
# DWD WDIS Evidence Plan
# July 2025 to June 2026

**Department of Workforce Development**
**Workforce Data Integration System**
**wdis@dwd.wisconsin.gov**
**Version: June 2025**

| #1: Relationship between training services and employment outcomes | |
|---|---|
| Learning Questions | What individual characteristics and training services funded by different workforce programs predict employment outcomes (specifically employment rates and wages)? |
| Data/Information Needed | Workforce Data Integration System (WDIS) Longitudinal Workforce Database (LWD) as a main data source. |
| Funding Source(s) | WDIS Cost Sharing / Workforce Data Quality Initiative (WDQI) Sustainment |
| Researcher(s) | Internal Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development (DWD) staff on WDIS Research and Evaluation Team. |
| Methods (Type) | The main component is an evaluation, more specifically a longitudinal data analysis, to study the relationship between training services and employment outcomes, controlling for demographics and employment influencers. Evaluators will pull and analyze data using a regression analysis, such as a hierarchical logistic regression analysis or similar analysis, to measure the strength of the relationship. The three specific areas of interest for training services are career pathways, work-based learning, and credential attainment.<br><br>Cohort 1: services received by adults who exited from April 2019 to March 2020.<br>Cohort 2: services received by adults who exited from Jan 2022 to Dec 2022.<br><br>In a preliminary analysis, "The Influence of Demographics and Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act (WIOA) Employment and Training Services on Employment Outcomes for Teenagers," specifically modeled the impact of employment and training services funded by the Workforce Innovation Opportunity Act (WIOA) for teens with disabilities and their families. The article highlights the critical role of coordinated employment-focused services in enhancing employment outcomes for youth and families facing unique challenges, and stresses how co-enrollment across WIOA Title (I, III and IV) and partner (youth apprenticeship) programs was associated with improved employment rates and wages. |
| Challenges | Evaluation questions will be limited by the variables available in the LWD. Findings will be correlational, so impact cannot be assessed directly. Economic conditions during this period may have an influence on results. Finding an adequate comparison group for this analysis is limited to the data available in the LWD. |
| Dissemination Strategies | Dissemination strategies should include sharing results and sharing implications for potential policy and practice change. Also, next steps for evaluation and/or evidence building in this area should be identified. Evaluators should determine who and how to best share this information to maximize learning from this evaluation effort. Sharing of evaluation results should be vetted through appropriate communication and leadership staff. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Focus of dissemination will be through the performance advisory committee, and with Bureau of Workforce Training governance, including local program liaisons. Findings will also be shared with DWD individual staff managing or implementing programs included in the evaluation. The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) communications team may feature findings on their webpage. Findings will be presented to the Council on Workforce Investment and Wisconsin Workforce Development Association with discussions on how to use what was found.<br><br>Share findings externally with research and evaluation community and with professional organizations such as the Wisconsin Workforce Development Association (WWDA), and as relevant will share with affinity groups (for example, disability groups, race/ethnicity groups, geographic groups, socioeconomic groups).<br><br>Draft a long-term communication plan, with talking points, as well as communication goals for specific milestones (scorecard). Highlight how findings may inform practice or policy changes, technical assistance, and/or trainings. |
| **#2: Tracking unemployment insurance (UI) trends by industry, occupation, individual characteristics, education, and location** | |
| Learning Question | Does likelihood to claim, number of UI claimants, UI duration, fiscal trends of UI claimants, and/or time to reemployment vary by industry, occupation, individual characteristics, education, and location? |
| Data/Information Needed | UI Claim data: UI claims, week enddate of initial claim, region, individual characteristics, education, UI wage data (prior to UI claim), industry, occupation.<br><br>UI Wage file: quarterly UI wages, employer, industry<br><br>New Hire file: new hire date, employer, industry<br><br>Local economic information: unemployment rates, percent local workforce by industry. |
| Funding Source(s) | Coleridge Democratizing Data Challenge / WDIS Cost Sharing / Workforce Data Quality Initiative (WDQI) Sustainment |
| Researcher(s) | Internal DWD staff on WDIS Research and Evaluation Team, Bureau of Workforce Information and Technical Support staff, UI staff |
