyser Act programs, the upper bound of the performance range will be the negotiated level of performance for the measure, while the lower bound of the range is 80% of the negotiated level of performance. Performance on an individual measure will be interpreted based on the outcome's position relative to the two boundaries for a measure as follows:

- **Exceeds** - when the actual performance achieved against an individual performance measure is in excess of 100% of the negotiated level of performance for the measure;
- **Meets** - when the actual performance achieved against an individual performance measure falls in the range of 80 to 100% of the negotiated level of performance for the measure; and,
- **Fails** - when the actual performance achieved against an individual performance measure is less than 80% of the negotiated level of performance.

For example, if a state negotiates a 90.0% goal for the employment retention rate measure, the state would:

- **Exceed** the goal if the actual performance level achieved was greater than 90.0%;
- **Meet** the goal if the actual performance level achieved was greater than or equal to 72.0% and less than or equal to 90.0%; and,
- **Fail** the goal if the actual performance level achieved was less than 72.0%.

While whole percentages are used in this example, it should be noted that this is simply because 80% of the negotiated 90.0% happens to be exactly 72%; actual performance results should not be rounded to a whole number. Negotiated performance levels and results are stated to the tenth of a percent. States may continue to use additional distinctions to differentiate performance within the **Meets** category.

These three categories align with WIA regulations
(http://www.doleta.gov/performance/guidance/laws_regs.cfm):

666.220(b)(3) The state exceeded the state negotiated levels of performance for title I, the levels of performance under title II and the levels for vocational and technical programs under Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act. (WIA sec. 503(b));

666.230(a)(2) The extent to which the negotiated levels of performance were exceeded; and

666.240(d) Only performance that is less than 80 percent of the negotiated levels will be deemed to be a failure to achieve negotiated levels of performance.

Please note that for purposes of WIA incentive grant eligibility, a state must meet at least **90** percent of the negotiated level for each applicable WIA performance measure to be considered eligible for an incentive.

6. Applicable Performance Measures for the PY 2009 Performance Negotiation Process. The negotiation process will focus on establishing agreed-upon levels of performance for 20 performance measures for the WIA and Wagner-Peyser programs. The 20 performance measures include 17 WIA indicators of performance (15 Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Youth program measures and two customer satisfaction indicators) and three Wagner-Peyser performance measures.

For those states that have requested a waiver to report against the WIA Adult and Youth common performance measures only, and have received approval to do so in accordance with the waiver authority granted to the Secretary at WIA section 189(i)(4), the negotiation process will focus on establishing a total of nine agreed-upon levels of performance for the WIA Adult, Dislocated Worker and Youth programs and three agreed-upon levels for the Wagner-Peyser program. For these waiver states, the three

Adult common measures will be applied separately to the WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker programs, and the three Youth common measures will be applied to the WIA Youth program. The table below summarizes the performance measures involved in the negotiation process.

Applicable Performance Measures

WIA Measures (Majority of States)				Common Measures (Waiver States)			Wagner-Peyser Measures (All States)
Adult	Dislocated Worker	Youth	Customer Satisfaction	Adult	Dislocated Worker	Youth	
Entered Employment Rate	Entered Employment Rate	Older Youth Entered Employment Rate	Participant American Customer Satisfaction Index	Entered Employment Rate	Entered Employment Rate	Placement in Employment or Education	Entered Employment Rate for Total Exiters
Employment Retention Rate	Employment Retention Rate	Older Youth Employment Retention Rate	Employer American Customer Satisfaction Index	Employment Retention Rate	Employment Retention Rate	Attainment of a Degree or Certificate	Employment Retention Rate for Total Exiters
Employment and Credential Rate	Employment and Credential Rate	Older Youth Credential Rate		Average Six Months Earnings	Average Six Months Earnings	Literacy and Numeracy Gains	Average Six Months Earnings for Total Exiters
Average Six Months Earnings	Average Six Months Earnings	Older Youth Earnings Change Younger Youth Skill Attainment Rate Younger Youth Diploma or Equivalent Rate Younger Youth Retention Rate					

The source documents with the definitions and related reporting specifications for the applicable performance measures follow:

- **The 17 WIA performance measures** - TEGL No. 17-05, "Common Measures Policy for the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) Performance Accountability System and Related Performance Issues" (<http://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/attach/TEGL17-05.pdf>); and the **Workforce Investment Act Annual Report: General Reporting Instructions and ETA Form 9091, Revised 2006** (<http://www.doleta.gov/Performance/guidance/WIA/WIA-Annual-Report-Specifications-Expires-02282009.doc>);

- **The WIA Youth program common measures** - TEGL No. 17-05, "Common Measures Policy for the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) Performance Accountability System and Related Performance Issues" (<http://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/attach/TEGL17-05.pdf>); TEGL No. 17-05, Change 1, "Common Measures Policy for the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) Performance Accountability System and Related Performance" (<http://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/attach/TEGL/TEGL17-05c1.pdf>); and the Workforce Investment Act Annual Report; General Reporting Instructions and ETA Form 9091, Revised 2006 (<http://www.doleta.gov/Performance/guidance/WIA/WIA-Annual-Report-Specifications-Expires-02282009.doc>); and
- **The three Wagner-Peyser program performance measures** - TEGL No. 17-05, "Common Measures Policy for the Employment and Training Administration (ETA) Performance Accountability System and Related Performance Issues" (<http://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/attach/TEGL17-05.pdf>); and the ETA 9002 and VETS 200 Data Preparation Handbook, ET Handbook No. 406 released in February 2006 (<http://www.doleta.gov/Performance/guidance/WIA/ET-406-Handbook-Expiration-022809.pdf>).

As was the case in PY 2007 and PY 2008, all states will continue to collect and report against the three Youth common performance measures for the entire Youth population (Older and Younger Youth combined) in PY 2009. However, ETA will not consider performance against these measures in the incentive award and sanctions determinations for states that are accountable for outcomes on the 17 WIA measures. The exception is for states that have received an approved waiver to implement and report against the "WIA common measures only." These states will negotiate levels of performance for the Youth common measures and ETA will use these measures in the incentive and sanctions determinations.

Please note that for purposes of WIA incentive and sanctions determinations, the applicable performance measures are listed in TEGL 9-07, "Revised Incentive and Sanction Policy for Workforce Investment Act Title IB Programs" (<http://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/attach/TEGL09-07.pdf>).

States should also be aware that the Veterans' Employment and Training Service (VETS) intends to issue separate guidance on negotiating PY 2009 veterans' performance targets with State Workforce Agencies. This negotiation of specific levels of performance for veterans will include: 1) performance targets for veterans served by the Wagner-Peyser Employment Service; and 2) grant-based performance targets for veterans served through the Jobs for Veterans state grants.

7. Reaching Agreement on State Performance Levels. States should use negotiated levels of performance to drive continuous improvement and enhanced customer satisfaction. In proposing performance targets for both the WIA Title IB and Wagner-

Peyser programs, states should negotiate their goals within the context of integrated service delivery, priority of service, economic conditions, customers served, and workforce solutions that contribute to the regional economic competitiveness of their state and sub-state areas.

A. Customers to Be Served

The customers served by the local area may have a significant impact on outcomes, depending on the type of services, including entrepreneurial training, length of services, and other factors unique to the population.

ETA encourages states to serve those individuals with barriers to employment and individuals more at-risk of not connecting to the labor market, including those who were formerly incarcerated, the homeless, veterans, individuals with disabilities, and out-of-school youth. States should bring appropriate information to the negotiation process that demonstrates either their past performance in serving these populations and/or their current strategy for serving these populations.

ETA will consider adjusting performance targets to accommodate states currently serving a significant number of at-risk individuals who need higher levels of service to achieve a positive labor market outcome. States that have ongoing initiatives for serving at-risk individuals may work with their respective Regional Administrator to negotiate appropriate goals for PY 2009. During the negotiation process, states must provide data to support adjustments of goals based on numbers of at-risk individuals currently being served.

