



U.S. House of Representatives
Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training
Committee on Education and Workforce

Hearing on Removing Inefficiencies in the Nation's
Job Training

May 11, 2011

Testimony presented by

Evelyn Ganzglass
Director, Workforce Development
Center for Law and Social Policy

eganzglass@clasp.org

Good morning Chairwoman Foxx, Ranking Member Hinojosa and Members of the Subcommittee. I appreciate the opportunity to testify about improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the nation's workforce system. CLASP is a nonprofit organization that develops and advocates for policies at the federal, state and local levels that improve the lives of low-income people.

In a recent report, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) examined fragmentation, overlap and potential duplication in federally funded workforce programs. We believe that Congress should take steps to create a more coherent and effective workforce system. My testimony will focus on three points:

1. As the subcommittee considers reforms and possible improvements, it is important not to overlook the critical role that the nation's workforce programs have played during the recession and will play as the economy recovers.
2. Program overlap is not synonymous with program duplication.
3. There are actions that Congress can take to encourage greater program alignment and increase the effectiveness of workforce programs.

1. The contribution of federally funded workforce programs

First, it is important to acknowledge the valuable contributions of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) and other federally funded workforce programs described in the recent GAO report. At a time when nearly 14 million Americans are unemployed, workforce programs are helping those out of work and the underemployed find jobs, prepare for jobs and build skills for the future. These programs also are helping employers find qualified workers as the nation recovers from the worst recession since the end of World War II.

The programs authorized by WIA, though created during an economic boom, have responded strongly and effectively during the recent economic downturn. When the Great Recession struck, state and local administrators responded with energy and tremendous spirit as the workforce system responded to rising unemployment and economic hardship. A summer youth employment program was implemented rapidly in 2009, ultimately reaching more than 355,000 disadvantaged youth. More than 8 million individuals received services provided by WIA during 2009 and more than 4.3 million found jobs in a difficult labor market. In 2008-2009, about two-thirds of adults and three-quarters of dislocated workers who participated in training found jobs after exiting the program, according to outcome measures tracked by the U.S. Department of Labor.

Although the recent GAO report states that "little is known about the effectiveness" of workforce programs, there is in fact growing evidence that workforce programs are a good investment, especially for disadvantaged individuals. Unlike federal performance accountability systems that focus on outcomes, impact studies are designed to determine whether the outcomes of a program or set of services are a direct result of the intervention. As the GAO has reported, the results of an experimental evaluation of WIA are not yet available; however, several rigorous, quasi-experimental evaluations conducted since 2000 have demonstrated the value of training and

workforce services. For example, a 2011 evaluation of Washington State workforce programs revealed that WIA services boost employment and earnings for adults, dislocated workers and youth. A U.S. Department of Labor evaluation of Youth Opportunity Grants, an important component of the WIA legislation, found that these grants increased the employment rate among blacks, teens, out-of-school youth, and native-born youths; increased receipt of Pell Grants; and had a positive effect on the hourly wages of women and teens.

Most evaluations tend to average out results from a wide range of local approaches and consequently mask the success of promising workforce strategies that are increasingly being used in the field and are gaining wider recognition by the policy community. Some of the most promising advances are the use of sector-focused workforce strategies to meet the needs of employers and low-income, low-skilled individuals and integrated education and training strategies that blend basic skills instruction with occupational skills preparation. For example, an experimental study of three sector-focused training programs found positive impacts for low-income, disadvantaged workers and job seekers. Participants in sector-based training programs earned 18 percent—about \$4,500—more than control group members during the two years of the study.¹

Most evaluations also tend to focus on a limited range of outcome measures, especially employment and earnings gains for individual participants. Yet, workforce programs are likely to generate a broader set of benefits to individuals and society. For example, a growing body of research suggests that investments in the adult workforce are likely to pay off for the next generation: when mothers with a high school education or less complete additional education and training, their children have improved language and reading skills.² As Christopher T. King and Carolyn J. Heinrich write in a review of recent research, “workforce investments produce widespread benefits for employers and society as a whole. Returns are particularly remarkable given the magnitude and intensity of workforce investments relative to the size and complexity of the barriers they address.”³ (See Appendix for a full summary of research findings)

2. Program overlap is not synonymous with program duplication.

The premise of some of the recent criticisms of employment and training programs, drawing on findings of a recent GAO report, is that there is unwarranted duplication of federally supported employment and training programs and that reducing this duplication or consolidating programs will increase the efficiency with which these services are delivered.