| Methods | Build additional dashboards (as data allows) including likelihood to claim, fiscal trends, and time to reemployment.<br><br>Note: The data team shared how previous data analytics have been used to assess equity during a WorkforceGPS - Workforce Data as an Equity Lever: Current and Emerging Resources webinar in April 2024. Unemployment to reemployment dashboards that vary by demographics, geography, occupation, and industry created in the ADRF are now being tested and shared with workforce partners. |
| Challenges | Ensure data quality is sufficient for analyses. Obtain necessary agreements. Ensure adequate business data testing prior to implementation. Determine |

| | |
|---|---|
| | location and access to portals. Support use of portals for local workforce data-based decision-making. |
| Dissemination Strategies | Dissemination strategies should include sharing results and sharing implications for potential policy and practice change. Potential use for development of layoff aversion strategies under DWD's Rapid Response program. Evaluators should determine who and how to best share this information to maximize learning from this evidence-building effort. Sharing of evidence should be vetted through appropriate communication and leadership staff.<br><br>Aim of dissemination will be to develop an interactive internal or public-facing dashboard that will provide up-to-date data to aid workforce training and business support based on unemployment claim trends by region, demographics, education, industry, and occupation. |
| **#3: Reemployment Services and Eligibility Assessments (RESEA) Impact and Process Evaluation** | |
| Learning Questions | 1. Confirmatory impact analysis:<br>a. Do RESEA participants have higher a) reemployment rates; and b) median earnings the second full calendar quarter following the start of a participant's unemployment claim (UIPL 01-20) compared to UI claimants in a comparable comparison or control group who do not receive RESEA program services?<br>b. Do RESEA participants have a lower number of weeks with UI benefits compared to UI claimants in a comparable comparison or control group who do not receive RESEA program services?<br>2. Exploratory analyses:<br>a. Does an additional RESEA session enhance RESEA impacts by further reducing UI benefit length and/or further increasing employment rates, and/or wages?<br>b. Do RESEA treatment effects vary by service delivery mode (virtual vs. in-person sessions)?<br>c. Do RESEA treatment effects vary by regional area and/or participant demographic groups? (Regional and demographic analysis)<br>d. Do the RESEA online assessment scores correlate with outcomes?<br>3. Process/implementation evaluation:<br>a. Are RESEA services consistently implemented and provided across RESEA regional areas and participant demographic groups? (Fidelity of intervention)<br>b. How do RESEA services delivery vary (e.g., quality of service delivery of single or multiple sessions, virtual or in-person service delivery, timing, or delivery of RESEA service components)? (Process analysis) |
| Data/Information Needed | RESEA participation, control/comparison group, number of sessions, RESEA services delivered, session mode (in person, virtual), online assessment scores, UI duration, UI wages. |
| Funding Source(s) | RESEA federal funding for evaluation. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Researcher(s) | Actus Policy Research in partnership with American Institutes for Research; internal RESEA, UI, WDIS, and Information Technology Center Services (ITCS) staff provide content expertise for evaluation. |
| Methods | DWD contracted with Actus, an external evaluator, to conduct a randomized controlled trial experimental research design with a treatment and control group (preferred) or a rigorous quasi-experimental design with a treatment and comparison group. The trial started in March 2022 and continued through December 2023.<br><br>Wisconsin RESEA program currently has a contract with Actus to provide evaluation of RESEA and RESEA services. Evaluation includes a confirmatory analysis, exploratory analysis, and process/implementation evaluation. The confirmatory analysis includes random assignment and aims to assess if RESEA participants have better employment outcomes and smaller use of UI benefits. The exploratory analyses aim to assess if an additional RESEA session, quality of service delivery improves outcomes, and assesses if differences in outcomes are observed based on region, participant demographics, and/or online assessment scores. Finally, the process/implementation evaluation aims to assess the consistency of implementation, quality of service delivery, compare virtual and in-person service delivery, and track the timing and delivery of different RESEA service components.<br><br>Results to date are available via the annual report. To date researchers have found that the RESEA program is associated with increased access to job counseling (with 61% of RESEA participants accessing job counseling services compared to 3% of control participants), reduced duration of weeks receiving UI (averaging 0.7 less weeks on UI), UI savings averaging $237 per participant, and a reduced likelihood of exhausting benefits by 0.9 percentage points. The final report of the impact, exploratory, and process evaluation is due July 2025. |