When negotiating the Youth goals, states should be aware that ETA's strategic vision for youth services includes a focus on serving the neediest youth, especially out-of-school youth, including youth in foster care, youth in the juvenile justice system, children of incarcerated parents, and migrant youth, as well as youth with disabilities and Native American youth. States that transition to serving a higher percentage of these more difficult to serve populations should take into account the populations being served when proposing performance levels for the Youth measures. Serving a greater percentage of the neediest youth may impact outcomes. If states are serving a greater percentage of the neediest youth, they should provide data that shows how outcomes are impacted by serving this population.

When negotiating goals for the Adult program, states proposing new efforts to increase access to services for special populations that may face significant barriers (such as veterans, older workers, individuals with disabilities, migrant or seasonal farm workers, Indian and Native Americans, or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) recipients), should provide data to show how these new efforts will impact WIA Adult, WIA Dislocated Worker and Wagner-Peyser Act outcomes. ETA supports efforts that will help states better tap into a wider pipeline of available workers. Available performance data indicate that the workforce investment system's

employment and training programs have positive impacts on individuals' employment, including traditionally underserved populations. ETA expects states to document how outcomes are impacted by changes in the mix of participants served.

Efforts to expand services to at-risk populations are consistent with the WIA legislation. Section 101(13) of WIA defines eligible youth as a low-income individual between the ages of 14 and 21 who is deficient in basic literacy skills, a school dropout, homeless, a runaway or foster child, pregnant or parenting, an offender, or an individual who requires additional assistance to complete an educational program or hold employment. Section 112 (b)(17)(A)(iv) requires that the State Plan describe how the state will serve the employment and training needs of dislocated workers (including displaced homemakers), low-income individuals (including recipients of public assistance), individuals training for nontraditional employment, and other individuals with multiple barriers to employment (including older individuals and individuals with disabilities). Section 134(d)(4)(E) requires that priority shall be given to recipients of public assistance and other low-income individuals for intensive services and training services.

For future negotiations, ETA invites states to suggest mechanisms for expanding services to at-risk populations within our current performance framework. Suggestions should be emailed to: ETAperforms@dol.gov.

B. Tools for Proposing Levels of Performance

The following tools and process guidelines provide a uniform framework for states to use to set performance goals. Following these guidelines should make coming to agreement on final performance levels easier. The state and the ETA Regional Administrator must negotiate and agree to final performance levels no later than June 30, 2009.

Prior to proposing levels of performance for the applicable performance measures to the appropriate Regional Administrator to begin the negotiation process, as discussed further in Part C of this section (and **Attachment I**), states should review and make use of the following resources/tools to ensure that they have considered these factors in determining a proposed level and that there is a sound rationale for the proposed levels of performance:

I. *Past performance*. States should use historical, annual performance information (PY 2005-2008) to inform projected levels of performance for PY 2009. Recent quarterly performance results should also be used to inform the performance path the state is following. The Wagner-Peyser funded activities began reporting against the common performance measures in PY 2005 and now have three full years of data on which to base future performance projections. The Department anticipates that states will submit proposed levels of performance that reflect continuous improvement and additional experience, and show increases over the prior years' performance levels. However, it is recognized that performance levels may vary, up or down, based on economic factors that are beyond the state's

control. While states should have ready access to their own historical performance information, various tools and resources are available to examine states' historical performance data, including state by state files of the data (www.doleta.gov/Performance/results/wia_national_performance.cfm); the Federal Research and Evaluation Database (www.fred-info.org); VETS' performance data (<http://www.dol.gov/vets/vetoutcomes/index.htm>) and Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data for employment, industries, counties, average earnings, etc. (www.bls.gov/cew/home.htm). When using BLS data as a guide, states should carefully consider the timeframes covered by BLS employment and wage information, and the relative time periods in which WIA and Wagner-Peyser exiters enter employment and obtain post-program earnings.

II. Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) goals. Throughout the performance negotiation process, states should be aware of the preliminary GPRA goals the Department established through PY 2010. These goals may or may not be revised upon completion of a study currently under way to determine the effects of the business cycle on program performance. If the GPRA goals are to change, they will be revised in time for the FY 2010 Congressional Budget Justification, at which time they will also be shared with the regional offices. The regional offices will use the GPRA goals as one of several benchmarks by which to gauge their states' proposed performance levels in the context of these national system goals. The GPRA is an important mechanism by which Congress, and the Office of Management and Budget evaluate the success of Federal programs, including those operated by states and localities. The preliminary GPRA performance goals for the Department's WIA Adult and Dislocated Workers, and Wagner-Peyser programs are listed in **Attachment II**; more information is available at: <http://www.doleta.gov/Performance/goals/gpra.cfm>.

III. National Distribution of WIA and Wagner-Peyser Performance Outcomes. ETA has utilized states' previously submitted annual performance data to provide information on the national averages and distribution of performance outcomes. These benchmarks serve as estimates that states and regions can refer to when setting goals to achieve continuous improvement. **Attachment III** presents WIA and Wagner-Peyser outcomes for the past seven program years (table 1) and the national distribution of performance outcomes for the past three program years (table 2).

IV. Average Six Months Earnings for WIA Adult and WIA Dislocated Worker Programs. **Attachment IV** presents this information by state for the past six Program Years using state WIA Annual Report data.

V. Estimates of Six Months Average Earnings by State Using BLS-Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) Program Data. The QCEW is a cooperative program involving the BLS and the State Workforce Agencies that produces a comprehensive tabulation of employment and wage information for workers

covered by state Unemployment Insurance (UI) laws and federal workers covered by the Unemployment Compensation system. The QCEW contains data on the number of establishments, monthly employment, and quarterly wages, by North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) industry, by county and by ownership sector for the entire United States. At the state and local levels, the QCEW program publishes employment and wage data down to the 6-digit NAICS industry level. The QCEW data can serve as a resource to assist states in placing the results achieved under the average earnings measure for the WIA programs and Wagner-Peyser funded activities within the context of the average earnings for the overall workforce. **Attachment V** presents an estimate of this information by state for the past five years and **Attachment VI** provides additional information on the methodologies used to develop these estimates and details on the data's coverage and limitations. As noted earlier, states should carefully consider the timeframes covered by BLS wage information, and the relative time periods in which WIA and Wagner-Peyser exiters enter employment and obtain post-program earnings.

VI. Estimates of the effects of economic and demographic variables and other factors. WIA section 136(b)(3)(A)(iv) (see http://www.doleta.gov/performance/guidance/laws_regs.cfm) addresses additional factors, such as differences in economic conditions, characteristics of participants, and services to be provided, that should be considered in the negotiation process. Consider the following additional detail on these and other factors:

- **Attachment VII** provides estimates of how various economic and demographic variables may impact outcomes. Please note that these estimates are based on national-level data, and do not necessarily reflect the economic conditions and client base unique to a state. Therefore, these estimates are not hard and fast reasons for adjusting performance goals up or down. Instead, they are provided as an example of how a state might analyze its own data in order to propose goals that take into account the characteristics of individuals served and economic conditions in the state. In applying these variables, it is also important to recognize that the different performance measures may not be affected by the same variable in the same way because of the lag associated with the calculation of some of the performance measures. For example, a given state's economy could project no job growth for 2009, which could have a strong effect on the negotiated entered employment rate for PY 2009, but a lesser effect on the employment retention and six month average earnings measures for PY 2009, because the individuals included in those measures for PY 2009 reporting purposes would have been employed prior to the start of calendar year 2009 for the most part. **Attachment VIII** contains a description of the time periods during which individuals will have to have exited program services to be included in the different performance measures. This

attachment will assist states in their analysis of the impact of a given variable on the different measures against which the state will be negotiating levels for PY 2009 (and including in their WIA Annual Report submissions for PY 2009).

- o States that have Workforce Innovation in Regional Economic Development (WIRED) regions should consider how the additional investment and reshaping of talent development strategies within those regions impact overall performance, particularly individuals served. To the extent possible, negotiations should reflect projected impacts of the WIRED strategies.

C. Process for Reaching Agreement on State Performance Levels

The process for reaching agreement on state performance levels includes the following steps, as outlined in the attached timeline (**Attachment I**):

- I. After conducting their own analysis of factors that may affect performance, as discussed above (in Part A of this section), states will propose levels of performance for each of the applicable performance measures for PY 2009 by submitting these proposed levels to the Regional Administrator serving the state. Proposed performance levels should be stated to a tenth of a percent (XX.X%) and must be submitted to the appropriate Regional Administrator no later than April 15, 2009; however, regional offices will work with states to begin the negotiation process prior to that date and in parallel with the planning process in order to ensure that final levels are agreed upon by June 30, 2009.

