

#1: Relationship between training services and employment outcomes	
Evaluation Questions	Are DWD program services, specifically training (such as career pathways, work-based learning, and credential attainment), followed by positive employment outcomes for clients?
Data/Information Needed	Workforce Data Integration System (WDIS) Longitudinal Workforce Database (LWD) as a main data source
Methods (Type)	Evaluation. Once the LWD is built, evaluators will need to further refine the evaluation question. Additionally, evaluators will operationally define the independent and dependent variables, and any other variables to include in the regression model. Once identified, evaluators will pull and analyze data using a regression analysis, a hierarchical logistic regression analysis or similar analysis, to measure the strength of the relationship.
Challenges	Evaluation question will be limited by the variables available in the LWD. The three specific areas of interest for training services are career pathways, work-based learning, and credential attainment. Depending on the structure of the training programs and data analysis, these may be separate research questions.
Dissemination Strategies	<p>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.</p> <p>Focus of dissemination will be through the performance advisory committee, and with Bureau of Workforce Training (BWT) governance, including local program liaisons (LPLs). Findings will also be shared with DWD listservs, with the aim to share with individual staff managing or implementing programs included in the evaluation. The WIOA communications team may feature findings on their webpage. Findings will be presented at the Council of Workforce Investment (CWI) and Wisconsin Workforce Development Association (WWDA) with discussions on how to use what was found.</p> <p>Share findings externally with research and evaluation community and with professional organizations such as Wisconsin Employment and Training Association (https://wetainc.org/), and as relevant will share with affinity groups (e.g., disability groups, race/ethnicity groups, geographic groups, socioeconomic groups).</p> <p>Draft a long-term communication plan, with talking points, as well as communication goals for specific milestones (scorecard). If findings lead to practice or policy changes, technical assistance, or trainings, communicate accordingly.</p>
#2: Tracking unemployment insurance (UI) trends by industry, occupation, and demographics	
Evaluation Questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As pandemic slows/ends how do UI claims duration trends change by industry/occupation? 2. Subsequently, do UI claimant characteristics predict differences in duration trends?
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
Methods	Wisconsin team taking ADRF class will refine research questions, coding, and data analysis using Illinois data. Based on lessons learned from class project, team will copy code, and explore options to do a similar analysis with Wisconsin data.
Challenges	Currently, Illinois data are available in ADRF. Wisconsin data are not similarly organized, so replicating the process may not be possible. Consider how best to analyze Wisconsin data using

	existing Wisconsin UI data infrastructure, using the LWD, and/or by modifying Wisconsin data infrastructure.
Dissemination Strategies	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

#3: DWD staff equity evaluation consultation

Evaluation Questions	Can we use data/evaluation to measure the diversity of DWD's Workforce and subsequently measure the impact of increasing the diversity of DWD's Workforce?
Data/Information Needed	Results of literature review; staff demographics; client demographics; data by region; additional data/information as identified through literature review
Methods	Complete Literature Review to identify how to measure diversity and equity of a workforce, impact of a diverse and equitable workforce, and evidence-based practices for improving equity in the workforce.
Challenges	Research designs will be limited, as we will need to (for good reason) adhere to ethical and legal hiring practices. In addition, changes to the workforce depend on turnover rates. If turnover rates are slow, changes to the diversity of the workforce will also be slow. In addition, current hiring practices may be inadvertently limiting the diversity of the workforce (e.g., work experience and/or education or training requirements may have more influence over hiring than lived experience). Such factors will need to be identified. Hopefully, the literature review will help to identify these factors, and the impact these factors may have on data collection and evaluation efforts.
Dissemination Strategies	<p>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.</p> <p>Focus on internal dissemination to human resources (HR) and hiring managers at DWD. In addition, share findings with staff via division leadership (interest level in this topic is high), with councils, including CWI and the Wisconsin Rehabilitation Council (WRC), and with DWD Secretary with the suggestion to share with Governor's Equity and Inclusion Advisory Council.</p>

#4: RESEA Impact and Process Evaluation

Evaluation Questions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confirmatory impact analysis: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does an additional RESEA session enhance RESEA impacts by further reducing UI benefit length and/or further increasing employment rates, and/or wages?
----------------------	---