| Challenges | The impact evaluation must use a research design that can qualify for a high or moderate rating from Clearinghouse for Labor Evaluation and Research (CLEAR), based on the standards set forth in the CLEAR Causal Evidence Guidelines, Version 2.1. The study must also be powered to be able to detect impacts with what Unemployment Insurance Program Letters (UIPL) 1-20 describes as "strong statistical confidence" ($p < .05$).<br><br>Past research indicates a sample size of at least 10,000 individuals is needed to detect whole program impacts, and even larger sample sizes are needed to confirm component impacts (see the RESEA Evaluation Toolkit).Therefore, depending on sample sizes, component analyses will likely be exploratory. |
| Dissemination Strategies | Dissemination strategies should include sharing results and sharing implications for potential policy and practice change. Also, next steps for evidence building in this area should be identified. Evaluators should determine who and how to best share this information to maximize learning from this evidence building effort. Sharing of evidence should be vetted through appropriate communication and leadership staff.<br><br>Share internally with relevant job center and UI management and field staff. Share with federal partners including the Department of Labor, the Employment and Training Administration, and Abt Associates Inc. Share on CLEAR, Workforce |

| | |
|---|---|
| | GPS, and other resource pages. May share with congress. Share internally with DWD peers (e.g., with other division administrators, Information Technology Management Board). Utilize webinars and podcasts like an evidence forum to facilitate knowledge brokering. Share outcomes with sponsors to lead to ideas for evidence-building for others. Cultivate awareness, knowledge, and support of stakeholders to develop champions. Note: utilize translation resources such as the Center on Knowledge Translation for Disability & Rehabilitation Research and these knowledge translation strategies. |
| **#4: Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) Career Pathways Advancement Initiative Evaluation** | |
| Learning Questions | 1. Did DVR enroll at least 500 consumers in the Wisconsin Career Advancement Initiative with an aim to advance their careers in a career pathway? What were the enrollment numbers by WDA, by race and ethnicity, and by disability type?<br>2. Do at least 40% of participants co-enroll in DVR and another workforce training program?<br>3. After partner training, do at least 80% of training providers and employers report they consider people with disabilities, including people with disabilities of color as valuable candidates for career advancement?<br>4. After DVR Career Advancement training, do at least 80% of DVR staff report they understand how to use career pathways and labor market information as part of career counseling?<br>5. Do at least 80% of participants enter a Department of Public Instruction regional healthcare, manufacturing, construction, or digital technology career pathway?<br>6. Do at least 55% of participants participate in training within the career pathway?<br>7. Do at least half (50%) of participants achieve a measurable skills gain and/or credential during the grant?<br>8. Do at least one-third (33%) of participants obtain competitive integrated employment (CIE) within a healthcare, manufacturing, construction, or digital technology regional career pathway?<br>9. Of those participants who exit in CIE, is at least 67% of participants' average hourly wage higher than prior to receiving services?<br>10. Of those participants who exit in CIE, is at least 50% of participants' hours worked per week at exit in CIE higher than prior to receiving services?<br>11. Do at least 5% of project participants report they received a promotion or additional responsibility resulting in an increase in salary?<br>12. Do at least one-third (33%) of participants exit in CIE with employer-provided medical benefits?<br>13. Do at least half (50%) of participants report earned income as the primary source of support at the time they exit in CIE?<br>14. Do no more than 10% of participants report public benefits (e.g., SSI, SSDI, and/or TANF, and state or local benefits) as their primary source of support at the time they exit in CIE? |

| | |
|---|---|
| Data/Information Needed | Most data will be collected from DVR's case management system, Integrated Rehabilitation Information System (IRIS). Additional data will be collected via administrative co-enrollment reports (e.g., WIOA co-enrollment report, data report in LWD). Data that do not exist in current administrative data sets will be collected via a project survey. |
| Funding Source(s) | Rehabilitation Services Administration Disability Innovation Fund – Career Advancement Initiative Model Demonstration Project. |
| Researcher(s) | Internal DVR Career Pathways Advancement Initiative staff and Wisconsin Center for Education Research. |