When submitting the proposed levels, states should provide the following as support for the levels (see Part II, Section X, Subpart C, Item 1 of the Stand-Alone Planning Guidance or State Planning Guidance, or Part III, Section K, Item 1(a)(i) of the Unified Planning Guidance):

- The methodology used for developing proposed levels of performance, including a description of data sources, calculations, and additional environmental factors (such as those previously addressed in TEGL 9-07, and discussed in Section 5 of this guidance.)
- How the target levels will promote continuous improvement in state performance.

When submitting the proposed levels for review, states should also include a discussion of how the proposed levels will positively impact customer satisfaction with services received and the extent to which the proposed levels ensure optimal return on investment of Federal funds. (See WIA section 136(b)(3)(A)(iii) and (iv).)

- II. The regional offices will review the analyses used by the state to develop the proposed performance levels and will work with the state to set mutually agreed-upon levels of performance. Regional offices will take into account the environmental factors addressed by the state, including current and future economic conditions. The regional offices will consider the proposed levels in light of previously negotiated goals, past performance results, and the national GPRA goals, as prescribed by the FY 2010 Congressional Budget Justification. Additionally, regional offices will consider the quality of the data presented by the state, including its relevance, source, the time period from which it is drawn, and whether the data is part of a trend or is anomalous. The negotiation process will focus on whether each performance level appears appropriate in light of statutory criteria and this guidance, and the adequacy of any information the state offers to substantiate each level. If regional offices determine through their analysis that a state could increase its proposed performance levels to more fully support continuous improvement and customer satisfaction strategies, they will negotiate with the state to obtain higher mutually agreed-upon performance levels.
- III. Once the performance levels are agreed upon, the Regional Administrator will send a letter to the state confirming the agreed-upon levels this letter constitutes a modification, incorporating these performance goals into the State Strategic Plan.

8. Inclusion of Performance Goals in State Plans. States are required to submit the *proposed* levels of performance by April 15, 2009. States can submit the proposed performance levels either with the modification request that revises the current State Plan, or with the letter requesting a one-year extension of the current State Plan, or separately to the Regional Administrator. States should note that the proposed levels of performance are subject to the same public review and comment requirements that apply to State Plans and Plan modifications. When the state submits the proposed levels to ETA, the state should confirm that it has made the proposed levels available to the public for review and comment.

States that have completed negotiations with ETA by April 15, 2009, can include their agreed-upon levels of performance for PY 2009 in the modification to the current State Plan, or with the letter requesting a one-year extension of the current State Plan.

In cases where final agreement on performance goals has not been reached until after the State Plan has been approved, the Regional Administrator's letter advising the states of the agreed-upon goals will constitute a modification to the State Plan. For subsequent revisions to performance goals during the life of the State Plan, the Regional Administrator's letter advising the state of the agreed upon goals will also constitute a modification to the State Plan. The state must ensure that the agreed-upon goals are included in the state's official copy of the State Plan, and that any published State Plan, on the state's Web site or through other forums, includes the agreed-upon goals. ETA

will incorporate these performance goals into the Regional and National Office copies of the State Plan.

9. Action Required. States are requested to distribute this information to the appropriate state and local staff.

10. Inquiries. Questions concerning this guidance may be directed to the appropriate regional office.

11. Attachments.

- Attachment I: Recommended Timeline for the Negotiation Process
- Attachment II: GPRA Performance Goals for the Department of Labor
- Attachment III: National Distribution of WIA and Wagner-Peyser Performance Outcomes
 - Table 1: National Averages of Performance Measure Outcomes, PY 2001 to PY 2007
 - Table 2: National Distribution of Performance Outcomes, PY 2005 to PY 2007
- Attachment IV: Average Six Months Earnings for WIA Adult and WIA Dislocated Worker Programs
- Attachment V: Estimates of Six Months Average Earnings by State Using BLS-QCEW Program Data
- Attachment VI: Additional Notes on BLS-QCEW Program Data
- Attachment VII: Economic and Demographic Variables
- Attachment VIII: Time Periods for Reporting Performance Information in the WIA Annual Report for PY 2008 - PY 2010

ATTACHMENT I

Recommended Timeline for the Negotiation Process

DATE	ACTION
March 2009	ETA regional offices provide technical assistance on negotiating performance goals.
No later than April 15, 2009	States submit proposed performance levels either with the modification request that revises the current State Plan, or with the letter requesting a one-year extension of the current State Plan, or separately to the Regional Administrator.
April 16, 2009 - June 26, 2009	Regional offices review states' proposed performance levels and work with states to arrive at mutually agreed-upon levels.
June 2009	Negotiations continue if necessary.
June 30, 2009	ETA advises states of agreed upon-levels within the letter approving the modification, within the letter approving states' request for an extension of their current State Plan, or in a separate letter from the Regional Administrator. ETA incorporates final performance levels into Regional and National Office copies of the State Plan and the state includes the agreed upon performance levels in its official copy of the State Plan.

ATTACHMENT II

GPRA Performance Goals for the Department of Labor ¹

PERFORMANCE GOAL	PY 2005 GOAL	PY 2006 GOAL	PY 2007 GOAL	PY 2008 GOAL	PY 2009 GOAL	PY 2010 GOAL
WIA Adult Entered Employment Rate	76%	76%	70%	70%	70%	70%
WIA Adult Employment Retention Rate	81%	82%	84%	84%	84%	84%
WIA Adult Average Earnings	NA	\$11,000	\$13,575	\$13,575	\$13,575	\$13,575
WIA Dislocated Worker Entered Employment Rate	83%	78%	73%	73%	73%	73%
WIA Dislocated Worker Employment Retention Rate	89%	88%	87%	87%	87%	87%
WIA Dislocated Worker Wage Replacement Rate/ Average Earnings (PY 2006, PY 2007, PY 2008, PY 2009, PY 2010)	92%	\$14,265	\$15,188	\$15,188	\$15,188	\$15,188
Wagner-Peyser Entered Employment Rate	61%	60%	64%	64%	64%	64%
Wagner-Peyser Employment Retention Rate	78%	77%	81%	81%	81%	81%
Wagner-Peyser Average Earnings	Baseline	\$11,749	\$12,763	\$12,763	\$12,763	\$12,763

¹ PY 2008 – 2010 targets as of December 3, 2008

ATTACHMENT III

National Distribution of WIA and Wagner-Peyser Performance Outcomes, PY 2001 - PY 2007

Table 1: National Averages of Performance Measure Outcomes

Performance Measures	PY 2001	PY 2002	PY 2003	PY 2004	PY 2005 ¹	PY 2006	PY 2007
	WIA Adults						
Entered Employment Rate	75.7%	75.1%	74.3%	77.1%	77.0%	70.2%	69.6%
Employment Retention Rate	80.8%	82.7%	84.5%	86.2%	82.5%	82.4%	83.8%
Average Earnings ³	\$9,950	\$9,396	\$10,348	\$10,773	\$11,208	\$11,870	\$13,575
Employment and Credential Rate	57.8%	61.5%	61.8%	65.6%	67.8%	67.6%	71.9%
	WIA Dislocated Worker						
Entered Employment Rate	81.6%	83.3%	81.3%	83.7%	83.2%	78.0%	72.5%
Employment Retention Rate	87.6%	89.2%	90.2%	91.1%	88.1%	88.0%	87.2%
Average Earnings ³	\$13,431	\$12,998	\$13,803	\$14,003	\$14,150	\$14,265	\$15,188
Employment and Credential Rate ²	61.8%	65.4%	64.6%	69.5%	71.3%	70.8%	73.2%
	WIA Older Youth ²						
Entered Employment Rate	67.0%	69.5%	70.6%	73.6%	76.3%	76.4%	77.5%
Employment Retention Rate	78.0%	79.5%	81.2%	82.7%	82.6%	82.6%	85.2%
Average Earnings ³	\$3,081	\$2,938	\$3,167	\$3,547	\$3,769	\$3,765	\$3,980
Credential Rate ²	39.9%	46.2%	47.7%	52.0%	53.0%	54.1%	53.6%
	WIA Younger Youth ²						
Diploma Attainment Rate	53.6%	63.1%	62.6%	65.8%	63.5%	68.5%	74.1%
Employment Retention Rate	54.2%	59.5%	61.0%	64.8%	63.7%	70.1%	74.1%
Skill Attainment Rate	82.9%	80.2%	83.0%	84.4%	81.5%	83.2%	86.1%
	WIA Youth ¹						
Placement in Employment or Education Rate	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	60.3%	62.3%
Attainment of Degree or Certificate	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	43.5%	56.8%
Literacy and Numeracy Gains	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	30.4%
	Wagner-Peyser						
Entered Employment Rate	NA	63.0%	61.0%	64.0%	63.0%	60.3%	63.0%
Employment Retention Rate	NA	80.0%	80.0%	81.0%	80.0%	77.9%	81.0%
Average Earnings ⁵	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	\$11,747	\$12,763