In our view, duplication of effort is not a major problem in the workforce development arena and we believe that consolidation will not result in more efficient or effective utilization of resources. Overlap is not the same as duplication. In fact, we believe that one size does not fit all and that it is beneficial to have a number of delivery systems with specialized expertise and capacity that can be drawn upon to provide the appropriate mix of high- and low-intensity, specialized and more general services to address the unique needs of different populations seeking to enter and advance in the labor market. Program duplication is not a major issue for the following reasons:

- ***GAO acknowledged that even when the 47 employment and training programs they identified do overlap, the services they provide and the populations they serve may differ in meaningful ways.***⁴ The programs identified do, in fact, differ along these dimensions. For example, the three largest programs (WIA, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Employment Service) provide services to different segments of the population with different levels of intensity of service.⁵ The Employment Service provides job search assistance and job matching to all job seekers, typically through online access or self-service resources. WIA provides three levels of services, including intensive career navigation services such as skills assessment and matching, counseling, and job search and training services for individuals in need of individualized assistance with employment and skill development. Local areas have considerable discretion in whom to serve and how. TANF services vary widely by state and can include job readiness, job search assistance, training and community service or subsidized employment programs. Some of the programs, such as the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program, were created out of political necessity to compensate a subset of dislocated workers who are negatively impacted by U.S. trade policy with a richer set of services than can be provided to other job seekers at current funding levels. We would welcome resources to extend the types of such services provided through TAA to a broader population. Still other programs are small discretionary grant programs that provide one-time grants for special purposes to states or local areas on a competitive basis.
- ***Specialization is necessary and desirable to effectively serve populations with different needs.*** Congress created targeted programs to ensure that appropriate strategies are being used to address the unique needs of certain populations such as veterans and individuals with disabilities, who often require highly specialized services and equipment that cannot easily be provided through general services. Adult education programs are equipped to serve people with limited English proficiency and low levels of literacy. Other programs are designed to serve the unique circumstances of groups such as Native Americans and farm workers.
- ***Programs are significantly underfunded, rarely serve the same people and together serve only a small fraction of individuals and families in need of or eligible for services.*** Despite the fact that some postsecondary education is increasingly needed to access employment that pay family-sustaining wages, fifteen percent of U.S. adults lack a high school diploma or GED, and another 30 percent have only a high school diploma or its equivalent. Only a fraction of the individuals with low basic skills or inadequate occupational skills have access to education and training services. Adult Education services reach about 2.4 million students among a pool of an estimated 93 million adults with low basic skills who may be eligible for and need these services to upgrade their skills. The demand for adult education services is growing nationwide, with waiting lists in at least 49 states. Both the numbers of students and the waiting times have doubled since 2008; in states with extremely high demand—Arizona, Texas, and New York, for example—students can wait for one year or longer for services.⁶ States report that some 160,000 people seeking services cannot be served.⁷ In addition, a recent survey of local

workforce areas in Illinois found that a number of WIBs have implemented waiting lists at program intake and for training services because of limited funding.

- ***Many of the programs included in the GAO list are, in fact, administered through the public workforce system.*** Of the 47 programs identified by the GAO, just 3 programs – WIA’s Adult and Dislocated Worker programs and Wagner Peyser programs account for nearly 80 percent of the 24 million people served by the federal workforce development system.⁸ These services are generally accessible through WIA one-stops; and together with the WIA Youth program and TAA they are administered and delivered through a unified system in many states.
- ***States and local communities have used different approaches to make federally funded programs work together in non-duplicative ways.*** Looking specifically at connections between WIA and TANF, which GAO found to be the fourth largest source of funding for employment and training services in FY 2009, we find that at one end of the coordination continuum is Utah, where the programs are fully integrated into a seamless system that uses funding from WIA, from TANF and from the SNAP Employment and Training program to provide the same set of services to the extent allowable within funding streams to eligible populations. TANF participation rates and WIA performance standards apply to people served with these funding streams. The same staff work with customers funded under all three programs, with their time allocated to the appropriate programs depending upon whom they actually serve. This approach allows the state to serve more workers with employment and training services than they would with just WIA funds.⁹ Although it minimizes administrative and overhead costs, it is not a low-cost approach.