| Methods | The Wisconsin Career Advancement Initiative evaluation plan uses a structured, methodical, systematic, data-driven approach aimed at providing information to guide project implementation decisions with confidence, in a timely manner, and that can be measured accurately. To accomplish these tasks, the evaluation plan follows several key operational principles: (a) adequate and objective evaluation capacity by using a dedicated, expert evaluation entity; (b) a centralized design and monitoring approach; (c) full input and participation by target audiences and stakeholders; and (d) utilization of the most rigorous design and data collection strategies possible. In addition, researchers use the DVR Career Pathways logic model as the organizing framework that provides a systematic view of key operational aspects and evaluation components; a measurement focus that incorporates both implementation (formative) and impact (summative) data; and a data-driven approach whereby key program evaluation objectives will be closely associated with the mission and project goals of Wisconsin Career Advancement Initiative and measurement data. Each evaluation objective will be linked to specific tasks, a facilitator (responsible party), a timetable, as well as implementation and outcome indicators.<br><br>As of early March 2025, 1,071 DVR consumers have enrolled in the Wisconsin Career Pathways Advancement Initiative, with 56% in healthcare, 24% in digital/information technology, 11% in manufacturing, and 9% in construction. To date, 92% have started training, 52% have obtained a measurable skill gain and/or credential. As of March 2025, 100 participants were employed in the following career clusters at exit: Healthcare (50%); Digital/Information Technology (7%), Manufacturing (28%), and Construction (15%). In looking at program partnerships, 37% of the career advancement participants had co-enrolled in partner employment and/or training program (including WIOA Title I and III and apprenticeship), and 24 participants co-enrolled in WIOA Title II program. Developed partner tools include Wisconsin Career Pathways and Hot Job Pathways Examples). |
| Challenges | The Wisconsin Career Pathways Advancement Initiative is a complex and multi-component project with multiple partners. It requires a comprehensive, consistent, and objective evaluation to assess progress and outcomes in each proposed activity. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Dissemination Strategies | The Wisconsin Career Advancement Initiative will result in an evaluation report that will detail the overall project outcome, the type of effect of the program (e.g., positive effect), and the contribution, or lack thereof, of different intervention components on the intended outcomes. This will support the utilization of the findings by other agencies to identify specific approaches to career pathways that at least have a potentially positive effect on the obtaining and maintaining of enhanced career outlook. The evaluation report will also incorporate the findings from qualitative data analysis toward the identification of potential barriers to implementation, outcomes, or sustainability of the project. |
| **#5: DWD Service alignment foundational fact finding** | |
| Learning Questions | 1. What are the enrollment and co-enrollment patterns across all WIOA partners and apprenticeship?<br>2. Do patterns of enrollment and co-enrollment vary by demographics (race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, veteran status)?<br>3. Do wages earned vary by program completion, co-enrollment, service type, region, demographics, and/or trade?<br>4. Does apprenticeship and WIOA Title I co-enrollment improve credential attainment performance metrics?<br>5. What career, training, support, and business services influence WIOA performance metrics, employment rates, wages, credential attainment, measurable skill gains, and employment retention with the same employer two and four quarters after exit? |
| Data/Information Needed | Counts of program participation. Matching participations across programs. Demographics and individual characteristics. UI wage amounts, employer, and industry data. Credential attainment. Measurable skill gains. Career, training, support, and business service information. |
| Funding Source(s) | WDIS MOU shared funds, ARPA Program Schedule 9 Workforce Data Quality Initiative Sustainment, and WIOA Sec. 134 funding. |
| Researcher(s) | Internal WDIS and WIOA staff. |
| Methods | 1. Add Apprenticeship to WIOA co-enrollment reports.<br>2. Add demographics (race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability veterans) to co-enrollment reports.<br>3. Add other WIOA partners (e.g., Wisconsin Works, FoodShare Employment and Training, and Corrections) to the WIOA co-enrollment reports.<br>4. Run data analytics on the association between program participation, co-enrollment, individual characteristics, services, and performance metrics.<br>5. In the meantime, for programs not in existing WIOA co-enrollment dashboard, use the LWD to pull co-enrollment reports for WIOA partners located at DWD. |
| Challenges | Time to implement appropriate data sharing agreements may delay implementation. Need sufficient time and resources. Need to prioritize activities and may need time to complete each piece. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Dissemination Strategies | Evaluators should determine who and how to best share this information to maximize learning from this evidence building effort. Sharing of evidence should be vetted through appropriate communication and leadership staff.<br><br>Share internally at DWD with key policy staff, technical and data steward staff, and business service teams. Share with job service staff and one stop operators to use findings to build outreach and networking activities. |
| **#6: Improving Inter- and Intra- agency Data Sharing by Defining Data and Process** | |
| Learning Questions | 1. Are there barriers to inter- and intra- agency data sharing?<br>2. Are data and data restrictions defined sufficiently to allow for data sharing?<br>3. Will mapping out the data sharing processes improve data sharing?<br>4. Will updating the WIOA Performance Technical Assistance Guide (TAG) improve data sharing?<br>5. Will increasing staff's understanding of data assets and data lead to impactful data sharing? |