Source: WIA State Annual and Wagner-Peyser State Quarterly Reports

Estimates of these outcomes were developed from state Workforce Investment Act Standardized Record Data (WIASRD) file submissions using common measures definitions.

Notes:

¹In PY 2005, these programs began reporting common measure, which standardized the definitions of performance indicators across these programs. This change in methodology had some impact on performance levels beginning in PY 2005; hence these data are not directly comparable to results of prior years.

²Ten states had a waiver to report on common measures only and did not report on the WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker credential rates or older/younger youth measures in PY 2006. 25 states had such a waiver in PY 2007.

³ Average earnings figures for WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker programs for PY2001-2005 are approximations based on Workforce Investment Act Standardized Record Data. Earnings were measured as an earnings change for the WIA Adult program in PY 2001 -2005. This Adult measure changed to average earnings beginning in PY 2006. For the WIA Dislocated Worker program, earnings were measured as a wage replacement rate in PY 2001- 2004. In PY 2005, this measure changed to earnings changed for WIA Dislocated Worker program and further changed to average earnings beginning in PY 2006.

⁴States began reporting against the three Youth Common Performance Measures in PY 2006.

⁵ Prior to PY 2006, average earnings were not tracked for the Wagner-Peyser program.

Table 2: National Distribution of Performance Outcomes

	Top 10% of States			Top 25% of States			Top 50% of States			Bottom 25% of States			Bottom 10% of States			
	PY 05	PY 06	PY 07	PY 05	PY 06	PY 07	PY 05	PY 06	PY 07	PY 05	PY 06	PY 07	PY 05	PY 06	PY 07	Avg.
WIA Adults																
Entered Employment Rate	89%	91%	88%	87%	88%	87%	87%	88%	85%	85%	85%	85%	69%	71%	69%	66%
Employment Retention Rate ¹	90%	91%	93%	88%	89%	91%	89%	89%	86%	87%	89%	87%	76%	80%	78%	75%
Average Earnings	\$13,426	\$14,649	\$16,199	\$14,758	\$12,390	\$13,376	\$14,604	\$13,457	\$11,534	\$12,502	\$13,468	\$12,501	\$9,113	\$9,086	\$9,298	\$8,400
Employment and Credential Rate	83%	81%	81%	82%	78%	76%	76%	77%	75%	71%	76%	74%	57%	59%	58%	55%
WIA Dislocated Workers																
Entered Employment Rate	93%	93%	93%	91%	91%	92%	92%	91%	89%	89%	90%	89%	76%	71%	74%	63%
Employment Retention Rate ¹	94%	95%	98%	96%	94%	96%	96%	94%	92%	93%	94%	93%	81%	84%	85%	82%
Average Earnings	\$17,283	\$17,778	\$17,975	\$17,678	\$16,499	\$16,792	\$17,220	\$16,837	\$15,409	\$15,708	\$16,225	\$15,781	\$11,656	\$11,902	\$12,422	\$10,911
Employment and Credential Rate	86%	83%	84%	84%	81%	79%	83%	81%	78%	76%	79%	77%	60%	57%	53%	50%
Wagner-Peyser																
Entered Employment Rate	79%	75%	76%	77%	74%	73%	73%	73%	71%	69%	71%	70%	57%	50%	54%	44%
Employment Retention Rate	88%	84%	86%	86%	83%	83%	85%	85%	85%	82%	83%	83%	76%	68%	77%	63%
WIA Older Youth																
Entered Employment Rate	92%	87%	89%	86%	83%	87%	83%	85%	82%	81%	83%	82%	64%	71%	70%	64%
Employment Retention Rate	90%	93%	97%	93%	89%	89%	93%	90%	87%	88%	89%	88%	74%	81%	80%	75%
Credential Rate	78%	67%	65%	70%	69%	62%	64%	65%	64%	61%	61%	62%	40%	50%	38%	42%
WIA Younger Youth																
Skill Attainment Rate	97%	93%	94%	93%	93%	90%	93%	92%	89%	87%	91%	89%	73%	70%	73%	69%
Diploma Attainment Rate	90%	84%	88%	87%	82%	80%	85%	83%	76%	75%	80%	77%	49%	45%	54%	34%
Retention Rate	86%	86%	89%	87%	80%	81%	84%	82%	76%	77%	79%	77%	59%	52%	60%	53%
Customer Satisfaction																
Participants	90	91	92	88	88	89	88	85	85	85	86	85	73	68	75	70
Employers	89	88	88	86	85	86	86	81	81	81	82	82	65	63	68	64
													56	54	54	65
													69	59	74	67
													56	54	65	58

Source: WIA State Annual Reports and Wagner-Peyser State Quarterly Report

¹ Common Measures performance estimates derived from Workforce Investment Act Standardized Record Data (WIASRD)

