

SUMMARY REPORT

Each year all programs under the purview of the Western Wisconsin Workforce Development Board, Inc. undergo a thorough monitoring review. The ultimate goal of the Continuous Improvement Plan is to ensure that systems and processes are in place to deliver customer value, assure quality and achieve organizational success and sustainability. The objectives of the Continuous Improvement Plan are to:

- Ensure that federal, state and local grants are being used for authorized purposes in compliance with laws, regulations and grant agreements;
- Identify technical assistance and staff training needs to achieve better performance;
- Keep key processes current with organizational needs and directions; and
- Identify best practices and lessons learned to drive organizational learning and innovation.

The Administrative Coordinator, in cooperation with the WDB Liaison, is responsible for the implementation of the Continuous Improvement Plan.

The following is a synopsis of the review.

WIA Formula Funded Programs

The Planning Committee reviewed the **WIA Adult, Dislocated Worker and Flood** programs in April 2009. The following observations were made:

- The WIA programs continue to deliver appropriate and timely services and meet program standards.
- The State tracking system continues to cause reconciliation problems with our internal data. It is recommended that conversations regarding tracking complications continue with the State until they address the problem.
- Workforce Connections, Inc. should continue to focus on high wage, high demand occupations as the DWD works to re-set the measurement criteria.
- The reporting for the WIA programs should be redesigned for ease of evaluation, and to give a historical review.

The Youth Council reviewed the WIA Youth Program on March 31, 2009. The following observations were noted:

- The youth program service providers are continuing to successfully meet program requirements; both programmatically and fiscally.
- There are still discrepancies with performance reporting for younger and older youth, especially with reconciling the program against the State of Wisconsin Reports.
- A successful tool for measuring participant satisfaction has yet to be incorporated into the overall program evaluation

To date there has been no review of the formula funded WIA programs.

Disability Navigator

The Planning Committee also reviewed **the Disability Navigator Program** in April 2009. The following conclusions were made:

- Independent Living Resources continues to successfully fulfill the requirements set forth in the WDA contract;
- Program performance continues to exceed expectation. A continuation of the current processes and practices is recommended.

American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA)

The Youth Council also reviewed the WIA Summer Youth Program funded through the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act.

The WDB Youth Unit offers the following recommendations for providers:

- Have procedures/timelines in place in order to ensure paperwork and documentation is received prior to participation
- Ensure proper documentation of income, barriers, and other eligibility elements accompany paperwork when it is sent to the WDB Youth Unit for review
- Properly determine eligibility prior to submitting paperwork
- Add beginning and end dates to worksite agreements
- Ensure all worksite agreements are signed and dated prior to youth starting work
- Assess youth interest in regard to worksite placement prior to placement.

American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) - The State Liaison, Karen Pfeil was on site to review the ARRA Adult, Dislocated Worker and Youth Programs in early June. To date, no report has been issued. The Planning Committee will review the report upon receipt.

PROCESS

The WDB Administrative Coordinator performed the 2009 continuous improvement/monitoring review of the WIA adult and dislocated worker program service provider, Workforce Connections, Inc. The review included both the formula funded adult and dislocated worker program and any program for dislocated workers through the special response grants. The monitoring contained four separate reviews:

- Review of the self assessment survey follow-up submitted by Workforce Connections, Inc.
- Review of fiscal management through audit and internal fiscal reports
- Review of performance in meeting standards, enrollment goals and case file management.
- Review of customer satisfaction and outcome measures.

SELF ASSESSMENT SURVEYS

The WDB Administrative Coordinator developed a follow-up survey to the 2008 self assessment surveys, based on past monitoring and continuous improvement processes. The survey was done to assess whether the program operators have systems in place to ensure compliance with all regulations. The surveys were sent near the beginning of the year and were due back by April 15, 2009.

<p>2008 “Review of Outcome” (1) <i>“A recommendation was made for the WIA adult and dislocated worker service providers to track those from untapped labor pools by hear to see if enrollments increase. This should be done in relation to the demographics of the region.”</i></p>	
<p>2009 Follow-up Question</p> <p>Have you begun to tracking the untapped labor pools to measure enrollment increases?</p>	<p>Workforce Connections, Inc. Response</p> <p>Yes, it is reported monthly in the Connections Report.</p>
<p>2008 “Review of Outcome” (2) <i>“There is no requirement for frequency in client contact so it was difficult to determine if gaps in contact are problematic. It is suggested that a standard be set for client contact taking into consideration his or status.”</i></p>	
<p>2009 Follow-up Question</p> <p>Has the suggestion to set a standard for the frequency of client contact been considered for this program year or future program years?</p>	<p>Workforce Connections, Inc. Response</p> <p>“Contact with the Employment Coordinator is a MUST.” Participants are required to maintain monthly or bimonthly contact with their Employment Coordinator while enrolled and during the follow-up phase. The contact intervals following exit are jointly determined.</p>
<p>2008 “Review of Outcome” (3) <i>“The provider should continue to strive to place workers in high wage, high demand occupations. Once the Department of Workforce Development has re-set the criteria for the high wage training goal, plans should be put in place to meet or exceed the goals.</i></p>	
<p>2009 Follow-up Question</p> <p>Are new guidelines in place for the high wage training goal? If so, do you have a plan in place to meet or exceed the goal?</p>	<p>Workforce Connections, Inc. Response</p> <p>The Department of Workforce Development has not re-set the criteria for the high wage training goal. The goal is still in place is 35% of the funding allocation should be spent on high wage training. We still strive to meet this goal.</p>