| Data/Information Needed | Current data dictionaries or catalogues. WIOA Performance TAG. Other relevant policy documents. DWD Data assets, inventories of system administrative datasets available for use by DWD. |
| Funding Source(s) | WDIS MOU shared funds, potential WDQI grant, programmatic funded. |
| Researcher(s) | Internal: WDIS staff, agency/division security teams and data stewards, project management office. |
| Methods | Foundational fact-finding with DWD data stewards and WIOA performance advisory committee.<br><br>1. Review data dictionaries and data catalogues. Create, complete, and/or update as needed (e.g., ASSET Data Dictionary).<br>2. Map out the data sharing process. Identify blockers, pain points, risk, and opportunities for improvement.<br>3. Review WIOA Performance TAG. Update as needed. |
| Challenges | Depending on existing documentation, need to identify staff and time to complete necessary documentation and make needed updates. Data sharing takes time and varies by data being shared and purpose of data sharing, due to these varying factors standardization of process may be trickier to establish. |
| Dissemination Strategies | Data sharing policy and links data dictionaries/catalogues, and TAG will be published on the DWD shared data site, shared with data stewards, research and evaluation staff, and other relevant program and policy staff. |
| **#7: Customer Satisfaction and Feedback Loops** | |
| Learning Questions | 1. How do DWD, WIOA, and partner programs collect information on customer service?<br>2. Do DWD, WIOA, and partner programs include customer feedback and input to measure accessibility, usefulness, and quality of services to reach personal employment goals? |

| | |
|---|---|
| | 3. How do current customer satisfaction and feedback loops compare to industry best practices for customer service assessment? |
| Data/Information Needed | Summary of tools and way partners are collecting customer feedback. Summary of research, state recommendations, and federal recommendations. Recommendations on how best to collect customer feedback. Recommendations on how to coordinate customer feedback loops across WIOA programs and partners. Recommendations on how to use customer feedback to improve customer service and outcomes. |
| Funding Source(s) | WDIS shared funding and WIOA Sec. 134 funding, ARPA Program Schedule 9 WDQI Sustainment, WIOA Peer Learning Cohort. |
| Researcher(s) | WIOA program and partner staff. Includes WDIS staff, WIOA Title I, II, III, and IV staff, Registered and Youth Apprenticeship staff, Department of Children and Families (DCF) TANF (W2) staff, Department of Health Service (DHS) FSET staff, and a one stop operator. |
| Methods (Type) | 1. Gather information on the current customer feedback loops implemented by WIOA programs and partners.<br>2. Review existing research literature on how best to gather customer service feedback in the workforce development and human services industries. Determine practice that evidence supports, common practices without evidence, and practices that evidence does not support.<br>3. Have information conversations from other states and federal partners to determine if there are other recommendations from other states and federal partners. Review federal technical assistance documents about customer feedback loops.<br>4. Create a customer feedback loop user guide for WIOA programs and partners. |
| Challenges | Identifying staff time and prioritizing this work maybe challenging. Partners may be hesitant to share customer service feedback methods and results. Care will need to be taken to explain the purpose of this project is to assess if WIOA programs are incorporating customer feedback into service delivery and design. If this investigation results in recommendations for improved customer input on service delivery, it is recommended to collaborate across WIOA programs and partners in determining best next steps to improve and use evidence-based customer service feedback loops. |
| Dissemination Strategies | Create a customer feedback loop user guide for WIOA programs and partners. The report will be submitted for communications and leadership review and then posted on the WDIS resources website. A presentation sharing the best practices will also be developed to be shared with local partners and at regional, state, and national conferences. |
| **#8: Staff training in career pathways, work-based learning, and credential attainment training services** | |
| Learning Questions | 1. What training do staff get aimed at enhancing training service delivery, specifically in the areas of career pathways, work-based learning, and credential attainment?<br>2. Is there any evidence these trainings influence client service experience and employment outcomes? |

| | |
|---|---|
| Data/Information Needed | Count of the number and types of each staff training, date of training(s), any outcome measures of trainings (e.g., pre- and post-test comparisons, training evaluations, etc.), any available client feedback (e.g., surveys, focus groups, etc.), existing research literature in this area. |
| Funding Source(s) | WDIS shared funding and WIOA Sec. 134 funding, ARPA Program Schedule 9 WDQI Sustainment. |
| Researcher(s) | Internal WDIS and WIOA staff. |