ATTACHMENT IV

Average Six Months Earnings for WIA Adult and WIA Dislocated Worker Programs¹

State	WIA Adult Program						WIA Dislocated Worker Program					
	PY 2002 ²	PY 2003 ²	PY 2004 ²	PY 2005 ²	PY 2006	PY 2007	PY 2002 ²	PY 2003 ²	PY 2004 ²	PY 2005 ²	PY 2006	PY 2007
Nation	\$9,396	\$10,348	\$10,773	\$11,208	\$11,869	\$13,575	\$12,998	\$13,803	\$14,003	\$14,150	\$14,265	\$15,188
AK	\$10,539	\$13,506	\$12,606	\$13,008	\$13,595	\$14,689	\$14,675	\$18,606	\$16,271	\$15,907	\$19,079	\$19,972
AL	\$8,859	\$11,506	\$13,094	\$8,974	\$9,859	\$11,092	\$10,677	\$11,642	\$12,653	\$12,861	\$13,471	\$14,805
AR	\$9,077	\$10,005	\$12,634	\$11,861	\$12,428	\$12,898	\$10,311	\$11,172	\$12,518	\$12,228	\$13,090	\$14,428
AZ	\$9,434	\$9,439	\$9,409	\$10,330	\$12,117	\$12,263	\$12,977	\$13,206	\$13,533	\$14,792	\$15,598	\$15,010
CA	\$10,397	\$10,483	\$11,680	\$12,396	\$15,732	\$16,640	\$14,945	\$15,030	\$15,311	\$15,726	\$16,321	\$16,978
CO	\$9,172	\$11,037	\$10,512	\$11,274	\$11,587	\$14,286	\$13,410	\$15,269	\$16,040	\$15,980	\$15,282	\$15,717
CT	\$10,243	\$9,517	\$9,818	\$11,004	\$12,298	\$11,463	\$15,775	\$14,159	\$16,193	\$16,336	\$16,726	\$16,945
DC	\$8,478	\$8,971	\$8,924	\$10,220	\$10,830	\$12,633	\$14,209	\$13,816	\$15,059	\$14,027	\$13,697	\$15,570
DE	\$8,586	\$9,518	\$9,272	\$10,075	\$10,612	\$9,915	\$12,374	\$12,058	\$12,987	\$12,979	\$12,906	\$13,369
FL	\$9,690	\$11,367	\$12,118	\$15,108	\$16,439	\$19,531	\$12,799	\$13,720	\$14,140	\$14,480	\$15,844	\$16,887
GA	\$8,716	\$9,102	\$10,284	\$10,644	\$10,573	\$12,046	\$11,151	\$13,024	\$13,940	\$14,244	\$13,897	\$14,682
HI	\$8,987	\$9,137	\$10,087	\$10,186	\$10,951	\$12,451	\$12,435	\$12,434	\$12,941	\$12,868	\$14,640	\$15,072
IA	\$9,049	\$9,344	\$9,511	\$9,598	\$10,319	\$10,233	\$11,296	\$11,791	\$12,230	\$11,880	\$12,401	\$12,856
ID	\$9,229	\$8,921	\$9,413	\$10,391	\$10,232	\$11,796	\$12,940	\$12,417	\$13,266	\$13,094	\$13,364	\$14,164
IL	\$9,585	\$9,985	\$10,198	\$10,759	\$11,288	\$11,802	\$13,676	\$15,034	\$15,333	\$15,413	\$15,828	\$16,358
IN	\$9,348	\$10,159	\$10,149	\$10,370	\$10,461	\$11,893	\$12,839	\$14,980	\$14,189	\$14,577	\$13,652	\$14,753
KS	\$8,950	\$10,105	\$11,281	\$11,419	\$13,451	\$12,960	\$12,294	\$14,804	\$15,539	\$15,621	\$15,417	\$15,170
KY	\$9,381	\$9,612	\$10,081	\$10,634	\$12,179	\$15,928	\$12,066	\$11,668	\$11,950	\$13,296	\$13,436	\$13,338
LA	\$8,764	\$9,277	\$10,063	\$10,194	\$12,082	\$12,537	\$11,083	\$11,227	\$11,544	\$12,179	\$13,459	\$14,554
MA	\$9,515	\$9,849	\$10,018	\$10,581	\$10,426	\$10,666	\$13,972	\$14,756	\$16,643	\$18,615	\$17,486	\$17,513
MD	\$10,501	\$11,431	\$12,240	\$12,740	\$12,096	\$12,245	\$14,307	\$15,902	\$17,269	\$15,919	\$15,574	\$15,713
ME	\$8,959	\$9,220	\$9,312	\$9,247	\$9,701	\$9,989	\$10,932	\$10,760	\$12,919	\$11,164	\$12,285	\$11,916
MI	\$9,096	\$9,617	\$9,388	\$9,651	\$10,316	\$10,099	\$12,598	\$12,674	\$12,336	\$12,914	\$12,797	\$13,768
MN	\$9,319	\$10,035	\$10,539	\$10,661	\$11,203	\$12,466	\$15,434	\$16,498	\$16,300	\$16,143	\$17,003	\$17,528
MO	\$8,101	\$8,589	\$8,658	\$9,178	\$9,414	\$10,466	\$12,651	\$13,165	\$12,590	\$13,257	\$12,830	\$14,460
MS	\$8,313	\$8,333	\$8,450	\$8,871	\$9,334	\$9,818	\$9,346	\$9,659	\$9,663	\$10,169	\$10,597	\$11,148
MT	\$8,468	\$7,936	\$9,697	\$9,758	\$11,398	\$13,825	\$13,127	\$13,014	\$13,888	\$13,964	\$13,582	\$17,107
NC	\$9,133	\$9,110	\$9,669	\$9,893	\$10,259	\$11,634	\$11,229	\$11,858	\$12,217	\$13,714	\$13,487	\$13,683
ND	\$7,801	\$7,809	\$8,332	\$9,447	\$9,235	\$10,499	\$11,328	\$10,832	\$11,164	\$12,338	\$12,388	\$12,042
NE	\$7,887	\$9,387	\$9,505	\$9,839	\$9,924	\$10,582	\$12,647	\$12,676	\$13,342	\$12,919	\$14,194	\$14,301
NH	\$9,485	\$11,009	\$10,544	\$9,947	\$9,104	\$9,211	\$13,389	\$17,111	\$15,121	\$17,111	\$13,159	\$15,903
NJ	\$9,928	\$10,533	\$11,209	\$11,945	\$11,885	\$12,177	\$13,821	\$14,189	\$15,815	\$16,272	\$15,706	\$16,698
NM	\$8,946	\$9,234	\$10,158	\$11,007	\$10,658	\$11,877	\$11,223	\$11,800	\$13,315	\$12,739	\$14,248	\$13,914
NV	\$9,536	\$8,537	\$10,437	\$9,767	\$11,025	\$11,934	\$13,575	\$15,004	\$14,723	\$13,727	\$14,199	\$15,839
NY	\$10,134	\$10,969	\$11,639	\$12,164	\$10,841	\$15,368	\$14,815	\$15,182	\$15,138	\$14,716	\$14,158	\$17,457
OH	\$13,409	\$14,218	\$14,221	\$14,718	\$14,860	\$15,040	\$15,618	\$17,021	\$17,093	\$17,057	\$16,744	\$17,451
OK	\$9,311	\$9,422	\$10,206	\$10,452	\$11,701	\$11,376	\$11,871	\$12,020	\$12,842	\$13,118	\$12,767	\$13,569
OR	\$8,354	\$9,323	\$9,938	\$9,990	\$10,053	\$10,704	\$11,719	\$12,425	\$12,812	\$12,919	\$13,352	\$13,960
PA	\$8,844	\$9,762	\$10,184	\$11,540	\$12,177	\$12,469	\$12,975	\$13,741	\$14,581	\$15,460	\$15,142	\$14,901
PR	\$4,629	\$5,835	\$7,149	\$7,158	\$5,753	\$6,898	\$4,925	\$5,638	\$5,847	\$6,959	\$6,129	\$7,740
RI	\$9,757	\$10,608	\$10,653	\$10,378	\$11,213	\$12,507	\$13,161	\$13,099	\$13,324	\$14,691	\$13,273	\$13,986
SC	\$8,429	\$8,774	\$9,071	\$9,240	\$9,268	\$9,416	\$10,425	\$11,107	\$11,283	\$12,252	\$11,749	\$12,172
SD	\$7,402	\$8,277	\$8,954	\$9,978	\$10,277	\$10,745	\$10,328	\$11,333	\$11,348	\$12,388	\$12,317	\$13,193
TN	\$9,814	\$17,178	\$14,595	\$11,860	\$12,692	\$13,137	\$12,118	\$20,922	\$16,898	\$12,586	\$12,970	\$13,272
TX	\$9,255	\$10,257	\$10,591	\$11,248	\$11,658	\$12,243	\$12,533	\$13,407	\$12,859	\$13,598	\$13,893	\$14,319
UT	\$9,540	\$9,271	\$9,031	\$9,029	\$12,094	\$12,108	\$13,674	\$13,250	\$13,794	\$15,022	\$15,611	\$14,457
VA	\$7,804	\$9,812	\$9,253	\$9,031	\$9,168	\$9,924	\$12,371	\$13,665	\$13,147	\$12,651	\$12,593	\$13,368
VT	\$9,822	\$9,730	\$10,427	\$10,611	\$12,107	\$12,647	\$13,440	\$14,285	\$14,947	\$13,174	\$14,969	\$15,502
WA	\$9,710	\$10,387	\$10,394	\$11,100	\$11,928	\$12,159	\$14,477	\$15,383	\$16,022	\$17,295	\$18,566	\$17,928
WI	\$7,965	\$7,918	\$9,073	\$9,441	\$9,432	\$9,581	\$13,116	\$13,547	\$13,829	\$13,836	\$13,846	\$14,513
WV	\$9,447	\$7,549	\$9,378	\$9,610	\$10,509	\$11,246	\$13,060	\$10,641	\$14,979	\$12,770	\$13,318	\$15,392
WY	\$8,173	\$9,775	\$10,724	\$10,215	\$13,817	\$12,907	\$12,199	\$11,121	\$14,140	\$11,996	\$14,492	\$14,589

Source: Estimates using Workforce Investment Act Standardized Record Data (WIASRD) PY 2002 - PY 2007

¹These estimates do not include NEG-only participants. However, they incorporate those who receive both WIA Title 1B and NEG assistance.

