DWD WDIS Evidence Plan
July 2023 to June 2024

#1: Relationship between training services and employment outcomes	
Learning Questions	What demographics, employment influencers, and training services funded by different workforce programs predict employment outcomes (specifically employment rates and wages)? Does the training result in a job in the field of training?
Data/Information Needed	Workforce Data Integration System (WDIS) Longitudinal Workforce Database (LWD) as a main data source.
Funding Source(s)	WDIS Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) funds / American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Schedule 9 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, like 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.
Challenges	Evaluation questions will be limited by the variables available in the LWD. Timeframe: services received by adults who exited from April 2019 to March 2020. Use July 1, 2015 as earliest training start date. 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 of Workforce Investment and Wisconsin Workforce Development Association with discussions on how to use what was found. Share findings externally with research and evaluation community and with professional organizations such as Wisconsin Employment and Training Association, and as relevant will share with affinity groups (for example, disability groups, race/ethnicity groups, geographic groups, socioeconomic groups).

	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, demographics, and location	
Learning Questions	1. Do UI claims (both initial and continuous) vary by industry, occupation, demographics, and location? 2. Do UI stay rates vary by industry, occupation, demographics, and location? 3. Do inequities exist in benefit pursuit and receipt? If yes, what are these inequities? 4. What are the differences in characteristics between claimants and eligible non-claimants? 5. How can UI and DWD's Division of Employment and Training (DET) ensure effective, efficient, and equitable unemployment to reemployment services for all? 6. Does prevalence of receipt of career or training services (through programs like WIOA Title I, Title III, Title IV, apprenticeship, etc.) by UI claimants vary by demographics? Does receipt of reemployment services, increase the likelihood UI claimants access these services?
Data/Information Needed	PROMIS data file: UI claims, week end date of initial claim, region, demographics (age, race, ethnicity, disability), education, UI wage data (prior to UI claim), industry, occupation. UI Wage file: quarterly UI wages. Local economic information: unemployment rates, percent local workforce by industry.
Funding Source(s)	Coleridge Democratizing Data Challenge and Promoting Equity in Unemployment Compensation (UIPL23-21).
Researcher(s)	Internal DWD staff on WDIS Research and Evaluation Team, Bureau of Workforce Information and Technical Support staff, UI staff, University of Wisconsin – Madison Institute for Research on Poverty (IRP).
Methods	Build Unemployment to Reemployment Portal in the Administrative Data Research Facility managed through Coleridge similar to UI portals built by other states (e.g., Illinois). Build a stay rate portal based on Wisconsin's experience of building a stay rate with Illinois data in the Coleridge Applied Data Analytics class. Build additional dashboards (as data allows) including likelihood to claim, time to payments, and time to reemployment. Establish a memorandum of understanding with the IRP to do both quantitative and qualitative research on better understanding if inequities exist and how to better promote equity. IRP aims to examine potential inequities regarding delays in the process of filing UI claims, getting UI claims certified, and receiving initial benefit payments; understand inequities in benefit pursuit and receipt, and

	potential obstacles and delays in the UI claims processes; and translate findings into a final report including implications for policy and service delivery practices.
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. 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:
	  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?
	  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?
	2. Exploratory analyses:
	  a. Does an additional RESEA session enhance RESEA impacts by further reducing UI benefit length and/or further increasing employment rates, and/or wages?
	  b. Do RESEA treatment effects vary by service delivery mode (virtual vs. in-person sessions)?
	  c. Do RESEA treatment effects vary by regional area and/or participant demographic groups? (Regional and demographic analysis)
	  d. Do the RESEA online assessment scores correlate with outcomes?
	3. Process/implementation evaluation:
	  a. Are RESEA services consistently implemented and provided across RESEA regional areas and participant demographic groups? (Fidelity of intervention)
	  b. How does 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 will continue for at least two years.
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. Guidelines can be found at. 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" ($p < .05$). 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. 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: Support to Communities Evaluation

Learning Questions	What do proposed projects aim to do? How are projects implementing Support to Communities?