“Review of Outcome” from 2008 self-assessment surveys

Outcome of Review:

- **Workforce Connections, Inc. continues to provide their staff with quick and reliable access to program related information; this includes attending regular monthly meetings and/or training.**

FISCAL MONITORING

The capabilities for fiscal management were monitored through a review of independent audit reports. Workforce Connections, Inc. had a clean audit report. The self assessment also contained questions relating to the fiscal procedures. There are procedures in place to reconcile program expenditures by comparing planned programmatic expenditures to fiscal reports to ensure spending is on target and to uncover any discrepancies among reports.

Rather than using a straight line pattern, expenditures are planned using budget projections made by staff according to spending for client services and training. The WIA allocations need to be 80% obligated by end of program year. With funding in continual decline, Workforce Connections, Inc. plans for an 80% obligation rate in order to carry forward 20% into the next fiscal year.

Expenditures to contracts amounts were reviewed as of February 28, 2009.

	Contract Amount	Expenditures	Planned Expenditures through February 2008 by straight line calculation	Planned Expenditures through February 2008 with an 80% obligation assumption	Percent Expended
Adult Program	\$492,169	\$263,404	67%	57%	54%
Dislocated Worker	\$568,823	\$337,221	67%	57%	59%
NEG - Flood Grant	\$422,035	\$370,234	81%	n/a	88%

Based on internal fiscal reports

The State has set a goal to spend 35% of the adult and dislocated worker allocations on training for high wage, by the end of the contract period. Currently the State is reassessing this goal to determine if the 35% goal is realistic and what expenditures are to be included in “training costs.”

- Fiscal reviews as February 28, 2009 show that 11.4 % of the adult allocation and 9.0% of the dislocated worker funding have been spent on training high wage occupations.
- If spending patterns continue, the programs will be at 18% at the end of the contract.

Outcome of Fiscal Review:

- **The program provider has systems in place to monitor and track expenses.**
- **Expenditures are on track and should continue to be monitored monthly.**
- **The Department of Workforce Development has yet to revise the high wage training allocation measure; however the providers should continue to emphasize training on high wage occupations while waiting for the revision.**
-

PERFORMANCE AND CASE FILE REVIEWS

Case File Reviews - Case files are reviewed in ASSET, the electronic tracking tool, quarterly. At least twenty case files are reviewed per quarter. The following is a summary of the case file review.

- All required screens are complete.
- Case notes were complete.
- Assessments were completed properly.
- Services for clients are appropriate and linked to assessments.
- During the reviews, feedback is given to strengthen services and the Individual Employment Plan(IEP)
- Client contact is occurring on a regular basis with only a few minor exceptions.

Outcome of review:

- **Current system for case file management ensures thorough and consistent documentation.**
- **Participants are required to maintain monthly or bimonthly contact with the Employment Coordinator while enrolled in the Adult and Dislocated Worker program(s). There seems to be a correlation between consistent contact and the client’s success; continue to strive for this level of interaction.**

Performance Review - Reviews of actual to planned enrollments and exits were performed by program. The following table shows the enrollments and exits through March 9, 2009.

Program	Enrollments			Exits		
	Planned	Actual	Percent	Planned	Actual	Percent
Adult	197	165	83.7%	114	36	31.6%
Dislocated Worker	232	350	150.9%	119	79	66.4%
NEG – Flood Grant	71	50	70.4%	71	27	38.0%

Based on Programmatic Plans and Reports

One of the WDB’s goals is to increase workforce diversity. Workforce Connections, Inc. was asked to report on the untapped labor pools that are represented in the WIA program.

	Untapped Labor Pools*					
	Adult Program			Dislocated Worker Program		
	PY08 7-01-08 6-30-09	PY07 7-01-07 6-30-08	Increase (Decrease)	PY08 7-01-08 6-30-09	PY07 7-01-07 6-30-08	Increase (Decrease)
Minorities	36	4	32	12	5	7
Older Workers	30	4	26	44	22	22
Veterans	8	8	0	20	19	1
Persons w/ Disabilities	12	10	2	8	9	(1)
Ex-Offenders	Not Tracked by State or Local System			Not Tracked by State or Local System		
TOTALS	86	26	60	84	55	28

*Data for Webi Reports is based on *registered* individuals reported in ASSET as of March 31, 2008.

**2008-2009 Continuous Improvement Report
October 19, 2009**

ASSET Reports, Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development

The performance standards are as listed. In order to meet the performance standards, a service provider must be at 85% of the standard. The following indicates the progress toward meeting the standard as of March 9, 2009.