In the middle of the continuum are the many areas where the TANF agency contracts with the Workforce Investment Board (WIB) to provide some or all workforce services to TANF cash assistance recipients, but they are served through specialized programs limited only to TANF recipients, rather than through the programs offered to other job seekers. For example, the state of Missouri requires that all employment-related services for TANF cash assistance recipients be housed within the Division of Workforce Development. However, in practice, most of the local WIBs subcontract with community-based organizations, such as Goodwill, whom they believe to have more experience in serving low-income populations, to provide the services to TANF recipients. These contracts can also provide for more individualized and in-depth case management than the workforce agency can offer most clients.¹⁰ And at the other end are areas where there is little or no coordination between TANF and WIA agencies.

Many TANF and WIA agencies collaborated in recent years to provide subsidized employment programs for low-income youth and parents using the additional funding provided under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). In addition, New York State combined discretionary ARRA funds with TANF funds to expand a career pathways initiative targeted at public assistance recipients, TANF-eligible young adults ages 18 to 24 and low-income adults who qualify for WIA services.¹¹ While this funding is now gone, many program administrators indicate that this experience has

reinvigorated the relationships between the organizations and led to new interest in partnering.¹²

It is important to note that we do not have evidence about whether TANF recipients are connected to the workforce sooner, or obtain better jobs, through services provided through the WIA system than through stand-alone programs. During the early 2000s, both CLASP and the Department of Health and Human Services undertook studies of WIA-TANF integration, and both concluded that there was little basis on which to claim that one model was superior.¹³

In particular, there is reasonable basis to be concerned that individuals with significant or multiple barriers to employment may not be well served in a system that has a universal service mandate, and that is charged with providing employers with a ready-to-work workforce. For this reason, CLASP does not believe that TANF should be made a mandatory partner in the WIA one-stop system unless substantial changes are made to WIA as part of that program's reauthorization to ensure that TANF recipients are well served. While an integrated approach is working well in some areas, we do not think that mandating a partnership between unwilling agencies is likely to produce optimum results.¹⁴

Therefore, rather than focusing on reducing duplication to possibly—but not certainly—reduce administrative costs, we believe that Congress should take steps to reduce unnecessary incompatibilities among existing programs to make it easier for states and local areas to coordinate the use of multiple funding streams to improve services for both workers and employers. Such improvements would allow workforce programs to make the best use of the very limited funds Congress has chosen to devote to these programs.

3. Toward a more coherent and effective workforce system

Consolidation and use of vouchers for training services are two strategies that are typically offered to address perceived program duplication.

In our view simple consolidation is not the answer. Experience has shown that block granting multiple funding streams is not an effective strategy for achieving either greater efficiency or effectiveness in service delivery. Because of the flexible nature of block grants, it is often difficult to report clearly regarding who is being served, how and to what result. This makes oversight difficult, and leaves block grants with uncertain support.

Moreover, maintenance of effort requirements have a poor track record. In practice, states often have the ability to substitute block grant funds for existing state investments, reducing the total amount of funding available and shifting costs from states to the federal government.

High-need groups such as individuals with disabilities, veterans, and workers with multiple barriers to employment are likely to be ill-served under block grants, as they are more expensive to serve, and are likely to have weaker results under outcome-based performance measures.

Margy Waller, while at The Brookings Foundation¹⁵ found that state-wide programs tend to benefit whereas local communities tend to lose resources when programs are block granted.