² Average earnings figures from PY 2002 - 2005 are approximations based on Workforce Investment Act Standardized Record Data. Earnings were measured as an earnings change for the WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker programs from PY 2002-2005 before changing to average earnings in PY 2006.

ATTACHMENT V

Estimates of Six Months Average Earnings by State Using BLS-QCEW Program Data

	CY 2003		CY 2004		CY 2005		CY 2006		CY 2007	
	Annual Avg. Employment	Estimated ¹ 6-Month Avg. Earnings	Annual Avg. Employment	Estimated ¹ 6-Month Avg. Earnings	Annual Avg. Employment	Estimated ¹ 6-Month Avg. Earnings	Annual Avg. Employment	Estimated ¹ 6-Month Avg. Earnings	Annual Avg. Employment	Estimated ¹ 6-Month Avg. Earnings
US ²	107,792,549	\$18,754	109,233,923	\$19,567	111,361,684	\$20,253	134,870,635	\$19,748	135,704,350	\$20,613
AK	215,626	\$18,252	220,849	\$18,853	226,441	\$19,409	307,637	\$20,875	310,810	\$21,986
AL	1,483,039	\$15,784	1,509,246	\$16,408	1,548,068	\$17,004	1,928,281	\$18,102	1,952,091	\$18,746
AZ	930,765	\$14,247	942,044	\$14,901	957,385	\$15,389	1,167,925	\$16,195	1,173,852	\$17,059
AR	1,902,998	\$17,301	1,980,818	\$18,104	2,107,545	\$18,853	2,614,344	\$20,010	2,687,691	\$20,776
CA	12,447,085	\$20,932	12,609,942	\$22,022	12,877,981	\$22,842	15,503,144	\$24,173	15,640,575	\$25,269
CO	1,776,722	\$19,445	1,800,646	\$20,103	1,843,544	\$20,796	2,242,012	\$21,753	2,292,630	\$22,698
CT	1,390,345	\$24,487	1,398,093	\$25,815	1,409,194	\$26,839	1,672,109	\$27,407	1,686,043	\$29,015
DC	421,101	\$28,038	429,176	\$29,589	435,674	\$30,799	671,143	\$35,075	n/a	\$36,725
DE	347,500	\$20,442	356,173	\$21,171	361,184	\$22,206	422,187	\$23,142	423,412	\$23,654
FL	6,213,122	\$16,487	6,423,693	\$17,219	6,694,864	\$18,048	7,952,023	\$19,242	7,945,162	\$19,873
GA	3,156,763	\$18,432	3,206,888	\$19,123	3,288,867	\$19,757	4,024,699	\$20,185	4,077,184	\$21,089
HI	454,089	\$15,987	468,748	\$16,792	487,265	\$17,282	618,178	\$18,899	625,862	\$19,733
IA	1,177,501	\$15,110	1,195,269	\$15,838	1,218,487	\$16,326	1,470,742	\$17,160	1,485,627	\$17,869
ID	468,484	\$14,136	482,745	\$14,713	505,098	\$15,220	643,671	\$16,290	660,683	\$16,772
IL	4,887,063	\$20,287	4,895,801	\$21,159	4,942,881	\$21,926	5,821,022	\$22,825	5,869,157	\$23,843
IN	2,427,271	\$16,697	2,451,737	\$17,364	2,476,047	\$17,732	2,892,419	\$18,277	2,905,725	\$18,764
KS	1,048,871	\$15,897	1,058,858	\$16,506	1,067,241	\$17,132	1,327,677	\$17,848	1,356,966	\$18,522
KY	1,423,208	\$15,829	1,439,029	\$16,462	1,464,009	\$16,868	1,779,202	\$17,600	1,801,907	\$18,240
LA	1,493,180	\$15,307	1,500,416	\$15,861	1,483,085	\$16,759	1,807,563	\$18,302	1,868,986	\$19,115
MA	2,739,212	\$23,285	2,739,861	\$24,614	2,758,287	\$25,213	3,194,914	\$26,217	3,234,357	\$27,622
MD	1,983,840	\$19,578	2,014,285	\$20,506	2,048,789	\$21,390	2,530,011	\$23,081	2,547,351	\$24,121
ME	492,329	\$15,115	492,329	\$15,697	495,573	\$16,052	598,525	\$16,897	602,321	\$17,565
MI	3,679,892	\$19,742	3,665,091	\$20,202	3,664,372	\$20,562	4,235,650	\$21,079	4,179,122	\$21,679
MN	2,206,420	\$19,347	2,230,302	\$20,290	2,266,499	\$20,483	2,670,222	\$21,093	2,687,482	\$22,188
MO	2,200,623	\$16,972	2,213,813	\$17,512	2,247,382	\$18,102	2,699,860	\$18,571	2,719,380	\$19,302
MS	864,109	\$13,569	871,265	\$14,016	877,853	\$14,600	1,122,474	\$15,597	1,135,336	\$16,146
MT	314,240	\$12,830	323,727	\$13,305	334,143	\$13,968	426,182	\$15,298	436,656	\$16,112
NC	3,093,372	\$16,657	3,141,074	\$17,317	3,208,940	\$17,882	3,965,478	\$18,719	4,052,955	\$19,455
ND	251,672	\$13,599	258,025	\$14,303	264,609	\$14,789	335,718	\$15,658	341,705	\$16,543
NE	724,281	\$14,962	730,413	\$15,527	739,567	\$16,002	902,383	\$16,907	916,580	\$17,619
NH	520,458	\$18,843	529,498	\$19,771	536,157	\$20,512	627,371	\$21,224	630,204	\$21,932
NJ	3,262,121	\$22,990	3,274,157	\$23,817	3,308,847	\$24,560	3,951,210	\$25,822	3,961,341	\$26,927
NM	570,868	\$14,470	582,169	\$15,045	597,145	\$15,672	807,063	\$17,284	821,484	\$18,190
NV	949,334	\$17,160	1,010,267	\$18,055	1,075,087	\$18,941	1,271,634	\$20,035	1,284,502	\$21,075
NY	6,803,570	\$23,951	6,854,296	\$25,397	6,928,662	\$26,489	8,429,519	\$27,739	8,554,012	\$29,720
OH	4,524,065	\$17,303	4,533,380	\$17,964	4,555,293	\$18,415	5,314,572	\$19,284	5,306,812	\$17,746
OK	1,120,680	\$14,632	1,130,802	\$15,225	1,158,861	\$15,779	1,507,196	\$17,011	1,534,802	\$19,989
OR	1,314,854	\$16,909	1,344,751	\$17,513	1,386,917	\$18,115	1,699,932	\$19,039	1,727,886	\$19,785
PA	4,753,844	\$18,241	4,781,005	\$19,033	4,837,168	\$19,632	5,607,139	\$20,675	5,652,547	\$21,620
PR	726,994	\$10,159	743,857	\$10,435	750,665	\$10,762	1,036,802	\$11,854	1,016,362	\$12,371
RI	407,764	\$17,432	412,149	\$17,984	414,842	\$18,533	480,570	\$20,227	480,132	\$20,823
SC	1,454,329	\$15,121	1,476,668	\$15,654	1,500,676	\$16,210	1,855,842	\$17,141	1,891,255	\$17,697
SD	295,714	\$13,376	300,583	\$13,896	306,681	\$14,328	383,876	\$15,146	392,060	\$15,828
TN	2,204,879	\$16,748	2,246,911	\$17,429	2,286,964	\$17,930	2,728,694	\$18,782	2,745,099	\$19,541
TX	7,587,587	\$18,721	7,695,635	\$19,550	7,926,772	\$20,440	9,922,313	\$21,229	10,231,906	\$22,348
UT	857,043	\$15,261	884,984	\$15,795	925,300	\$16,414	1,170,587	\$17,565	1,219,207	\$18,527
VA	2,788,213	\$19,071	2,859,017	\$20,058	2,931,169	\$20,969	3,636,417	\$22,025	3,672,958	\$22,998
VT	244,595	\$15,786	248,057	\$16,361	249,757	\$16,824	303,205	\$17,771	303,448	\$18,478
WA	2,157,934	\$19,337	2,196,183	\$19,409	2,264,776	\$20,113	2,850,073	\$21,449	2,925,908	\$22,511
WI	2,307,228	\$16,499	2,335,623	\$17,194	2,365,071	\$17,558	2,767,141	\$18,411	2,780,924	\$19,025
WV	542,349	\$14,179	550,559	\$14,788	558,749	\$15,272	705,169	\$16,364	706,172	\$17,053
WY	183,403	\$14,574	187,822	\$15,329	195,241	\$16,310	266,894	\$18,331	277,721	\$19,627

Data Source: BLS Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages, Annual Averages, 2003-2005. <http://www.bls.gov/cew>.