Adult Performance Measures	Performance Standard	Actual	Status
Entered Employment Rate	79.9%	82.1%	Exceed
Six Months Retention Rate	88.0%	87.5%	Meet
Average Earnings	\$9,800	\$12,803	Exceed
Employment and Credential Attainment Rate	72.6%	80.0%	Exceed
Dislocated Worker Performance Measures	Performance Standard	Actual	Status
Entered Employment Rate	90.2%	96.4%	Exceed
Six Month Retention Rate	95.7%	100%	Exceed
Earnings Changed	\$14,400	\$12,933	Meet
Employment and Credential Attainment Rate	77.6%	90.5%	Exceed
NEG – Flood Grant	Performance Standard	Actual (as of 3-31-09)	Status
Entered Employment Rate (by end of grant period 6-30-09)	88.7% (75.4%)	70.4%	Fail
Customer Satisfaction Measures* <i>Reporting period 1-1-08 thru 12-31-08</i>	Performance Standard	Actual	Status
Participant Customer Satisfaction	82.8%	78.61%	Meet
Employer Customer Satisfaction	79.8%	80.42%	Exceed

2nd Quarter Report, as of March 3, 2009 – Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development

*1st Quarter Report due to 2nd Quarter Report being N/A – Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development.

Outcome of Performance Review

- Enrollment is well on track, and in the case of the Dislocated Worker program exceeding expectations at over 150 percent above our projected number. This was to be expected with the recent plant closings and worker releases.
- The exit percent (31.6%) for the WIA Adult program is lower than desired with only 2 ½ months left in the 2008 Program Year, but with the limited employment opportunities in the area we would expect to see this occurrence.
- The NEG – Flood Grant also has a lower than expected exit rate due to limited employment opportunities in the area.
- Last year’s concern with decreasing enrollments from the untapped labor pool is not a concern this year with large increase in participation in the WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker program. It is recommended that this measurement continue to be tracked to discern how much of this increase is reflective of the current economic situation.
- Performance standard attainment continues to be good with 70% of measures exceeded and 30% met.

CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATIONS

- The WIA programs continue to deliver appropriate and timely services and meet program standards.
- The State tracking system continues to cause reconciliation problems with our internal data. It is recommended that conversations regarding tracking complications continue with the State until they address the problem.
- Workforce Connections, Inc. should continue to focus on high wage, high demand occupations as the DWD works to re-set the measurement criteria.

The Disability Navigator Program is funded by the Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development to increase the employment and self-sufficiency for persons experiencing disabilities. The Disability Navigator operates from the Wisconsin Job Center – La Crosse County and is expected to assist individuals from the entire Workforce Delivery Area in “navigating” through the employment and training system. The Navigator also serves as a resource to the case manager in the job centers. Contracts were awarded to Independent Living Resources through a competitive process in 2003 and 2007.

PROCESS

The WDB Administrative Coordinator performed the 2009 continuous improvement/monitoring review of the Disability Navigator Program contracted through Independent Living Resources. The monitoring contained three separate reviews:

- Review of the self assessment survey follow-up submitted by Independent Living Resources
- Review of fiscal management through audit and internal fiscal reports
- Review of performance in meeting standards and/or goals.

SELF ASSESSMENT SURVEYS

The WDB Administrative Coordinator developed a follow-up survey to the 2008 self assessment surveys, based on past monitoring and continuous improvement processes. The survey was done to assess whether the program operators have systems in place to ensure compliance with all regulations. The surveys were due back by April 15, 2009.

Topic	Independent Living Resources
Staff and Partners	The Navigator provides the La Crosse One-Stop Job Center staff and partner agencies with resources on an as-needed basis, as well as training and technical assistance on disability-related issues as they affect the Job Centers. As a result, the La Crosse Job Center has an increased capacity to serve persons with disabilities by development systems and providing outreach through a variety of referral resources.
Meeting Performance Measurements	Staff is required to record daily activity in an internal management information system which runs monthly reports. These reports are compared to the agency strategic and advocacy plans to ensure all goals are being achieved and that work is being done to achieve the outcomes set forth by all funding source contracts. The Ethics and Quality Assurance Committee meets quarterly and reviews complaints, compliments and consumer satisfaction surveys.
Staff Training	The current Disability Navigator is a season professional with almost 20 years of experience living and working as a disability advocate. The Navigator attends all mandatory training that is required under the contract.
Program Recommendations	A possible mechanism to impact the overall effectiveness of the program would be to integrate peer support. Connecting peers and/or staff and clientele with similar experiences has a strong potential to improve the overall quality and outcome of the program.

“Review of Outcome” from 2009 follow-up survey

Outcome of Review:

- **Independent Living Resources has a professional, knowledgeable and dedicated Navigator in place to ensure the overall effectiveness and success of the program.**

FISCAL MONITORING

The capabilities for fiscal management were monitored through a review of independent audit reports. Independent Living Resources had a clean audit report.

Rather than using a straight line pattern, expenditures are planned using budget projections made by staff according to spending for client services and training.

PY08 expenditures to contract amounts were reviewed as of February 28, 2009.

	Contract Amount	Expenditures	Planned Expenditures	Percent Expended
Disability Navigator Program	\$65,547	\$41,197	67%	63%

Based on internal fiscal reports

Outcome of Fiscal Review:

- **Independent Living Resources has the capacities and processes in place for proper account recording, tracking and reporting.**
- **The program is on track for program expenditures.**

PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

The Western Wisconsin Workforce Development Board, Inc. has set for the expectation that the Disability Navigator Program serve all counties in the Workforce Delivery Area. The following table shows the breakout of the contacts by county for the 2008 Program Year as of March 31, 2009.