Nor is voucherizing programs. While an increased investment in training is needed, exclusive reliance on vouchers for providing access to training is not warranted. The research evidence on the effectiveness of using vouchers with disadvantaged adults has been negative, and evidence on effectiveness with dislocated workers has been mixed. The sole reliance on vouchers would deprive the workforce investment system of two important training tools to increase the self sufficiency of individuals and the economic development of communities:

- **customized training** that supports local economic development and ties training directly to employment, resulting in job placement for trainees; and
- **contract training** that allows local areas to purchase cohort and other training tailored to the needs of hard-to-serve customers.¹⁶

The current use of Individual Training Accounts under WIA unnecessarily discourages the use of contract training, which can be an effective way to design programs that are tailored to the needs of low-skilled individuals, such as bridge programs, which prepare adults with low basic skills to enter postsecondary education and training programs. The use of contracts can also facilitate the provision of training to groups or cohorts of lower skilled adults with similar needs, which can provide important peer support to participants.

It is our contention that rather than a single consolidated program, we need a more coherent system that brings together diverse services, service providers and resources to provide appropriate and effective services to address the diverse needs of different populations.

CLASP recommends that the following actions be taken to promote greater alignment of resources and effectiveness:

- ***Streamline and reduce the paperwork burden associated with the eligibility determination and verification processes.*** According to a 2002 U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) survey of state and local workforce boards, documenting eligibility has been “difficult to accomplish and resource-intensive.”¹⁷ We recommend that Congress allow cross system eligibility for young people and families who have been determined eligible for other means-tested federal programs that require families or individuals to be low-income. For example, Congress should allow students who are determined eligible for free or reduced lunch under the National School Lunch Program to be automatically determined income eligible WIA youth services. This was the policy under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Congress should allow local workforce areas to include youth that live in a high-poverty area or who live in a school district with high percentages of free and reduced lunch when it is not possible to identify individuals enrolled in the free or reduced lunch program due to privacy concerns. In addition Congress should be eligible for WIA services without regard to income if youth are out of school and have not received a high school diploma or fall into any of the specified

target groups such as youth in foster care, youth in the juvenile justice system, youth with disabilities, homeless and runaway youth, and young parents. Also, Congress should clarify that self-certification methods, such as sampling and other methods that reduce the documentation burden, are acceptable alternatives to individual documentation.

- ***Reduce the need for duplicative reporting and accounting systems.*** This should be done by agreeing on consistent definitions of units of service, standards of data quality, and commonly agreed upon accurate and unbiased cost-allocation methods for services funded by multiple sources for use across federal workforce education and training programs.
- ***Align performance expectations across programs.*** Incompatible performance accountability requirements across programs serve as a barrier to greater integration of efforts. The most blatant examples of incompatible performance expectations and associated administrative requirements are the ones under which the workforce and welfare systems operate. WIA's primary performance measures are outcome measures focusing on employment and earnings. In contrast, TANF's primary performance measure is the work participation rate, which is a process measure. Particularly in the wake of the changes made by the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005, states must track and verify every reported hour of participation. Workforce agencies consistently report that this is a significant barrier to serving TANF recipients in programs that are not solely dedicated to this population. The WIA performance expectations have discouraged many local areas from serving individuals who are perceived as having greater barriers to employment. It is worth noting that even states with highly integrated systems, such as Utah and Florida, rarely cross-enroll TANF recipients in WIA programs.

The federal government should ensure that the WIA performance measures make sufficient adjustment for individuals who are more difficult to place in higher paying jobs. States that are ready to adopt fully integrated models should be allowed to substitute the WIA outcome-based performance measures for the TANF work participation rate accountability measure. In addition, in order to encourage coordination, states should be able to deem TANF cash assistance recipients who are participating in WIA intensive and training services as fully engaged for the purpose of the TANF work participation rates.

We also recommend that over time the federal government develop and implement a system of shared accountability across workforce and other education and training programs.

- ***Align WIA with other education, training and work support programs to create multiple pathways to postsecondary and career success for low-income adults, dislocated workers and disadvantaged youth.*** Each step in a career pathway is designed to prepare students for the next level of employment and education and to meet employer demand for skilled workers. Ideally, pathways begin with short, intensive remedial "bridge" and "pre-bridge" programs for those at the lowest literacy and English language levels and extend through two-year and four-year college degrees. Connecting these services can

accelerate learning, and help people attain necessary credentials as well as advance over time to successively higher levels of education and employment in a given industry or occupational sector. This will promote long-term, inclusive economic growth by helping workers gain the skills and connections they need to access family-sustaining employment and by ensuring that employers have access to the skilled workers they need to retain and create good jobs. In particular, to better meet the needs of limited English proficient individuals and individuals with lower levels of education, Congress should encourage stronger connections between the workforce development and adult education systems, and provide additional flexibility within the workforce system to provide the basic skills and English language training services that are necessary for success in the labor market.