¹ Average Annual Wages, which are used to compute the Estimated 6 Months Average Earnings, are obtained through taking Total Annual Wages and dividing them by the Average Annual Employment

² Aggregated National data incorporates all 50 States as well as territories

ATTACHMENT VI

Additional Notes on BLS – QCEW Program Data

Data Source/Methodology:

ETA utilized annual Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) employment and wage data for private industry by state for calendar years 2003 through 2007, which is readily available on the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) website at <http://www.bls.gov/cew/> under the heading "Publications and Other Documentation." Calendar year data on average earnings for the overall workforce were used as a point of comparison to the actual average earnings achieved by the reporting cohorts included on state Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Annual Report submissions during Program Years (PY) 2002 through 2005, and the state quarterly reports submitted for the WIA and Wagner-Peyser programs for the quarter ending September 30, 2008. For instance, the exit cohorts for the employment retention and earnings measures on the state quarterly reports ending September 30, 2008, covered the periods July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008. With the exception of one quarter for the April-June 2008 cohort, the actual six months earnings quarters (i.e., 2nd and 3rd post-program quarters) for these exit cohorts covered the calendar year 2007 period. Similar coverage based on a calendar year period exists for exit cohorts reported on prior WIA Annual Reports.

To estimate the six months average earnings using the QCEW data, the following methodology was applied:

(TOTAL ANNUAL EARNINGS × 1,000) divided by ANNUAL AVERAGE Employment

The result of this computation was then divided by 2 to get the six months estimate.

All published BLS data are final. State detail may not add to the national totals due to rounding.

Data Coverage/Limitations:

Employment data under the QCEW program represent the number of covered workers who worked during, or received pay for, the pay period including the 12th of the month. Excluded are members of the armed forces, the self-employed, proprietors, domestic workers, unpaid family workers, and railroad workers covered by the railroad unemployment insurance system. Wages represent total compensation paid during the calendar quarter, regardless of when services were performed. Included in wages are pay for vacation and other paid leave, bonuses, stock options, tips, the cash value of meals and lodging, and in some States, contributions to deferred compensation plans (such as 401(k) plans). The QCEW program does provide partial information on agricultural industries and employees in private households.

BLS publishes data from the QCEW program every quarter in the County Employment and Wages press release. This is usually released 6 to 7 months after the end of the quarter. In addition, QCEW publishes the annual bulletin Employment and Wages, Annual Averages about 10 months after the end of the year.

ATTACHMENT VII

Economic and Demographic Variables

Table 1: Relationship between Performance Outcomes and Unemployment Rates and Customer Characteristics

	Effect on Performance of a One Percentage Point Increase in:					
	Unemploy- ment Rate	Percent Female	Percent Age 55 or Older	Percent Not High School Graduate	Percent Low Income	Percent with Disabilities
Adults						
Entered Employment Rate (%)	-0.5	-.011	-.065	-.105	--	-.144
Employment Retention (%)	-1.5	.010	-.006	-.081	-.054	-.072
Average Earnings (\$)	-944	-44	14	-34	-45	-30
Credential rate (%)	-1.9	.035	--	-.158	-.053	-.149
Dislocated Workers						
Entered Employment Rate (%)	-1.3	-.006	-.127	-.045	--	-.112
Employment Retention (%)	-1.3	.011	-.037	-.048	--	-.040
Average Earnings (%)	-1,347	-44	--	-34	--	-22
Credential rate (%)	--	-.020	-.041	-.032	--	-.064
Older Youth						
	Unemploy- ment Rate	Percent Female	Percent Age 19	Percent Not High School Graduate	Percent Basic Skills Deficient	Percent with Disabilities
Entered Employment Rate (%)	--	-.025	-.016	-.128	-.035	-.061
Employment Retention (%)	-1.4	--	--	-.118	-.036	--
Earnings change (\$)	-250	--	--	-39	-9	---
Credential rate (%)	--	--	--	-.096	-.097	--
Younger Youth						
	Unemploy- ment Rate	Percent Female	Percent Age 14 or 15	Percent High School Dropout	Percent Basic Skills Deficient	Percent with Disabilities
Skill attainment rate (%)	3.5	.009	.031	-.082	-.032	.013
Diploma attainment rate (%)	5.8	.055	.029	-.331	-.078	.094
Retention (%)	--	.021	-.026	-.095	-.019	-.032

Youth Common Measures	Unemploy- ment Rate	Percent Female	Percent Age 19 to 21	Percent High School Dropout	Percent Basic Skills Deficient	Percent with Disabilities
	Unemploy- ment Rate	Percent Female	Percent Age 14 to 15	Attending High School	Percent Basic Skills Deficient	Percent with Disabilities
Literacy and Numeracy Gain	2.4	--	-.085	-.083	--	--
Placed in Employment or Education	--	.022	-.167	-.065	-.073	-.052
Attained Degree or Certificate	--	.040	-.182	.073	-.138	.045

Note: Almost all adjustments shown are statistically significant at the 1% level; the remainder are statistically significant at the 5% level.

Table 1: Relationship Between Performance Outcomes and Unemployment Rates and Customer Characteristics

This table shows estimates of how performance outcomes are affected by changes in unemployment rates and selected customer characteristics. The analysis was conducted on PY 2007 WIASRD records. Each number in the table represents the effect on performance of a one percentage point change in the unemployment rate or in the percentage of customers with a specific characteristic. This type of information can be used during negotiations to inform discussions of the impact of changes in the economic environment and customer characteristics on state performance. States are encouraged to conduct similar analyses using their own state data when proposing performance levels.

Performance measures shown in the table were determined as follows:

- Adults and dislocated workers
 - Entered employment uses the common measures definition and reflects the use of supplemental data.
 - Retention uses the common measures definition and reflects the use of supplemental data.
 - Average earnings change uses the common measures definition.
 - Credential uses the TEGL 17-05 definition and uses supplemental data to determine employment.

- Older and Younger Youth
 - All measures based on TEGL 17-05 definitions and use supplemental data where appropriate.

- Youth
 - Common measures are based on the current definitions. Literacy and numeracy based on definition for first year of implementation and includes only youth who began youth services between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2007.

Table 1 provides estimated relationships between unemployment rates and performance outcomes. These relationships were estimated using WIASRD data on outcomes for exiters in the most recent year available for each measure¹ and CY 2006 and CY 2007 state unemployment rates in a simple bivariate regression analysis. CY 2006 was used for entered employment; CY 2007 was used for retention and earnings. The results indicate, for example, that an increase of the national unemployment rate by one percentage point (say from 5% to 6%) decreases the adult entered employment rate by 0.5 percentage points (say from 70.0% to 69.5%). This information may be used in conjunction with the information in Table 2 to determine the expected influence of changes in unemployment rates on entered employment rates.

Table 1 also provides estimated relationships between selected customer characteristics and performance outcomes. These estimates were developed in the same way as the estimates for the unemployment rate, using bivariate regressions based on WIASRD data. These estimates indicate, for example, that if the percentage of older youth with disabilities increases by 10 percentage points, then the entered employment rate is expected to decrease by 0.61 percentage points (10 x -0.061). **It should be noted, that the estimated relationships between performance outcomes and customer characteristics are generally small enough that only very large changes in customer characteristics will have a material impact on outcomes.** However, modest changes in the age categories or education status of youth, especially younger youth, can have a noticeable impact on outcomes.