County	Contacts	Percent	Distribution of Population
Buffalo	16	.79%	4.8%
Crawford	29	1.43%	5.9%
Jackson	42	2.08%	6.9%
Juneau	74	3.66%	9.5%
La Crosse	1575	77.9%	37.9%
Monroe	170	8.41%	15.0%
Trempealeau	40	1.98%	9.8%
Vernon	76	3.76%	10.2%

Based on monthly reports from PY08

Cumulative Contacts January 2004 through February 2009

Workshops/Presentations	1808
Customer Contacts	<u>8730</u>
Cumulative Contacts (YTD)	10538

The following individuals/entities have made referrals to, and/or had contact with the Disability Navigator program during the month of March 2009.

ADRC of Western Wisconsin (La Crosse)-9	Family/friend-4
Western Wisconsin DPN	Northwest Wisconsin DPN
Bay Area DPN	Wisconsin DPN Project Coordinator
Wisconsin DPN State Lead	Onalaska Elementary School (Northern Hills)
CESA-4 Teacher of the Vision Impaired	ILR-Independent Living Specialist-7
WCI-Connections to Independence	Western Wisconsin Cares Employment Coordinator
VRNA Counselor-6	La Crosse Job Center Help Desk-8
WCI-Transportation Connections	Riverfront Inc.-WIPA
Challenge Unlimited	Onalaska High School Special Education
ADRC of Juneau County	DVR Counselor-Juneau County
Willows Assisted Living Center	Nasa-3
CVTC Disability Services Office	DVR Counselor-La Crosse-11
NFB Wisconsin (La Crosse Chapter)-3	Salvation Army-La Crosse-5
Handishop Industries Tomah	Workforce Connections-Independence Office
La Crosse County Clinical Services-4	DVR Counselor-Monroe County-2
Western Wisconsin Cares Case Manager-2	Wisconsin DNR ADA Coordinator
City of La Crosse Housing Authority	ADRC of Western Wisconsin (Monroe County)-2
Coulee Youth Center	University of Wisconsin La Crosse Disability Resource Services-2
La Crosse MTU ADA Coordinator	Disability Rights Wisconsin
Attic Correctional Facility-3	Gundersen-Lutheran HR-2
Cornerstone Community Church-2	Job Service-La Crosse-4
WCI-Dislocated Worker	Options to Independence ILC
Western TC Employment Services	City of La Crosse Police Department
La Crosse Main Public Library	Second Supper
ADRC of Western Wisconsin (Vernon County)	Western Region Office of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing
Wisconsin Council of the Blind (Regional Rep)	Office of the Blind (La Crosse region)
La Crosse County Economic Support-3	Vernon County Webmaster
La Crosse County Human Services	City of La Crosse Department of Public Works
La Crosse County Community Liaison Program	Western Technical College Occupational Therapy Assistant Program-2
La Crosse Tribune	GLITC (Great Lakes Inter Tribal Council)

Disability Navigator Program March 2009 Activity

- Presented information on Job Center services to approximately 30 Salvation Army residents;
- Attended and participated in the Customized Employment/Discovery training by Michael Callahan, and sponsored by Western Wisconsin Cares;
- Participated in the Project Action Paratransit-101 teleconference;
- Attended the La Crosse County Veterans Services Office program and services presentation;

- Attended a round-table meeting with Senator Dan Kapanke discussing the proposed budget cuts in programs that will have a direct impact on persons with disabilities;
- Presented to the UWL and WTC Recreational Therapy students on assistance technology for the blind; Participated in a Wisconsin Disability Program Navigator monthly teleconference call focused on program status and funding; and
- Assisted Northwest DPN in evaluating the Bayfield County website for accessibility under the auspices of 508 website requirements.

Outcome of Performance Review

- **Customer contact continues to be a high priority and well met goal of the Disability Navigator program.**
- **The activity log for the month of March is just a snippet of the time and commitment the Navigator, Steve Johnson, puts into his work. The Disability Navigator program is strongly represented at various programs and related events. Steve collaborates regularly with organizations throughout the Workforce Delivery Area.**

CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Independent Living Resources continues to successfully fulfill the requirements set forth in the WDA contract;**
- **Program performance continues to exceed expectation. A continuation of the current processes and practices is recommended.**

PROCESS

The WDB Administrative Coordinator performed the 2009 continuous improvement/monitoring review of the WIA youth program service providers, Couleecap, Inc. and Workforce Connections, Inc. The monitoring contained three separate reviews:

- Review of the self assessment survey follow-up submitted by the providers,
- Review of fiscal management through audit reports and
- Review of performance in meeting standards, enrollment goals and case file management.

SELF ASSESSMENT SURVEYS – FOLLOW UP

The WDB Administrative Coordinator developed a follow-up survey to the 2008 self assessment surveys, which were based on the “review of outcome” comments. The follow-up survey was created to assess whether the program operators have considered the recommendations offered in the 2008 Monitoring Report, and inquire of any updates to the 2008 self assessment survey. The follow-up surveys were distributed February 6, 2009 and were due back by March 1, 2009.

