



**Missouri**

# The Annual Report

This report, while required by the Workforce Investment Act, 136(d), also provides the opportunity to inform the public about the activities of Missouri's Workforce Development System. This system has undergone many transformations with the implementation of this new employment and training legislation and the creation of a new state agency to implement it. Our state and our nation have also undergone many challenges that have profound ramifications on workforce issues. In this report, we describe some of the steps our agency took to stay on target with the multifaceted WIA Performance Measurement System. We also talk about where we missed, and what we'll do to improve our aim next year.

Please examine the report and check the referenced websites and documents. The more you understand about Missouri's workforce system, the more you can help us make it the best in the nation. We welcome your input.

# The Workforce Investment Act Performance Measurement System

The Performance Measurement System under the Workforce Investment Act “grades” the programs conducted as part of WIA in seventeen different ways. The purpose of these measures is to objectively measure the effectiveness of the Workforce Investment programs. These measures cover different program areas, including Adult services, Dislocated Worker Services, Youth Services, and Customer Satisfaction.

Among these programs, six primary measurements are conducted:

- Entered Employment Rates,
- Job Retention Rates,
- Earnings Change/Replacement Rates,
- Credential/Diploma Rates,
- Skill Attainment Rates, and
- Customer Satisfaction Surveys

What are these rates, and what do they mean for the programs?

## **THE ENTERED EMPLOYMENT RATE**

The “Entered Employment Rate” is used for the Adult, Dislocated Worker and Older Youth Programs. Each of these measures the success of WIA clients who were unemployed at registration in obtaining unsubsidized employment within one calendar quarter of “exiting” the particular WIA program. Determination of a successful outcome for this measure comes when either of two conditions is met:

- The client has wage credits greater than zero in the Unemployment Insurance wage files, or
- The client provides supplemental information of paid work (such as in a neighboring state, self-employment, etc.)

The Rate is determined by dividing the number of successful clients by the total number of eligible clients who exited in that quarter.

## **THE RETENTION RATE**

The “Retention Rate” is used for the Adult, Dislocated Worker and Older Youth Programs. Each of these measures the success of WIA clients in those programs in retaining employment for at least six months after obtaining employment in the first quarter after exit. The retention is based upon the number of clients who successfully found employment in the first quarter after exit

(whether they were unemployed at registration or not). Determination of a successful outcome for this measure comes when either of two conditions is met:

- The client has wage credits greater than zero in the Unemployment Insurance wage files, or
- The client provides supplemental information of paid work (such as in a neighboring state, self-employment, etc.)

The Rate is determined by dividing the number of successful clients (having wage credits or supplemental data in the first and third quarters after exit) by the number of clients who had employment in the first quarter.

## **THE EARNINGS CHANGE / REPLACEMENT RATE**

The Earnings Change / Replacement Rate measure is used in the Adult, Dislocated Worker and Older Youth Programs. In the Adult and Older Youth programs, the measure is known as the Earnings Change, while in the Dislocated Worker Program the measure is called the Earnings Replacement Rate.

The Earnings Change is a dollar figure calculated from Unemployment Insurance Wage Records. The measure calculates the average difference in six months of earnings after the client exits vs. six months of earnings prior to registration. A positive result means that the cohort of exiters had higher earnings after exit than before registration. A negative result means that the cohort of exiters had less earnings after exit than prior to registration.

The Replacement Rate, used in the Dislocated Worker program, is a similar measure to the Earnings Change, with the primary difference being that the measure is reported as a ratio of the post-service wages divided by the pre-dislocation wages.

## **CREDENTIAL / DIPLOMA RATES**

The Credential & Diploma Rates are used in various forms across all four WIA areas: Adult, Dislocated Worker, Older Youth and Younger Youth. In essence, this set of rates seeks to measure the rate at which these various groups obtain credentials and diplomas designed to enhance their work skills.

The Credential Rate for Adults and Dislocated Workers measures the percentage of exiters from those groups who receive training during enrollment and who enter employment in their first quarter after exit, and then obtain a credential by the third quarter after exit. The rate is determined by dividing those successfully meeting the criteria by all exiters for that particular quarter.

The Credential Rate for Older Youth is slightly different in that the client does not have to enter employment. The exiter from the Older Youth program may enter any of the following in the first quarter after exit: employment, post-secondary education, or advanced training. An exiter meeting these criteria then must receive his credential by the third quarter after exit, the same as with the Adult and Dislocated Worker Credential Rate.

The Diploma Rate for Younger Youth calculates the number of those exiters who obtain a high school diploma or its equivalent by the first quarter after exit. In all four measures, the credential or diploma may be earned before exiting the WIA system and count towards a positive outcome for these measures.