| Methods (Type) | Foundational fact finding will be used to better understand the staff trainings and staff development. The aim is to systematically review staff trainings. The fact-finding efforts should also include literature reviews and reaching out to experts and external research partners to learn better ways to collect and analyze data to answer these research questions. |
| Challenges | Foundational fact-finding efforts may be limited by the amount and type of data available. For example, there may be limited data on staff trainings (especially regarding "effectiveness" of training). Even if data exist, data access may be limited to specific personnel. Limited data may make it especially difficult to measure the relationship between staff training, service implementation, and employment outcomes. Currently, evidence activities 1 to 7 are prioritized before this activity. This activity will not start until enough staff time is available to implement this evidence activity, which may be in the current state fiscal year or in the next state fiscal year. |
| Dissemination Strategies | Dissemination strategies should include sharing results and sharing implications for potential policy and practice change. Also, next steps for evidence building in this area should be identified. Evaluators should determine who and how to best share this information to maximize learning from this evidence building effort. Sharing of evidence should be vetted through appropriate communication and leadership staff. Focus dissemination to human resources, internal training staff. Share with board management staff (for their staff training as well). If relevant share via WIOA communications team through training and messaging. |
| **#9 Increase data-based decision-making in the Eligible Training Provider List (ETPL)** | |
| Learning Questions | 1. What is the return on investment for training programs in the ETPL considering the cost of the training, length of training, and employment outcomes (employment rates and wages)?<br>2. Do trainings align with local and/or statewide good jobs (e.g., hot jobs, jobs with good wages in high demand, and/or with career advancement opportunities)?<br>3. Are people participating in the training programs? Are WIOA participants participating in the training programs?<br>4. How can we better identify short-term sector-based training, including non-degree micro-credentials and incorporate these trainings in the ETPL? |
| Data/Information Needed | Number of WIOA participants per training, UI wages, cost of training, and length of training. Local labor market information to identify local high demand jobs with good wages (e.g., hot jobs). |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funding Source(s) | DWD WDIS (to cover staff time) and WIOA set aside for evaluation. |
| Researcher(s) | Internal WDIS staff in collaboration with DET BWT and ITC staff. |
| Methods (Type) | 1. Determine number of WIOA participants per training.<br>2. Determine employment rate post training.<br>3. Determine employment wages post training.<br>4. Determine cost of training.<br>5. Determine length of training.<br>6. Identify trainings aimed to connect participants in high demand jobs with good wages (e.g., hot jobs).<br>7. Calculate return on investment per training. |
| Challenges | Information is available in aggregate numbers via a business intelligence report, so might not be able to link training and outcomes at an individual level, so training numbers might not match number of individuals with UI wage information, which might affect estimates. Might not have UI wage information for individuals who did not provide their social security number (SSN) and/or if the training program did not provide DWD the SSN for outcomes tracking. |
| Dissemination Strategies | Internal (DWD-BWT) use for policy-decision making. Share findings with workforce partners, career planners, and participants, so cost and benefit data and labor market information (LMI) to inform decisions on training to meet career goals. ETPL will use this information to better share information on cost-effective trainings job seekers are looking for and trainings are associated with good jobs. |
| **#10 Workforce metrics for Council of Workforce Investment (CWI) and to track influence of technology on workforce** | |
| Learning Questions | 1. What metrics can track progress on CWI plan activities?<br>2. What metrics can track influence of technology (e.g., Artificial Intelligence (AI), quantum, sustainable agriculture, etc.)? |
| Data/Information Needed | Data available from different workforce programs (focus on publicly available data). Workforce demographics, influencers, service, training, support, and outcomes (e.g., UI wage data). Career pathway information, including education, training, credentials, occupation, industry, employment information, etc. |
| Funding Source(s) | WDIS, CWI, WIOA, other funding sources identified as needed. |
| Researcher(s) | Internal WDIS and partner staff. |
| Methods (Type) | Identify CWI goal and/or technology workforce learning question. Identify a metric that could measure progress in this area. Determine the best way to display metric. Organize a way to systematically pull and share the metric with CWI or other target audiences. |