Follow-up Question:	Couleecap, Inc.	Workforce Connections, Inc.
(1) How have you dealt with the challenge(s) of maintaining support services during funding shortages?	Continually looking for other resources, other programs assist in enhancing support services and coordinate with other agencies to leverage additional resources.	Work with other agencies to offset costs and find service providers that offer services at no costs; e.g. high school tutoring program.
(2) How do you gather feedback from your program participants? How often? What types of information? With whom do you share this?	Face-to-face feedback is on-going and phone surveys have also been conducted. The Youth Coordinators share their findings with the Dept. Director.	Surveys have been attempted but receive little response so face-to-face interaction is the first approach. Information is shared at monthly Best Practice meetings.
(3) An observation recommended that an annual review of Cost Allocations take place and that the review be documented. Has this recommendation been taken into consideration?	Yes, this review has been completed.	DID NOT APPLY
(4) An observation recommended that travel voucher destinations be clearly defined. Has this recommendation been taken into consideration?	Yes, Staff will document more detail and clearly define their destination on travel vouchers when traveling during the program.	DID NOT APPLY

Responses from follow-up to the 2009 follow-up self-assessment surveys

Outcome of Review: Both organizations are continually searching for additional resources to support and/or enhance their program(s), as well as those that may leverage

costs or provide services at no cost. Gathering feedback from youth participants still poses a problem. It is recommended that an online medium, such as a blog, be considered for continuous communication.

FISCAL MONITORING

Program providers' spending was reviewed. Both providers submitted budgets with annual expenditures rather than by quarterly expenditure plans. Therefore, expenditures were reviewed according to a straight line. The spending as of January 31, 2009 should represent 58.33% of the total.

	Contract	Expenditures	Percent
Couleecap, Inc.	\$160,422.00	\$91,332.96	56.9%
Workforce Connections, Inc.	\$83,010.57	\$49,791.54	60.0%

Based on fiscal reports.

The capabilities for fiscal management were monitored through a review of independent audit reports.

- Workforce Connections, Inc. had a clean audit report. Minor observations were noted which are being addressed by the organization.
- Couleecap, Inc. submitted their audit report which was reviewed by the Director of Finance. No issues were found.

Outcome of Review: Couleecap, Inc. is spending in line with their budget. Workforce Connections, Inc. is slightly over. Expenditures should continue to be monitored monthly. Both organizations should continue to submit audit reports annually.

PERFORMANCE AND CASE FILE REVIEWS

Case files are reviewed in ASSET, the State's electronic tracking tool, on a regular basis. Five (5) random case file reviews were requested from Leigh Kinyon, who performs quarterly case file reviews on behalf of the WDB. Two (2) random case files per case manager, for a total of ten (10), were requested by the WDB Administrative Coordinator for review. The following was evaluated:

- All required screens were complete.
- Case notes were complete.
- Assessments were completed properly.
- During the reviews, feedback was given to strengthen services and the Individual Service Strategy (ISS)
- There was good correlation between assessment results, ISS development and goals.
- There was good collaboration with other service providers.

Couleecap, Inc.	Workforce Connections, Inc.
A lack of documented discussions regarding budgeting information was found.	A lack of documented discussion regarding budgeting information was found.
Career exploration variety seems to be lacking in a few cases.	Career exploration variety seems to be lacking in a few cases.

Outcome of review: Both service providers are consistent in youth contact, ASSET* documentation and case progression. There is little evidence of financial literacy discussion in the case files and the same was noted in the majority of the case file reviews.

While this does not indicate financial literacy discussions do not take place, it is recommended that the discussions be better documented. This same observation occurred in the last monitoring cycle. Service Providers chosen under the RFP process for 2009-2010 should be clear on the expectation of proper documentation.

A greater focus on demand-driven and emerging-industry job searches is also recommended.

Continuous Improvement Process
Monitoring of WIA Youth Program
Report to Youth Council
March 31, 2009

The performance standards and goals for caseloads are listed. In order to meet the performance standards, a service provider must be at 80% of the standard.

YOUNGER YOUTH (14 to 18) Reporting Period thru February 9, 2009		WDA 9	Couleecap, Inc. La Crosse, Vernon, and Monroe	Workforce Connections, Inc. Buffalo, Trempealeau, Jackson, Juneau and Crawford			
Percent of WDA's Youth Funding (Funding Levels)			63.5%	36.5%			
Younger Youth (14 -18) Performance Measurements	Standard	Actual Performance					
Skill attainment Rate*	94.0%	77.3% (Meet)		MEET: Data is not discernible in current reporting system.			
Youth Diploma or Equivalent	83.0%	93.3% (Exceed)		13/15 86.6% (Exceed)			
Retention Rate	81.8%	86.7% (Meet)		10/10 100.0% (Exceed)			
			7/8 87.5% (Exceed)	2/4 50.0% (Fail)			
			Data Discrepancy				
			Data Discrepancy				
Case loads Younger Youth		Negotiated	Actual	Negotiated	Actual	Negotiated	Actual
Actual Active Caseload – July 1 st		(69)	70	(46)	47	(23)	23
New Enrollments (to-date)		(26)	8	(15)	3	(11)	5
Exits (to-date)		(22)	12	(12)	8	(10)	4
Total Active Caseload (to-date)		(73)	66	(49)	42	(24)	24
Case loads Younger Youth		Negotiated	Actual	Negotiated	Actual	Negotiated	Actual
Total Follow-up caseload – July 1 st		(27)	26	(12)	16	(15)	10
Plus New Exits (to-date)		(22)	12	(12)	8	(10)	4
Moved to Inactive (to-date)		(27)	13	(12)	4	(15)	9
Total Follow-Up Case Loads (to-date)		(22)	25	(12)	20	(10)	5
Total Active Plus Follow Up Case Loads (to-date)		(95)	91	(61)	62	(34)	29
Skill Attainment Rate is an estimate based on rolling quarters.							