- ***Focus on obligations rather than expenditures in assessing fund availability.*** GAO has consistently found that states are spending WIA funds within authorized time frames and has strongly stated that obligations are a more useful measure than expenditures for assessing WIA funding status.¹⁸ The amount of “unexpended funds” may not reflect what states and localities actually have on hand because some portion may be tied up in obligations. The relentless focus on expenditures rather than obligations also discourages use of long-term training or long-term engagement of individuals in services that will help them advance in the labor market.
- ***Finally, system efficiency could be enhanced by providing more consistent funding to encourage states and local areas to plan wisely and well.*** The recent history of funding the system in dribs and drabs incurs its own administrative costs and inefficiencies. It also impairs the system’s ability to plan at a time of heightened demand for services.

Appendix: Summary of Research on Workforce Program Effectiveness¹⁹

Federal investments in workforce development help low-income adults and youth find jobs, improve their earnings and contribute to their communities. Although the results of an experimental evaluation of the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) are not yet available, several rigorous, quasi-experimental evaluations conducted since 2000 have demonstrated the value of training and workforce services, especially for disadvantaged individuals.

- A 2005 study found that Workforce Investment Act (WIA) services in seven states generate employment and earnings gains for adults and dislocated workers. Individuals receiving WIA services are more likely to be employed (by about 10 percentage points) and to have higher earnings (by about \$800 per quarter in 2000 dollars) than those who have not received services. In addition, participants in WIA programs are less likely than non-participants to receive public assistance. The authors conclude that “WIA services, including training, are effective interventions for adults and dislocated workers, when measured in terms of net impacts on employment, earnings, and receipt of public assistance for participants.”²⁰
- A 2008 report found positive outcomes for WIA Adult participants in 12 states, concluding that there are “large and immediate impacts on earnings and employment for individuals who participate in the WIA Adult program... Those who obtained training services have lower initial returns, but they catch up to others within ten quarters, ultimately registering total gains of \$800 for females and \$500 to 600 for males.” Despite substantial variation in program structure and implementation across the 12 states, “overall net impacts were estimated to be positive in almost all states.”²¹
- A 2008 evaluation of the Youth Opportunity Grant program found positive results, noting increased educational attainment, Pell Grant receipt, labor market participation, and employment rates and earnings for more than 90,000 program participants. The study found that the program increased overall labor-force participation rates, specifically for teens ages 16 to 19, women, native-born residents, blacks, and in-school youth. It also increased employment rates among blacks, teens, out-of-school youth, and native-born youths, and it positively impacted the hourly wages of women and teens.²²
- A 2011 evaluation of Washington State workforce programs—one of only a few net impact evaluations conducted by a state—revealed that WIA services boost employment and earnings for adults, dislocated workers and youth. Adults and youth receiving WIA services have higher employment rates and higher earnings than non-participants three quarters following participation. Dislocated workers receiving WIA services are more likely to be employed than non-participants three quarters following participation.²³

The national studies tend to average out results from a wide range of local approaches and consequently mask the success of promising workforce strategies that are increasingly being used in the field and are gaining wider recognition by the policy community.²⁴ Some of the most promising advances are the use of sector-focused workforce strategies to meet the needs of employers and low-income, low-skilled individuals and integrated education and training strategies that blend basic skills instruction with occupational skills preparation.