Data/Information Needed	Products, discussions/interviews with project partners, document implementation, flag of participation, employment service and outcomes in Automated System Support for Employment Training (ASSET).
Funding Source(s)	Department of Labor's Chief Evaluation Office, in partnership with the Employment and Training Administration.
Researcher(s)	Abt Associates Inc. in partnership with MDRC; Internal DWD Support to Communities staff.
Methods	National evaluator. Knowledge development, implementation study, and analysis/reporting. Rapid review of grantee materials, and clarification calls. Structured video interview, site visits, in-depth interviews, surveys, and administrative data collection. Document implementation approaches, challenges, and successes. Evaluators to share information/feedback during project implementation for reflective practice. To date, MDRC has coordinated with DWD to complete phone and written surveys with sites and DWD staff. MDRC will be doing on-site visits with Workforce Development Areas (WDA) 6 and 11 in June and will conduct a virtual visit with DET. Topics to be covered included project context, grant background and goals, management/staffing, and partnerships. The period of performance for this evaluation is four years and began September 2020 so it will be complete Aug. 31, 2024. Knowledge development was the initial evaluation task and is complete. Currently in the implementation study phase.
Challenges	Implementation varies which allows for flexibility and locally tailored design but makes it trickier to identify commonalities and service impacts on outcomes. COVID-19 has impacted design and implementation.
Dissemination Strategies	Final implementation report. The national evaluation team will also produce three short briefs or issue papers. The national evaluation team will create a public use data file and submit it to the Department of Labor with the final report.

#5: Worker Connection Evaluation

Learning Questions	1. Process/implementation evaluation
	   a. Did the Worker Connection program engage the number of individuals that was projected in both service delivery models?
	   b. What are the individual characteristics of Worker Connection participants by demographics and employment influencers? How do these compare to WIOA Title I participants, especially regarding the engagement of underserved/marginalized populations?
	   c. What are the key components of the implemented targeted outreach, navigation of career, training (including WorkAdvance), and support services? What successful targeted outreach and engagement strategies did Worker Connection use that can be shared with WIOA programs and partners?
	   d. What services, resources, and supports do Worker Connection participants utilize the most? Do Worker Connection participants enroll in WIOA Title I, III, and/or IV, apprenticeship, veterans, or other employment and training programs? Do accessing these services correlate with improved credential attainment and employment outcomes?

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>

e. Is there evidence that this project and/or practices from this project should be expanded to other WDAs?

f. Should the training and work duties of the Career Navigators be expanded and standardized for other coaches and services providers to other workforce programs and grants?

g. How should sector-based needs, labor and economic indicators, and outcome-based results be considered in determining workforce program service delivery and funding?

2. Impact analysis

a. Did Worker Connection clients see increased wages and employment rates post-enrollment? Where clients placed into "Good Jobs"?

b. Did Worker Connection reduce benefit uptake of clients via family-supporting occupations?

c. What is the return on investment of the Worker Connection program?

d. Did Worker Connection help address areas of labor shortage in both WDAs? Were these occupations connected to the local labor market?

</td></tr>
</table>

Data/Information Needed	Data may include, but not limited to outreach activities, partner community-based organizations, participant counts, service information, wages, surveys, and cost.
Funding Source(s)	ARPA Schedule 6 Worker Connection.
Researcher(s)	Internal Worker Connection Program research staff and Wisconsin Center for Education Research.
Methods	A mixed methodology approach will be utilized for the evaluation of program results. To establish the impact of the project, an event study framework will be utilized for many of the variables of interest, including, but not limited to, wage and employment. To allow for an event study framework, a large panel dataset will be created. The data included in the panel dataset will also include data on geographic location as well time invariant variables such as gender and racial and ethnic characteristics. Collecting these additional elements are vital to reduce the risk of omitted variable bias in the regression results. Beyond a basic event study framework, the identification of a comparison group allows for the testing of whether WorkAdvance (or a similar program) leads to statistically significant impacts using a probit regression model.

Qualitative methods include interviews, pre- and post-test surveys, focus groups, and observations. Observations will be conducted on each of the career navigators in two to three separate occasions (beginning, middle, end phases of the program) to ensure they are adhering to the training program focusing on the human-centered, trauma-informed coaching model. Focus group meetings with job seekers, employers, community partners, and career navigators will be conducted separately with research participant groups during the final phase of the project. The focus group meetings will be led by a facilitator using guided questioning. |