Performance Measurement rates are taken from ASSET; Planned and Follow up numbers are taken from Management Reports.

Continuous Improvement Process
Monitoring of WIA Youth Program
Report to Youth Council
March 31, 2009

OLDER YOUTH (19 to 21) As of February 09, 2009		WDA 9	Coulecap, Inc. La Crosse, Vernon, and Monroe			Workforce Connections, Inc. Buffalo, Trempealeau, Jackson, Juneau and Crawford		
Percent of WDA's Youth Funding (Funding Levels)			63.5%			36.5%		
Older Youth (19-21) Performance Measures	Standard	Actual Performance						
Entered Employment Rate	77.0%	100.0% (Exceed)		0/1	0%	(Fail)	2/2	100.0% (Exceed)
Retention Rate	89.0%	100.0% (Exceed)		3/3	100.0%	(Exceed)	1/1	100.0% (Exceed)
Six Months Earnings Change	\$4,575	\$4,984	(Meet)	3/3	-	Null	1/1	- Null
Credential Attainment Rate	71.0%	50.0%	(Fail)	0/0	-	Null	2/4	50.0% (Fail)
Active Case loads Older Youth		Negotiated	Actual	Negotiated	Actual	Negotiated	Actual	
Active July 1st		(58)	60	(47)	51	(11)	9	
New Enrollments (to-date)		(30)	13	(14)	9	(16)	4	
Exits (to-date)		(20)	15	(13)	11	(7)	4	
Total Active Caseload (to-date)		(68)	58	(48)	49	(20)	9	
Follow Up Caseloads Older Youth		Negotiated	Actual	Negotiated	Actual	Negotiated	Actual	
Total Follow-up caseload July 1st		(22)	26	(13)	18	(9)	8	
(Plus) New Exits		(20)	16	(13)	11	(7)	5	
Moved to Inactive		(21)	6	(13)	2	(8)	4	
Total Follow-Up Case Loads (to-date)		(21)	36	(13)	27	(8)	9	
Total Case Loads		(89)	94	(61)	76	(28)	18	
** Older Youth Performance Measures rely on data from Unemployment Insurance, and individual rates are difficult to determine at the local level, due to WRIS confidentiality measures.								

Performance Measurement rates are taken from ASSET; Planned and Follow up numbers are taken from Management Reports.

Couleecap, Inc. represents 63.5% of funding; and 72.1% of active cases. Workforce Connections, Inc. represents 36.5% of funding and 27.9% of active cases.

	Active	Follow-up	Total cases
Couleecap, Inc.			
Younger Youth	42	20	62
Older Youth	49	27	76
Total	91	47	138
Workforce Connections, Inc.			
Younger Youth	24	5	29
Older Youth	9	9	18
Total	33	14	47
Combined	124	61	185

Reports based on ASSET Reporting

Outcome of Review: Couleecap Inc. and Workforce Connections, Inc. are on target in total active caseloads for younger and older youth. Both providers are behind in new enrollments for younger and older youth, and also behind in younger youth exits to-date; Workforce Connections, Inc. being slightly more behind. With only 4 months left in the program year, there is not much time left to recruit strong program participants. The end of PY08 will bring with it a new program management format; this includes the implementation of the Workforce Development Board (WDB) Youth Unit. This change in format also spurred the release of the WIA Youth Program RFP. With the potential for new providers, the active caseload shortcomings may reflect the current providers' preparation for transition.

Report reconciliation is a concern again this year. The reporting data for youth performance measurements is not tracked on an internal system. There is no way to reconcile against the state's youth performance data. It is recommended that the Youth Unit evaluate this need to see if an easy tracking system can be put in place.

The state's reporting on older youth has discrepancies as well, in regards to the sharing of wages. This becomes an issue when trying to report on the six (6) months earnings change and credential attainment rate.

It is also recommended that the Youth Unit look into the merit of putting more than one skill goal set in ASSET*. Setting more than one skill and failing to meet the goal can negatively impact the outcome. The state only requires one skill goal be set in a program year (up to 3 can be counted towards performance in a program year).

The review also looked at the length of time participants were enrolled. The following table shows the tenure for the youth carried over into the present program year and those exited during the present program year.