- An experimental study of three sector-focused training programs found positive impacts for low-income, disadvantaged workers and job seekers. Participants in sector-based training programs earned 18 percent—about \$4,500—more than control group members during the two years of the study. Participants also were more likely to work, work in jobs with higher wages and hold jobs that offer benefits (such as health insurance). Sector-focused programs usually target rapidly growing jobs that require limited postsecondary education but pay wages at or near the median wage in the economy and that involve intermediary organizations that bring together training providers, employers and workers.²⁵
- Sector-focused workforce programs are beginning to identify the benefits that flow to participating employers or an entire industry. These outcomes include improvements to a business’s ability to find and retain qualified workers, increases in productivity and increases in the skills of existing workers. For example, a hospital participating in a healthcare initiative documented \$40,000 in savings as a result of lower turnover and reduced hiring costs.²⁶
- A quasi-experimental evaluation of Capital IDEA, a sector-focused training program in Austin, Texas found substantial employment, earnings, and Unemployment Insurance-related impacts relative to a comparison group receiving low-intensity one-stop center services. Participants trained in healthcare and other fields have experienced earnings impacts of more than \$3,100 per quarter seven years after enrollment and the impacts appear to be increasing during the economic recession and recovery.²⁷
- Research on programs that contextualize basic skills instruction to a specific occupation or set of occupations has yielded promising results. One of the best examples is Washington State’s Integrated Basic Education and Skills Training (I-BEST) program, which blends adult education with occupational training and pairs adult education teachers with career and technical education instructors. A recent study found that I-BEST participants are 56 percent more likely than regular adult education students to earn college credit, 26 percent more likely to earn a certificate or degree, and 19 percent more likely to achieve learning gains on basic skills tests.²⁸ Another study found that I-BEST participants experience higher employment rates and earnings than non-participants three quarters after leaving the program.²⁹

A growing body of research suggests that workforce investments are likely to pay off for the next generation. Most evaluations have focused on a limited set of outcome measures, especially employment and earnings gains for individual participants. Yet, there is evidence that workforce investments may produce benefits both for adult participants and their children.³⁰

- As Katherine Magnuson has written, “many workers, although certainly not all, are also parents, and human capital accumulation is an intergenerational process. Improving the educational and employment prospects for parents in the workforce today may also do the same for their children as they enter the workforce tomorrow.”³¹ There is encouraging evidence that, when mothers with low education levels complete additional education, their children appear to have improved language and reading skills.³² These quasi-experimental studies suggest that the effects of increased maternal education are apparent only for mothers with a high school education or less and are associated with a variety of

education and training services, including high school completion and GED, occupational training and college.³³

¹ Sheila Maguire, Joshua Freely, Carol Clymer and Maureen Conway, *Job Training That Works: Findings from the Sectoral Employment Impact Study*, P/PV In Brief (Public/Private Ventures), May 2009, http://www.ppv.org/ppv/publications/assets/294_publication.pdf.

² Several quasi-experimental studies have shown this linkage. K. Magnuson, H. Sexton, P. Davis-Kean, and A. Huston, "Increases in Maternal Education and Young Children's Language Skills," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, Vol. 55, No. 3, July 2009, http://muse.jhu.edu/login?uri=/journals/merrill-palmer_quarterly/v055/55.3.magnuson.pdf and K. Magnuson, "Maternal Education and Children's Academic Achievement During Middle Childhood," *Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 43, No. 6, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/login?uri=/journals/merrill-palmer_quarterly/v055/55.3.magnuson.pdf. In addition, Transitional Jobs programs, which combine time-limited subsidized employment with a comprehensive set of services including case management, have been found to significantly reduce recidivism among individuals who have left prison.

³ Christopher T. King and Carolyn Heinrich, *How Effective Are Workforce Development Programs?* Prepared for the Symposium Celebrating the Ray Marshall Center's 40th Anniversary, 2010. <http://www.utexas.edu/research/cshr/pubs/pdf/Heinrich%20and%20King%20-%20How%20Effective%20Are%20Workforce%20Development%20Programs.pdf>.

⁴ *Multiple Employment and Training Programs*, GAO, page 17.

⁵ Testimony Of LaDonna Pavetti, Vice President, Family Income Support Policy Before The House Ways And Means Committee, Subcommittee On Human Resources, April 5, 2011.

⁶ Marcie Foster, Julie Strawn and Amy Ellen Duke-Benfield, *Beyond Basic Skills: State Strategies to Connect Low-Skilled Students to an Employer-Valued Postsecondary Education*, CLASP, March 2011. <http://www.clasp.org/admin/site/publications/files/Beyond-Basic-Skills-March-2011.pdf>

⁷ *2009-2010 Adult Student Waiting List Survey*, National Council of State Directors of Adult Education.