Challenges	One of the main challenges facing the evaluation team is getting access to data needed to answer certain evaluation questions. Questions that require data on UI wages, benefits, and some Bureau of Labor Statistics and Census data are all dependent upon getting data sharing agreements or having a collaborative relationship between different government partners. Worker Connection also faces challenges on maintain consistency across both WDAs in service delivery as well as maintain consistency with data entry.
Dissemination Strategies	Dissemination strategies include sharing results and implications for policy change. Progress reports with quantitative and qualitative data will be shared with leadership on a regular basis. Evaluation staff will also determine alternative means to disseminate the findings of the Worker Connection program beyond internal staff.
#6: 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? 2. Do at least 40% of participants co-enroll in DVR and another workforce training program? 3. After partner diversity, equity, inclusion and accommodation and support 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? 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? 5. Do at least 80% of participants enter a Department of Public Instruction regional healthcare, manufacturing, construction, or digital technology career pathway? 6. Do at least 55% of participants participate in training within the career pathway? 7. Do at least half (50%) of participants achieve a measurable skills gain and/or credential during the grant? 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? 9. Of those participants who exit in CIE, is at least 67% of participants' average hourly wage higher than prior to receiving services? 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? 11. Do at least 5% of project participants report they received a promotion or additional responsibility resulting in an increase in salary? 12. Do at least one-third (33%) of participants exit in CIE with employer-provided medical benefits? 13. Do at least half (50%) of participants report earned income as the primary source of support at the time they exit in CIE?

	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. 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 will follow 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, we will 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.
Challenges	The Wisconsin Career 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 intervention 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 intervention report will also incorporate the findings from qualitative data analysis toward the identification of potential barriers to implementation, outcomes, or sustainability of the project.
#7: Comprehensive Employment Planning Toolkit (CEPT) Evaluation	
Learning Questions	1. Does using CEPT decrease time to complete employment planning and reach employment goal(s)?

	2. Is employment planning in CEPT easier for the career planner and customer compared to employment planning in ASSET? 3. Does CEPT improve case management, employment planning, goal setting, service delivery, informed decision-making, customer experience, customer involvement, staff experience, training and employment outcomes, co-enrollment, and/or cross program communication?
Data/Information Needed	Survey questions and data available through the CEPT tool in ASSET.
Funding Source(s)	WIOA Title I funds.
Researcher(s)	Internal WDIS, WIOA Title I staff.
Methods	The CEPT Employment Plan pilot is a joint effort by DWD's Jobs for Veterans State Grants (JVSG), Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) and WIOA Title I Adult, Dislocated Worker and Youth (Title I) Programs to use the same electronic employment plan tool developed in the CEPT application available through the Division of Employment and Training's Application (DET APPs) portal. From July 1, 2022 – Dec. 31, 2022, staff working in WDAs 5, 6, 7, and 9 on the TAA, JVSG, and Title I programs will pilot the use the CEPT. Note: CEPT includes the following tools: Employment Plan, Action Steps List, Self-sufficiency, Budget, Community Resources Search, and links to career exploration and labor market information data through WisConomy.
Challenges	As part of this pilot, DET understands that it is including restrictive requirements that could impact timely service provision for customers, especially those with barriers to employment. When staff encounter situations where this policy would likely negatively impact customers, staff are asked to communicate the challenge via an ASSET case note, email, and/or during CEPT monthly assistance calls. If staff encounter such issues during the pilot, they are authorized to provide services in-line with regular policies and procedures (without the restrictive requirements) as to avoid the impact to service provision.
Dissemination Strategies	Upon completion of the pilot, DWD's Bureau of Job Service, Bureau of Workforce Training, and Office of Veterans Employment Services will determine whether to continue requiring use of the CEPT Employment Plan tool within their respective programs and will determine which parts of the pilot policy, if any, will continue to be required in their programs.

#8: DWD Service alignment foundational fact finding

Learning Questions	1. What is the enrollment and co-enrollment patterns across all WIOA partners? 2. What is the co-enrollment between Apprenticeship and other DWD workforce programs, including WIOA Title I, III, IV, and veterans? Do wages earned vary by apprenticeship completion, region, demographics, and/or trade? 3. Do patterns of enrollment and co-enrollment vary by demographics (race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, veteran status)?