<p>Data/Information Needed</p>	<p>b. Do RESEA treatment effects vary by regional area and/or participant demographic groups? (regional and demographic analysis)</p> <p>c. Do the RESEA online assessment scores correlate with outcomes?</p> <p>3. Process/implementation evaluation:</p> <p>a. Are RESEA services consistently implemented and provided across RESEA regional areas and participant demographic groups? (fidelity of intervention)</p> <p>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)</p> <p>RESEA participation, control/comparison group, number of sessions, RESEA services delivered, session mode (in person, virtual), online assessment scores, UI duration, UI wages</p>
<p>Methods</p>	<p>DWD will contract with external evaluators to conduct a randomized controlled trial (RCT) experimental research design with a treatment and control group (preferred) or a rigorous quasi-experimental design with a treatment and comparison group.</p>
<p>Challenges</p>	<p>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 https://clear.dol.gov/sites/default/files/CLEAR_EvidenceGuidelines_V2.1.pdf. The study must also be powered to be able to detect impacts with what UIPL 1-20 describes as "strong statistical confidence" ($p < .05$).</p> <p>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 available at https://rc.workforcegps.org/resources/2019/07/30/17/32/RESEA_Evaluation_Evidence_Resources).</p> <p>Therefore, depending on sample sizes, component analyses will likely be exploratory.</p>
<p>Dissemination Strategies</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Share internally with relevant job center and UI management and field staff. Share with federal partners including ETA, DOL, and Abt. Share on CLEAR, Workforce GPS, and other resource pages. May share with congress. Share internally with DWD peers (e.g., with other division administrators, ITMB). 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 knowledge translation resources such as https://ktdrr.org/ktdrr/library/articles_pubs/ktdrr/models/ and https://implementationscience.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1748-5908-8-121</p>
<p>#5: WIOA Local Statistical Adjustment Model Evaluation Consultation</p>	
<p>Evaluation Questions</p>	<p>Can staff identify a local statistical adjustment model and process that better accounts for local client characteristics and labor market information (LMI)?</p>
<p>Data/Information Needed</p>	<p>Results of literature review; staff demographics; client demographics; data by region; additional data/information as identified through literature review</p>
<p>Methods</p>	<p>Research potential statistical adjustment models local areas can use. Complete review of local client characteristic and LMI data. Research possibility of running local data through the statistical model more often (e.g., quarterly) to increase adherence to annual performance rates.</p>

Challenges	There may not be enough a large enough sample with enough predictive power to regionalize the statistical adjustment model. Quarterly performance may not accurately predict annual performance.
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 with the aim to explain what the model coefficients are based on model findings.

#6: Support to Communities Evaluation

Evaluation 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 ASSET
Methods	National evaluator (Abt Associates Inc., in partnership with MDRC). 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.
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 is affecting 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 DOL with the final report.

#7: DWD outreach, customer service, engagement, and service alignment activities

Evaluation Questions	Can we identify and measure DWD outreach, customer service, engagement, and alignment activities? Can we identify when outreach, customer service, engagement, and alignment activities occur? Who is the intended audience/participants? (In subsequent evaluation activities will want to find out if strategies are reaching intended audience/participants.)
Data/Information Needed	Goal of evidence building is to discover what data and information are available regarding outreach, customer service, engagement, and service alignment.
Methods	Policy analysis and foundational fact finding to systemically explore existing data, program records and research literature to identify what is known about outreach, engagement, and alignment efforts, aimed to increase service participation, engagement, and outcomes. Consider using staff and client interviews to learn more about different types of outreach, customer service and service alignment activities, as well as staff and client interviews or surveys to solicit information on different ways to increase accessibility and engagement through technology or other means or methods. These fact-finding activities will consider regional and socio-economic variables that may impact outreach, engagement, and service alignment.
Challenges	A key challenge is the lack of clarity on what measures are available for outreach, customer service, engagement, service alignment, technology supports and accessibility. We will address this using fact-finding efforts to explore existing measures, and review research literature to explore different ways to track and measure these activities and this will help inform future evidence-building, evaluation, and/or research in this area.

Dissemination Strategies	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 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.
#8: Staff training in career pathways, work-based learning, and credential attainment training services	
Evaluation Questions	What training do staff get aimed at increasing training service delivery, specifically in the areas of career pathways, work-based learning, and credential attainment? 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
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.
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 HR, 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.