## **THE SKILL ATTAINMENT RATE**

The Skill Attainment Rate is a measure used solely in the Younger Youth program. These clients eligible for inclusion in this measurement include all in-school Younger Youth and any out-of-school Younger Youth who are determined to be in need of basic skills, work readiness skills and/or occupational skills.

The Skill Attainment Rate, unlike the above measures, does not work off of the exit of the client. Rather, for each skill attainment goal set, the client has one year to attain that goal. Multiple goals are possible, and indeed, encouraged where needed. Goals are set in the three categories listed above and multiple goals may be set in each category.

The calculation of this rate occurs in the quarter that a particular goal is met or, in the quarter after the expiration of the one-year time limit. The attainment of goals can also be subject to "hold" periods, where the one-year time limit remains "frozen" until such time as the gap in services is closed.

## **THE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY**

The Customer Satisfaction Surveys are surveys of randomly selected job seekers and employers. Both the job-seeker and the employer surveys are telephone surveys which primarily concentrate on three customer satisfaction questions as outlined in Training and Employment Guidance Letter 7-99. This survey uses the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI), the most widely used index of its kind.

# What is “Success”?

The measurement rates are categorized as to whether they “Exceed” the projected level, or “Meet” the projected level, or “Miss” the projected level.

To “Exceed” a measure, Missouri must attain more than 100% of the projected level for that measure. If, for instance, Missouri’s projected level for adult entered employment is 71%, and we attain a higher rate, we have exceeded the measure. To “Meet” a measure, Missouri must attain between 80 and 100% of the projected level for that measure. To “Miss” a measure, Missouri would have attained a rate lower than 80% of the projected rate for that measure.

In addition to the separate measures, the performance measures are also grouped by program area (Adult, Dislocated Worker and Youth) to determine Missouri’s average for the area. If we average 100% or more for the program area, we “Meet” the projected performance. If we average less than 100%, we “Miss” the projected performance. However, no matter what the average, if any individual performance measure in that program area is rated a “Miss”, then we also “Miss” the program area.

## **HOW DID MISSOURI DO THIS PAST YEAR?**

For the time period beginning on October 1, 2000, and continuing through until September 30, 2001, Missouri built upon last year’s successes:

- Missouri exceeded its goals for Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Older Youth Entered Employment Rates;
- Missouri exceeded its goals for Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Older Youth Employment & Credential Rates;
- Missouri exceeded its goal for the Younger Youth Diploma or Equivalent Attainment Rate;
- Missouri meet its goals for Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Older Youth Retention Rates;
- Missouri meet its goals for Dislocated Worker Earnings Replacement and Older Youth Earnings Change;
- Missouri meet its goals for Younger Youth Skill Attainment Rate and Younger Youth Retention Rate;
- Missouri missed its goal on only one measure – the Adult Earnings Change.

Most importantly of these successes was the improvement in the Older Youth Earnings Change, Older Youth Credential Rate, and the Younger Youth Retention Rates. Missouri had missed the goals for these performance measures in the previous year.

# The Missouri Division of Workforce Development

The Division of Workforce Development is now in its **second** year as the WIA agency in Missouri. The Division was originally created by merging the Job Training Partnership Act Agency with the employment and training programs of the Missouri Division of Employment Security. This new Division, under the umbrella of the Missouri Department of Economic Development, was charged with taking a set of fragmented employment and training programs and integrating them into a single and comprehensive workforce development system. This task of creating a single and comprehensive workforce development system is guided by the following principles that were set forth to guide the Division in its work:

- Integrate employment and training programs to provide job seekers greater access to employment opportunities, training, education and career choices;
- Promote community based design of integrated One-Stop Career Centers that are flexible, simple, timely and highly responsive to job seekers and employers;
- Serve both job seekers and employers equally through the One-Stop Career Centers;
- Provide accurate and easy-to-use labor market information allowing job seekers and employers the opportunity to make informed career and business decisions;
- Provide job seekers employment opportunities resulting in increased economic self-sufficiency and well-being;
- Provide employers a qualified workforce;
- Promote strong accountability for producing customer-based results for job seekers and employers;
- Be the system of choice as evidenced by expanded use by job seekers and employers; and
- Provide information on current labor market trends to assist educational and training institutions in the design of their curriculums.