Year of Enrollment	Couleecap OLDER Youth		Couleecap YOUNGER Youth		Workforce Connections OLDER Youth		Workforce Connections YOUNGER Youth	
	Enrolled	PY08 Exits	Enrolled	PY08 Exits	Enrolled	PY08 Exits	Enrolled	PY08 Exits
2001	-	-	1	0	-	-	-	-
2002	1	1	2	0	-	-	-	-
2003	4	1	3	1	-	-	1	0
2004	7	5	4	0	1	0	2	1
2005	9	1	10	5	3	2	2	0
2006	6	2	10	3	3	2	2	1
2007	15	2	16	1	2	1	8	1
2008	7	0	5	0	0	-	4	1
TOTALS	49	12	51	10	9	5	19	4

Report based on ACCESS reporting

Outcome of Review: While Couleecap, Inc. has been working hard to exit older youth who have been in the system for more than two years, there still seems to be an abundance of older youth in the system. It is recommended that older youth in the system for more than 2 years be evaluated more closely and put on the fast track to completion, or exited from the program.

CONCLUSION

This year's follow-up assessment confirms that the youth program service providers are continuing to successfully meet program requirements; both programmatically and fiscally. There are still discrepancies with performance reporting for younger and older youth; this, and other areas of concern are:

- Reconciling the Younger Youth performance standard report(s). A system for internal tracking of youth performance measurements has not been established. The ASSET report(s) provided by the Department of Workforce Development (DWD); in which the data is cumbersome and/or important filtering criteria is missing, is the only data source. Even the state has issued statements saying, "There are small differences in our reports." "Each performance measure has its own timeframe and can't be exactly duplicated.";
- Tracking Older Youth's 6 month earnings change and credential attainment. Due to restrictions in wage sharing between states, this information isn't always accurate in the ASSET report. The WDB Youth Unit does track Older Youth performance standards internally but again the state restrictions apply. Unless providers are able to continue follow-up contact with all participants, accurate performance measurement tracking will be problematic; and

- **A successfully tool for measuring participant satisfaction has yet to be incorporated into the overall program evaluation. It is equally important to show outcome measurements as it is to show performance measurements. A participant's attitude and behavior towards the program can impact their performance and success rate.**



**Reports to the Western Wisconsin Workforce Development Board Planning Committee
Shades of Green
ARRA Summer Youth Program
Monitoring Report
September 14, 2009**

PROCESS

The WDB Youth Program Coordinator performed the monitoring review of the 2009 ARRA Summer Youth Employment Program providers, Couleecap, Inc. and Workforce Connections, Inc. The monitoring contained information from:

- Review of overall program including selected worksite and case file monitoring
- Review of SYP plan adherence
- Review of monthly reporting from each provider

WORKSITE MONITORING

The WDB Youth Program Coordinator developed the worksite interview form to be used to monitor SYP worksites. The worksite interview form was developed to ensure worksites were providing a safe and productive work experience for the youth placed there. All of the worksites listed below were monitored in conjunction with the State monitoring that took place the week of July 13-17, 2009. One issue that seemed to recur throughout the worksite monitoring was that several of the youth that were interviewed stated their interests were not taken into account regarding their worksite placement. These youth stated their placement would not have been their first choice had they been given a choice. It was also noted that the worksite supervisors all stated that they had maintained contact with the employment coordinators on a regular basis.

The following chart shows the result of each worksite monitoring visit:

Worksite	Couleecap, Inc.	Workforce Connections, Inc.
Norskadalen	Youth was not coming to work, had to be let go. Worksite stated there was good communication with CC staff.	
LaCrosse Co Hazardous Waste	Interview with worksite was done by State monitor. There were no issues with the site. Provided adequate safety training and equipment. Youth was tearing down computers for recycling. Youth was satisfied with placement	
Worksite	Couleecap, Inc.	Workforce Connections, Inc.
Hillview Life Center	Youth were exposed to organic gardening practices. There was also informal intergenerational mentoring taking place. Youth placed at the site were happy with the placement. No issues were found.	
TLC Center	Worksite supervisor was very enthusiastic about program. Youth placed at the site enjoyed the work. There were no issues found.	
Couleecap Bargain Boutique		Youth placed at this worksite worked with donated items for reuse. Youth were learning the importance of reusing items as a way of decreasing consumption. No issues were found.
Karner Blue Butterfly Club		Youth placed at this site participated in planting, cultivating and maintaining flower gardens. Youth was taught about green practices. No issues were found.
UW-Extension 4-H		Youth placed at this site was teaching younger children about alternative power sources. No issues were found.
Western Dairyland Fresh Start		Youth placed at this site were taught green building practices. No issues were found.
Gilbert Brown Foundation		Youth placed at this site was helping to organize the office to go paperless. One issue was found-provider was specifically told not to use this site. Site was used due to another worksite dropping out at the last minute. Was nonprofit.

Outcome of monitoring:

Both providers utilized non- profit, green worksites for the most part. All of the worksites monitored were found to be in compliance of child labor laws as applicable. All of the worksites were also found to be safe and provided safety training as needed. The youth placed at the worksites of both providers were provided with a meaningful, productive work experience.

CASE FILE MONITORING

Both paper case files as well as ASSET files were reviewed for the ARRA SYP. A total of 22 out of 102 files were reviewed.

- All required screens were accurately completed
- All required paperwork and documentation were in files
- Case notes were up to date
- ISS was developed for each youth
- Work readiness goals were set
- Paper files were complete and logically put together

Couleecap, Inc.	Workforce Connections, Inc.
All case notes up to date	All case notes up to date
Goals set	Goals set
All screens completed	All screens completed

Outcome of monitoring:

Both providers had all necessary paperwork and documentation contained in the files. The state monitor did note some data validation issues for each provider but all issues were addressed and immediately corrected. No further follow up was required.