⁸ *Are Federal Workforce Programs Duplicative?*, National Skills Coalition, March 2011.

http://www.nationalskillscoalition.org/homepage-archive/documents/2011/nsc_programsduplicative_2011-03.pdf

⁹ Utah Department of Workforce Services, *Utah's Job Connection*, WIA/Wagner Peyser State ARRA Plan, <http://jobs.utah.gov/edo/stateplans/wiawpstateplan.pdf>. See also A. Rowland, *Utah's Economy: The Future is Here*. Voices for Utah's Children, January 2009, http://www.workingpoorfamilies.org/pdfs/Utah_Assessment_Report.pdf.

¹⁰ D. Wright and L. Montiel, *Workforce System One-Stop Services for Public Assistance and Other Low-Income Populations: Lessons Learned in Select States*, Rockefeller Institute, April 2010, prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor and released in 2011, http://www.rockinst.org/pdf/workforce_welfare_and_social_services/2010-04-DOL_Workforce_System.pdf.

¹¹ N. Ridley and E. Ganzglass, *Responding to the Recessions: How the Recovery Act Boosted Training and Innovation in Three States*, CLASP, February 2011 <http://www.clasp.org/admin/site/publications/files/Responding-to-the-Great-Recession-ARRA-and-WIA-2011.pdf>

¹² D. Pavetti, L. Schott, and E. Lower-Bash, *Creating Subsidized Employment Opportunities For Low-Income Parents: The Legacy of the TANF Emergency Fund*, CLASP and CBPP, February 2011, <http://www.clasp.org/admin/site/publications/files/Subsidized-Employment-Paper-Final.pdf>.

¹³ N. Patel et al, *A Means to an End: Integration of Welfare and Workforce Development Systems*, CLASP, October 2003, <http://www.clasp.org/admin/site/publications/files/0155.pdf> and A. Werner and K. Lodewick, *Serving TANF and Low-Income Populations through WIA One-Stop Centers*, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, January 2004, <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/WIA-centers-site-visits04/>.

¹⁴ *WIA Reauthorization: Recommendations for Reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act Adult Program*, CLASP, July 2009, http://www.clasp.org/admin/site/publications/files/WIA_Recs-for-Adult-Program-final.pdf.

¹⁵ Power point presentation on TANF Reauthorization 2003: Lessons from Block Grants, June 13, 2003, New York City.

¹⁶ *Reform or Dismantling? President's Workforce Proposal Raises Serious Concerns*, CLASP, 2006. <http://www.clasp.org/admin/site/publications/files/0279.pdf>.

