

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT NOTICE	NO. 40-09
	DATE April 21, 2010

TO: STATE WORKFORCE AGENCIES
STATE WORKFORCE LIAISONS

FROM: JANE OATES /s/

SUBJECT: Release and Availability of ETA Occasional Paper: *Pre-Design Study for the Evaluation of Recovery Act Green Jobs, Health care, and Other High Growth Competitive Grants*

1. Purpose. To announce the release and availability of ETA Occasional Paper: *Pre-Design Study for the Evaluation of Recovery Act Green Jobs, Health care, and Other High Growth Competitive Grants*

2. Background. On February 17, 2009, President Barack Obama signed into law the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) through which Congress intended to preserve and create jobs, promote the nation's economic recovery, and assist those most impacted by the recession. Among other funding directed toward the Department of Labor (DOL), the Recovery Act provides \$750 million for a program of competitive grants for worker training and placement in high growth and emerging industries. Of the \$750 million, the Recovery Act designates \$500 million for projects that prepare workers for careers in the energy efficiency and renewable energy sectors described in Section 171(e)(1)(B) of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). The Recovery Act further provided that in awarding grants for the remaining \$250 million, projects that prepare workers for careers in the health care sector would receive priority.

To implement this provision, the Employment and Training Administration issued the following solicitations for grant award which can be found at

http://www.doleta.gov/grants/find_grants.cfm:

- Health Care Sector and Other High Growth and Emerging Industries (SGA/DFA PY 09-01) Issue Date: July 22, 2009, Closing Date: October 5, 2009, Award Date: February 12, 2010
- State Labor Market Information Improvement Grants (SGA/DFA PY 08-17) Issue Date: June 24, 2009, Closing Date: August 14, 2009, Award Date: November 18, 2009
- Energy Training Partnership Grants (SGA/DFA PY 08-18) Issue Date: June 24, 2009, Closing Date: September 4, 2009, Award Date: January 6, 2010
- Pathways Out of Poverty (SGA/DFA PY 08-19) Issue Date: June 24, 2009, Closing Date: September 29, 2009, Award Date: January 13, 2010
- State Energy Sector Partnership and Training Grants (SGA/DFA PY-08-20) Issue Date: June 24, 2009, Closing Date: October 20, 2009, Award Date: January 20, 2010

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20210

- Green Capacity Building Grants (SGA/DFA PY 08-21) Issue Date: June 24, 2009, Closing Date: August 5, 2009, Award Date: November 18, 2010

Three of the Green Jobs SGAs – Energy Training Partnerships, State Energy Sector Partnerships, and Pathways Out of Poverty – and the High Growth/Health Care SGA include language that gave applicants points for their suitability for a random assignment evaluation.

3. Publication Description. The purpose of the study was to examine the possible objectives of evaluation of these grants and the most effective methodologies for addressing them. The White Paper did not recommend a single methodological approach, but rather explored the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches. Therefore, the report discusses:

- Features of the grants that might influence the type of evaluation design that may be appropriate;
- Possible objectives and types of research questions of interest to ETA;
- Three different types of random assignment designs that could be used for the evaluation; and
- Other types of methodologies that could be used should a random assignment approach be deemed either inappropriate or infeasible.

The study presents detailed analysis, option tables and projected power calculations of minimum detectable effects and concludes with the following four insights intended to broadly inform ETA in planning an evaluation of these grant efforts:

- Three possible objectives for ARRA evaluations might be of interest to ETA: 1) learning about the individual-level effects of training on workers, 2) learning about the macroeconomic effects of the grants on communities or industries, and 3) learning about implementation issues associated with the grants.
- Random assignment is the most analytically rigorous of the possible methodologies, but it also is more likely than other approaches to interfere with normal program activity and to take longer to implement.
- With a random assignment approach, either random sampling or purposive selection of grantees might be desirable if cost considerations make it infeasible or undesirable to include all grantees in an evaluation.
- Other types of methodologies, such as those using individual- or community-level comparison groups or those that do not use a comparison group, could be used for an evaluation but are less likely to provide convincing impact estimates.

4. Inquires. To view an abstract of this publication as well as to download the full report, visit the ETA Occasional Paper Series Web site at: <http://wdr.doleta.gov/research/keyword.cfm>.