ADHERANCE TO SYP PLAN

Both providers were given the WDB's SYP plan to use as a guide in the development of their programs.

Plan elements	Coulecap, Inc.	Workforce Connections, Inc.
Timetable For Implementation	Followed timetable for start/end of program activities	Followed timetable for start/end of program activities
Program design	Well designed program.	Well designed program.
Worksites	Did use a for profit site but that site was found to meet WDB requirements.	Did use one worksite that they were specifically told by the Youth Council as well as WDB Youth Program Coordinator not to use. Worksite was used due to another worksite pulling out at the last minute.
Scheduling/Pay	Paid youth \$7.25 for up to 24 hours per week.	Youth were paid \$7.25 for up to 30 hours per week.
Orientation Week	All required elements were provided during orientation.	All required elements were provided during orientation week.
Determining Eligibility	Overall paperwork and supporting documentation was received prior to program starting, although not within the 10-day period allowable for edit checks. Two youth were found to be ineligible; one was given a 5% window the other did not follow through.	It was noted that 2 case managers did not get paperwork and documentation to WDB Youth unit before program start. One youth was found to be over income and was given a 5% window
Performance	On track to meet performance	On track to meet performance
Other Requirements	Used blogs or journals All other requirements were met.	Used blogs or journals All other requirements were met.

OUTCOME OF MONITORING:

Based on the plan provided by the WDB both providers followed the plan and implemented quality SYP programs. The only issues noted were the youth found to not be eligible by both providers, as well as the delay in the paperwork getting to the WDB Youth Unit from Workforce Connections, Inc. The delay in the receipt of the paperwork presented possible issues with disallowed costs and monitoring issues. Steps need to be taken to ensure this will not happen in the future. The processes that were in place were well known by both providers since they were the same processes used for the WIA Youth program.

REVIEW OF PROVIDERS MONTHLY REPORTS

Based on the planned allocation formula each provider was expected to enroll a specific number of youth. The following chart demonstrates the estimated number of youth each provider was expected to enroll. These numbers do not reflect the 5 youth placed at the DNR sites.

Workforce Connections, Inc.	Participants-Planned	Participants-Actual	Participants-Completed
Buffalo	5	5	5
Trempealeau	9	9	7
Jackson	7	7	7
Crawford	7	7	6
Juneau	9	9	8
Total Workforce Connections, Inc.	37	37	33
Couleecap, Inc.	Participants-Planned	Participants-Actual	Participants-Completed
Monroe	16	16	13
Vernon	12	12	11
LaCrosse	36	36	27
Total Couleecap, Inc.	64	64	51
TOTAL WDA	101	101	84

OUTCOME OF MONITORING:

Both providers met or exceeded the number of youth they needed to enroll.

Workforce Connections Inc. had 33 out of 37 youth complete the program

Workforce Connections, Inc. had 36 out of 37 youth increase work readiness skills by at least 10%

CouleeCAP Inc. had 51 out of 64 youth complete the program

CouleeCAP Inc. had 51 out of 64 youth increase work readiness skills by at least 10%

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The ARRA SYP only had one measure of performance which was an increase in work readiness skills. The SYP plan stated that a 10% increase in work readiness skills was needed. It was determined that this measure of performance has successfully been met. 85% of all youth or 86 out of 101 met or exceeded a 10% increase in their work readiness skills. The overall program completion rate was 83% with 84 of 101 youth completing the program.

CONCLUSION

Both providers have done an excellent job putting together the SYP given the lack of time and guidance provided. The following observations were made based on the monitoring of the SYP:

- The State Monitor noted beginning and ending dates should be added to worksite agreements
- The State Monitor noted that Couleecap, Inc. did not have dates on several of their worksite agreements
- The State monitoring report has not been received but the exit conference indicated that both providers had quality programs and there were no findings or observations
- Complete and accurate reporting in ASSET was noted
- Providers required youth to use journals or blog in order to meet basic skills requirements
- A strong emphasis was placed on green jobs
- Youth were provided with a well thought out, comprehensive orientation before being placed at worksites
- Both providers did have youth that were found to not be eligible
- Workforce Connections, Inc. did have issues with paperwork and required documentation not getting to the WDB Youth Unit on time
- Both providers are on track to meet work readiness skill increase of 10% for each youth
- Both providers are also on track to meet program completion rate measure
- All worksites were found to be in compliance with all applicable state and federal labor laws
- All youth that were interviewed felt they were getting something out of their SYP experience
- Both providers were found to be maintaining regular communication with both the youth and worksites
- Both providers intend to provide 1 quarter of follow up to all youth

RECOMMENDATIONS

The WDB Youth Unit offers the following recommendations for providers:

- Have procedures/timelines in place in order to ensure paperwork and documentation is received prior to participation
- Ensure proper documentation of income, barriers, and other eligibility elements accompany paperwork when it is sent to the WDB Youth Unit for review
- Properly determine eligibility prior to submitting paperwork
- Add beginning and end dates to worksite agreements
- Ensure all worksite agreements are signed and dated prior to youth starting work
- Assess youth interest in regard to worksite placement prior to placement.