| Challenges | Available metrics may not answer the specific goal or question. Will need to use the data available and/or determine a way and funds to collect better information. There are a lot of CWI goals and metrics, which makes logistics and monitoring more difficult. May need to identify priority metrics to better track workforce metrics consistently overtime. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Dissemination Strategies | Share with CWI, workforce, and technology partners to make evidence-based policy and practice decisions. |
| **#11 Cost benefit analysis of Wisconsin's WIOA Title IB Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Youth Programs** | |
| Learning Questions | 1. What is the return on investment for the Wisconsin's WIOA Title IB Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Youth programs?<br>2. What is the cost of different career, training, and support services?<br>3. How do participant wages change overtime from the quarter to before exit and quarters after exit? How do these wage changes compare to benefit eligibility requirements, inflation, and/or comparison group? |
| Data/Information Needed | DWD DET BWT fiscal analysts will provide the total funding spent in aggregate, by WDA level, and by service type (career, training, and support). Federal reporting provides the number of participants in each WDA and number who receive each service type (career, training, and support). Additionally, the longitudinal workforce database has information for a stratified sample of program participants reflecting the population. |
| Funding Source(s) | WIOA and WDIS funding for staff and data infrastructure. |
| Researcher(s) | Internal WDIS in partnership with DWD DET BWT staff. |
| Methods (Type) | Calculate average cost per participant by service type. Compare cost to outcomes. Look at variances by region, demographics, and employment influencers. Consider past cost benefit analyses (e.g., Anderson, C., Schlegelmilch, A., & Hartman, E. (2019). Wisconsin PROMISE cost-benefit analysis and sustainability framework. Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 51, 253-261.) The time of interest for this evaluation is 2015 to present. It may be useful to make a split in the analysis pre- and post-pandemic. |
| Challenges | Financial information is not linked to individual participants, so cost needs to be inferred based on overall project costs and participant counts. Results will be correlational, so cause and effect cannot be inferred. |
| Dissemination Strategies | There are a few ways these results will be used. First, situations identified with low ROI will be the targets of technical assistance to troubleshoot and improve future performance. Use data to inform policy and/or practice. Looking at demographics and employment influencers will help identify target populations where recommendations for more funding may be necessary. For example, some parts of current WIOA legislation set aside funding specifically for marginalized populations such as youth who are not working or in school and Indigenous people. The data from this evaluation may target additional populations who would benefit from more funding. Results and lessons learned will be shared with workforce partners. |
| **#12 Worker Advancement Initiative (WAI) and Workforce Innovation Grant (WIG) Lessons Learned** | |
| Learning Questions | 1. What was learned from the Worker Advancement Initiative (WAI) and Workforce Innovation Grants (WIG)?<br>2. How many people were served with these programs?<br>3. What services, trainings, and/or supports did these programs provide? |

| | |
|---|---|
| | 4. Did these programs increase access to needed supports (housing, food, security, childcare, etc.)?<br>5. How did these programs support people to work and help local employers obtain and/or retain talent?<br>6. Did these programs improve employment rates and wages for underutilized talent pools and/or marginalized populations? Did programs connect with people not connecting with other workforce programs? Did these programs help people connect to other employment services and supports? What services were associated with improved employment outcomes? |
| Data/Information Needed | Information of the different grants, types of services and supports provided, number of people served, and employment outcomes. |
| Funding Source(s) | American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) |
| Researcher(s) | Internal WDIS staff in partnership with DWD DET staff and WAI and WIG grantees. |
| Methods (Type) | 1. Access existing reports from grantees and data shared with DWD through ASSET.<br>2. Survey grantees to learn additional information and lessons learned.<br>3. Determine if additional data should be collected from grantees (e.g., match participants to UI wage records or survey participants or other data collection efforts). |
| Challenges | WAI and WIG grants were granted through a variety of regions in Wisconsin and varied in focus, so goals and expected outcomes will vary grant to grant, which will make it tricky to measure an overall effect. Focus should instead be on lessons learned. What worked well and should be replicated? What did not work well and what adjustments could be made in the future to better connect workers to local good jobs in the future? |
| Dissemination Strategies | Share results with grantees, funders, federal, state, and local partners. May be a single report or multiple reports, as well as different mediums (e.g., presentations, infographics, etc.) to better share lessons learned with others. |