Data/Information Needed	Goal of evidence building is to discover what data and information are available regarding outreach, customer service, engagement, and service alignment.
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 other WIOA partners (e.g., Wisconsin Works, FoodShare Employment and Training, and Corrections) to the WIOA co-enrollment reports. 2. Add Apprenticeship to WIOA co-enrollment reports. 3. Add demographics (race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability veterans) to co-enrollment reports. 4. 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. 5. Use LWD to further explore co-enrollment with between partner programs (e.g., DVR, Veterans, WIOA Title I) with apprenticeship programs. For example, of those co-enrolled, discover number/percentage successfully completing apprenticeship programs and number/percentage utilizing Department of Veterans Affairs education benefits, by apprenticeship trade type, differences by geography (e.g., WDA and school consortium), and by program type (e.g., by JVSG and Wagner Peyser veterans).
Challenges	Time to implement appropriate data sharing agreements may delay implementation. Need sufficient time and resources. Need to prioritize activities and may 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. 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.

#9: 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? 2. Are data and data restrictions defined sufficiently to allow for data sharing? 3. Will mapping out the data sharing processes improve data sharing? 4. Will updating the WIOA Performance Technical Assistance Guide (TAG) improve data sharing? 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. 1. Review data dictionaries and data catalogues. Create, complete, and/or update as needed (e.g., ASSET Data Dictionary. 2. Map out the data sharing process. Identify blockers, pain points, risk, and opportunities for improvement. 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.

#10: Customer Satisfaction and Feedback Loops

Learning Questions	1. How do DWD, WIOA, and partner programs collect information on customer service? 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	Reach out to DWD, WIOA, and partner programs to learn what are existing ways they collect information on customer service, including customer satisfaction and other ways workforce programs customer feedback.
Funding Source(s)	WDIS shared funding and WIOA Sec. 134 funding, ARPA Program Schedule 9 WDQI Sustainment.
Researcher(s)	Internal WDIS, WIOA, and DWD division staff, including DET, DVR, Equal Rights, UI, and Worker's Compensation.

Methods (Type)	1. Assess the current customer feedback and service evaluation efforts.
	   a. Foundational fact-finding with the assistance of local policy liaisons and policy analysts across DWD divisions and bureaus of current DWD collection of customer service feedback.
	   b. Foundational fact-finding with partner agencies to discover how they collect customer service feedback.
	2. Conduct foundational fact-finding of customer service feedback best practices for the human services industry. Determine practices that evidence supports, common practices without evidence, and practices that evidence does not support.

	3. Conduct focus-group interviews with frontline staff to understand what customer service feedback they feel will help them improve their work with job seekers.
Challenges	Identifying staff time and prioritizing this work maybe challenging. Partner 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	A report for DWD's internal and partner consumption will be created that shares what is currently done to assess customer service feedback and how that compares with industry recommendations.
	A presentation sharing the best practices will be developed to be shared at "Beyond Performance Friday" presentations and at regional, state, and national conferences.

#11: Staff training in career pathways, work-based learning, and credential attainment training services

Learning Questions	1. What training do staff get aimed at increasing training service delivery, specifically in the areas of career pathways, work-based learning, and credential attainment? 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 posttest 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 9 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.

#12 DWD Call Center Customer Experience

Learning Questions	1. What are DWD's call center's most pressing learning questions? What do business areas need to know to improve operations, processes, and inform policy? 2. What data are available from DWD's customer facing systems? 3. What can DWD do to ensure the most optimal experience for its customers when contacting DWD programs? 4. How much data are available from the web application to show where someone may have started an application but then reverted to a call or started a chat session? 5. Are there ways the optimal experience cay be fine-tuned or at least areas of improvement and focused training?
Data/Information Needed	Business area learning needs, Nice N Contact data, call times, wait times, call duration, resolution rates, and counts of telephonic transfers before reaching the destination, data on dropped calls, return callers, reaching a "live" agent, and consumer experience will likely be helpful to answer learning questions.
Funding Source(s)	WDIS funding MOU shared funding, ARPA Program Schedule 9 WDQI Sustainment.
Researcher(s)	Internal WDIS and DWD staff from call centers including Worker's Compensation, UI, ITCS, Job Center, Equal Rights.
Methods (Type)	Foundational fact finding to better understand business learning needs, learn what data are available from Nice N Contact, information about call times and resolution rates, and number of telephonic transfers before reaching the destination. Based on learning questions implement data analysis/es and/or metrics to improve call center evidence-based decision-making.
Challenges	Foundational fact finding may be limited by the data available in DWD and SaaS systems. The focus is on foundational fact finding and program by program use cases.
Dissemination Strategies	Internal dissemination to DWD divisions that operate a call center and through continuous improvement teams.