States should note that the following parameters and definitions were used to create the estimates for customer characteristics:

- The percentage with disabilities includes both disabilities that are a substantial barrier to employment and other disabilities.
- The percentage female, the percentage in an age group, and the percentage with disabilities were based on all WIA exiters (except as noted below for the adult and

¹ Estimates for entered employment, credential attainment, placement in employment and education, and attainment of degree or certificate were based on exiters between October 2006 and September 2007. Estimates for retention and earnings change were based on exiters from April 2006 to March 2007. Estimates for younger youth skill attainment and younger youth diploma attainment were based on exiters between April 2007 and March 2008. Estimates for literacy and numeracy gains were based on youth who started youth services between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2007.

dislocated worker credential and employment rates, the younger youth diploma rate, and the youth common measures).

- The percentage who are low income or not high school graduates were calculated for all younger or older youth and for adults and dislocated workers who received intensive or training services (except as noted below for the adult and dislocated worker credential and employment rates and the younger youth diploma rate).
- When adjusting the adult and dislocated worker credential and employment rates, the customer characteristics were based on those who receive training (e.g., the relationship between the adult employment rate and the percent low-income variable is based on the percentage of low-income individuals receiving training services).
- When adjusting the younger youth diploma rate, the customer characteristics were based on younger youth who were not high school graduates, or the equivalent, at registration.
- When adjusting the youth common measures the characteristics should be based on the subset of youth included in the denominator of each measure.
- For younger youth, “not a high school graduate” includes school dropouts and those attending high school.

The estimated adjustments were designed to make adjustments only for a single characteristic. However, simultaneous adjustments for several characteristics are reasonably accurate.

Table 2: Unemployment Rates for CY 2003 to CY 2007

Actual Unemployment Rates (%)

	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006	CY 2007
Nation	6.0	5.5	5.1	4.6	4.6
Alabama	5.8	5.2	4.0	3.5	3.5
Alaska	8.0	7.4	6.8	6.5	6.2
Arizona	5.6	5.0	4.7	4.1	3.8
Arkansas	6.2	5.6	4.9	5.3	5.4
California	6.7	6.2	5.4	4.9	5.4
Colorado	6.0	5.6	5.0	4.3	3.8
Connecticut	5.5	4.9	4.9	4.4	4.6
Delaware	4.4	4.0	4.2	3.5	3.4
District of Columbia	7.0	7.5	6.5	5.9	5.7
Florida	5.1	4.7	3.8	3.4	4.0
Georgia	4.7	4.8	5.3	4.6	4.4
Hawaii	4.3	3.3	2.8	2.5	2.6
Idaho	5.4	4.7	3.8	3.2	2.7
Illinois	6.7	6.2	5.7	4.6	5.0
Indiana	5.1	5.3	5.4	4.9	4.5
Iowa	4.5	4.7	4.6	3.8	3.8
Kansas	5.4	5.6	5.1	4.3	4.1
Kentucky	6.2	5.5	6.1	5.8	5.5
Louisiana	6.6	5.7	7.1	3.9	3.8
Maine	5.1	4.6	4.8	4.6	4.7
Maryland	4.5	4.3	4.1	3.8	3.6
Massachusetts	5.8	5.2	4.8	4.8	4.5
Michigan	7.3	7.0	6.7	6.9	7.2
Minnesota	5.0	4.6	4.0	4.0	4.6
Mississippi	6.3	6.3	7.9	6.7	6.3
Missouri	5.6	5.8	5.4	4.8	5.0
Montana	4.7	4.3	4.0	3.3	3.1
Nebraska	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.0	3.0
Nevada	5.2	4.6	4.1	4.2	4.8
New Hampshire	4.3	3.9	3.6	3.5	3.6
New Jersey	5.9	4.9	4.4	4.7	4.2
New Mexico	6.4	5.7	5.3	4.3	3.5
New York	6.3	5.8	5.0	4.6	4.5
North Carolina	6.5	5.5	5.2	4.7	4.7
North Dakota	4.0	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.2
Ohio	6.1	6.2	5.5	5.4	5.6

Actual Unemployment Rates (%)

	CY 2003	CY 2004	CY 2005	CY 2006	CY 2007
Oklahoma	5.7	4.9	4.0	4.1	4.3
Oregon	8.2	7.3	5.4	5.4	5.2
Pennsylvania	5.6	5.4	4.7	4.6	4.4
Puerto Rico	12.0	10.6	10.4	10.4	10.9
Rhode Island	5.3	5.2	5.1	5.1	5.0
South Carolina	6.8	6.8	6.5	6.4	5.9
South Dakota	3.6	3.8	3.2	3.1	3.0
Tennessee	5.8	5.5	5.2	5.1	4.7
Texas	6.8	6.0	4.9	4.9	4.3
Utah	5.6	5.5	2.9	3.0	2.7
Vermont	4.6	5.0	3.6	3.7	3.9
Virginia	4.1	3.7	3.0	3.0	3.0
Washington	7.5	3.7	5.0	4.9	4.5
West Virginia	6.1	6.3	4.9	4.7	4.6
Wisconsin	5.6	5.3	4.7	4.7	4.9
Wyoming	4.4	5.0	3.2	3.3	3.0

Table 2: Unemployment Rates For CY 2003 to CY 2007

Table 2 shows annual average unemployment rates for the nation and each state spanning a period from Calendar Year (CY) 2003 to CY 2007. The data presented was obtained from the Annual Average Statewide Data category of the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS) program. More specifically, these tables are located at <http://www.bls.gov/lau/#tables>.

Characteristics of this data include:

- 1) The unemployment rates shown are calendar years, not program years.
- 2) The annual averages presented are the actual percent of unemployment and not seasonally adjusted rates. Seasonally adjusted data isolate for and measure the overall impact of effects on time series data, which occur at specific periods during the year in a highly predictable pattern.
- 3) The data refer to rates collected on a place of residence basis. The data have also been revised to incorporate updated population controls and re-estimation.
- 4) The annual average state estimates do not sum to the U.S. total.

ATTACHMENT VIII

Time Periods for Reporting Performance Information in the WIA Annual Report for PY 2008 - PY 2010

	Annual Report PY 2008	Annual Report PY 2009	Annual Report PY 2010
Reporting Item			
Total Participants	7/1/08 to 6/30/09	7/1/09 to 6/30/10	7/1/10 to 6/30/11
Total Exiters	4/1/08 to 3/31/09	4/1/09 to 3/31/10	4/1/10 to 3/31/11
Employer Customer Satisfaction	1/1/08 to 12/31/08	1/1/09 to 12/31/09	1/1/10 to 12/31/10
Participant Customer Satisfaction	1/1/08 to 12/31/08	1/1/09 to 12/31/09	1/1/10 to 12/31/10
Adult and Dislocated Worker Performance Measures			
Entered Employment Rate	10/1/07 to 9/30/08	10/1/08 to 9/30/09	10/1/09 to 9/30/10
Employment Retention Rate	4/1/07 to 3/31/08	4/1/08 to 3/31/09	4/1/09 to 3/31/10
Six Months Average Earnings	4/1/07 to 3/31/08	4/1/08 to 3/31/09	4/1/09 to 3/31/10
Employment and Credential Rate	10/1/07 to 9/30/08	10/1/08 to 9/30/09	10/1/09 to 9/30/10
Older Youth Performance Measures			
Entered Employment Rate	10/1/07 to 9/30/08	10/1/08 to 9/30/09	10/1/09 to 9/30/10
Employment Retention Rate	4/1/07 to 3/31/08	4/1/08 to 3/31/09	4/1/09 to 3/31/10
Earnings Change	4/1/07 to 3/31/08	4/1/08 to 3/31/09	4/1/09 to 3/31/10
Employment and Credential Rate	10/1/07 to 9/30/08	10/1/08 to 9/30/09	10/1/09 to 9/30/10
Younger Youth Performance Measures			
Skill Attainment Rate	4/1/08 to 3/31/09	4/1/09 to 3/31/10	4/1/10 to 3/31/11
Youth Diploma or Equivalent Rate	4/1/08 to 3/31/09	4/1/09 to 3/31/10	4/1/10 to 3/31/11
Retention Rate	4/1/07 to 3/31/08	4/1/08 to 3/31/09	4/1/09 to 3/31/10