- ¹⁷ GAO Report to Congressional Requesters, “Workforce Investment Act: Youth Provisions Promote New Service Strategies, but Additional Guidance Would Enhance Development”, April 2002, p. 29, <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d02413.pdf>.
- ¹⁸ GAO, Workforce Investment Act: Labor Has Made Progress in Addressing Areas of Concern, but More Focus Needed on Understanding What Works and What Doesn’t, 2009.
- ¹⁹ From Neil Ridley and Elizabeth Kenefick, *Research Shows Effectiveness of Workforce Programs: A Fresh Look at the Evidence*, Center for Law and Social Policy, May 2011, <http://www.clasp.org/admin/site/publications/files/workforce-effectiveness.pdf>.
- ²⁰ Kevin Hollenbeck, Daniel Schroeder, Christopher T. King and Wei-Jang Huang, *Net Impact Estimates for Services Provided through the Workforce Investment Act*, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, October 2005, http://wdr.doleta.gov/research/FullText_Documents/Net%20Impact%20Estimates%20for%20Services%20Provided%20through%20the%20Workforce%20Investment%20Act-%20Final%20Report.pdf.
- ²¹ Carolyn Heinrich, Peter Mueser and Kenneth Troske, *Workforce Investment Act Non-Experimental Net Impact Evaluation*, Final Report, IMPAQ International, December 2008, http://wdr.doleta.gov/research/FullText_Documents/Workforce%20Investment%20Act%20Non-Experimental%20Net%20Impact%20Evaluation%20-%20Final%20Report.pdf.
- ²² Russell H. Jackson, et. al., *Youth Opportunity Grant Initiative: Impact and Synthesis Report*, Decision Information Resources, Inc., prepared for U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, December 2007, http://wdr.doleta.gov/research/FullText_Documents/YO_Impact_and_Synthesis_Report.pdf.
- ²³ Washington State Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, *Results of the Net Impact Study of 12 Workforce Programs*, April, 2011. The study also shows that adults, youth and dislocated workers receiving WIA services have higher earnings than non-participants three years following participation. The short term results are for participants exiting in 2007-2008. The long term results are for participants exiting in 2005-06. The author of this study, Kevin Hollenbeck, has also conducted net impact studies for Virginia and Indiana.
- ²⁴ Whitney Smith, Jenny Wittner, Robin Spence and Andy Van Kleunen, *Skills Training Works: Examining the Evidence*, The Workforce Alliance (now the National Skills Coalition), September 2002, <http://www.nationalskillscoalition.org/assets/reports/-/skills-training-works.pdf>.
- ²⁵ Sheila Maguire, Joshua Freely, Carol Clymer and Maureen Conway, *Job Training That Works: Findings from the Sectoral Employment Impact Study*, P/PV In Brief (Public/Private Ventures), May 2009, http://www.ppv.org/ppv/publications/assets/294_publication.pdf.
- ²⁶ Maureen Conway, *Sector Strategies in brief*, Workforce Strategies Initiative, the Aspen Institute, November 2007, <http://www.aspenwsi.org/publications/07-014b.pdf>.
- ²⁷ Tara Smith, Christopher T. King and Daniel G. Schroeder, *Local Investments in Workforce Development: 2011 Evaluation Update*, Austin: Ray Marshall Center, University of Texas, April 2011 (forthcoming); and Robert G. Glover and Christopher T. King, “The Promise of Sectoral Approaches to Workforce Development: Towards More Effective, Active Labor Market Policies in the United States,” in Charles J. Whalen, Ed., *Human Resource Economics: Essays in Honor of Vernon M. Briggs, Jr.*, Kalamazoo, Michigan: The W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 2010.
- ²⁸ Matthew Zeidenberg, Sung-Woo Cho and Davis Jenkins, Washington State’s Integrated Basic Education and Skills Training Program (I-BEST): New Evidence of Effectiveness, Community College Research Center, 2010. <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?UID=805>
- ²⁹ Washington State Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, *Results of the Net Impact Study of 12 Workforce Programs*, April, 2011. The short term results are for participants exiting in 2007-2008.
- ³⁰ A number of experimental studies report that Transitional Jobs programs, which combine time-limited subsidized employment with a comprehensive set of services including case management, have been found to significantly reduce recidivism among individuals who have left prison.
- ³¹ Katherine Magnuson, *Investing in the Adult Workforce: An Opportunity to Improve Children’s Life Chances*, prepared for the Annie E. Casey Foundation Initiative on Investing in Workforce Development, March 2007, <http://www.aecf.org/news/fes/dec2008/pdf/Magnuson.pdf>.
- ³² Several quasi-experimental studies have shown this linkage. K. Magnuson, H. Sexton, P. Davis-Kean, and A. Huston, “Increases in Maternal Education and Young Children’s Language Skills,” *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, Vol. 55, No. 3, July 2009, http://muse.jhu.edu/login?uri=/journals/merrill-palmer_quarterly/v055/55.3.magnuson.pdf and K. Magnuson, “Maternal Education and Children’s Academic Achievement During Middle Childhood,”

Developmental Psychology, Vol. 43, No. 6, 2007, http://muse.jhu.edu/login?uri=/journals/merrill-palmer_quarterly/v055/55.3.magnuson.pdf.

³³ Various studies have found the linkage between increased maternal education and improved children's achievement only for mothers with low education levels and have shown that parents who completed additional education participated in a variety of programs. Additional research is needed to parse the effects of different types of education and training. Research to date has concentrated on the effects of maternal education for children at certain ages (during the first three years of life, between ages 4 and 6, between ages 6 and 10).