# Streamlining Workforce Development

The Division's second year was also marked by several important changes, most notably changes in leadership. Rick Beasley was named as permanent Division Director on July 12, 2002. Rick had previously served as head of the Missouri Training and Employment Council, and had been named Acting Director in July of 2001. His leadership and enthusiasm during that interim period confirmed that Rick was the right person for the job. Rick's commitment to the Division's mission, and in particular providing quality customer service and "growing our business, gave the Division additional impetus in reaching out to job seekers and employers alike to strengthen Missouri's economy during a difficult economic time.

A couple of Mr. Beasley's major accomplishments during the past year involved expanding the Toolbox case management system to incorporate all employment and training program systems of the Division, and a revised organizational structure of the Division's Central Office in order to provide better service and communication. This new structure organized the Division into three areas: Field Operations, Program Operations, and Employer Relations.

## **FIELD OPERATIONS**

Field Operations provides technical assistance and guidance on Wagner-Peyser and related services to regional managers and local career center front line staff and workforce development partners. Four regional coordinators serve as the link between central office and the career center system. Field Operations is also responsible for the Disabled Veteran Outreach Program (DVOP), the Local Veteran's Employment Representative (LVER) program and the newly formed Auto Match Unit.

Rex Hall continues as Assistant Director of Field Operations.

## **EMPLOYER RELATIONS**

Employer Relations, formed at the establishment of the Division, emphasizes the importance of employers as a primary customer of the workforce system. Employer Relations provides both federally and state funded programs and services which target Missouri employers. These programs include:

- The Work Opportunity and Welfare-To-Work Tax Credits;
- The Missouri Job Development Fund;
- The Community College New Jobs Training Program;
- Skills Development Tax Credit Program;
- Foreign Labor Certification.
- Business Representatives

Amy Deem continues as Assistant Director of Employer Relations.

## **PROGRAM OPERATIONS**

Program Operations was formed to bring together all workforce programs under one head, and now includes Adult & Youth Services, the Division's Planning & Research Unit, Field Services Unit, and Technical Support and Training staff. This structure will allow for better coordination of planning and reporting throughout Workforce programs. Roger Baugher, previously head of the Planning and Research Unit, was promoted to Assistant Director of Program Operations.

## **DEPUTY DIRECTOR**

Steve Kraus was promoted to Deputy Director of the Division of Workforce Development. Mr. Kraus will continue to be responsible for the Financial Management of the Division, in addition to oversight of Field Operations, Employer Relations and Program Operations. Mr. Kraus previously served as an Assistant Director of the Division.

## **MISSOURI TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT COUNCIL (MTEC)**

David Mitchem was named as Executive Director of the Missouri Training and Employment Council (MTEC) in July of 2002. MTEC serves as the leadership arm of the workforce investment system through the development of policies, plans and standards that promote the best practices and ensure accountability. Mr. Mitchem had previously served as Deputy Director of Department of Economic Development, where he designed the Department's cost allocation plan, consolidated the economic and workforce research sections, and consolidated the Department's seven customer service databases into a unified Oracle database.

# Workforce Development Evaluation Activities

Missouri is still in the early stages of evaluation activities, but our approach can be mapped as required by the Workforce Investment Act. Missouri continues to use a three-pronged approach, using continuous improvement reviews and the performance measurement systems for improvement in workforce programs.

## **FIRST PRONG: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT REVIEWS:**

Beginning in March of 2001, the Division of Workforce Development implemented a Continuous Improvement Review process in response to federal regulatory requirements and the direction of the State's workforce investment board, the Missouri Training Employment Council (MTEC). In this process, the Division's Field Services Continuous Improvement Team examines the delivery of local workforce services in terms of certain targeted WIA system elements. The team also identifies best practices that are occurring and publicizes them for technical assistance purposes.

## **SECOND PRONG:**

### **MISSOURI'S PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT SYSTEM:**

Missouri's performance measurement system assesses the system by program, by division, and by the entire system.

### **WIA PERFORMANCE**

The seventeen federal WIA performance measures provide the basis for both statewide and local Workforce Investment Board (WIB) data. The Division calculates quarterly and annual data for reporting the federal Department of Labor, and, additionally, calculates detailed data for the state as a whole and for each workforce region (there are fourteen regions in Missouri). The data provided to the state and the regions allow us to identify areas which need improvement, and areas to more closely examine for potential best practices.

### **DWD OUTCOMES**

Missouri's DWD Outcomes expands on the WIA performance measures, and combines WIA, Wagner-Peyser, and the Veterans programs into a single, unduplicated performance measurement system. Unlike WIA, the DWD Outcomes report both the percentages and the raw numbers for each outcome measurement. DWD Outcomes are grouped into four primary categories: obtained employment, retaining employment, increasing earnings, and earnings rising above the poverty level. These Outcomes are reported as part of our Department of Economic Development's strategic plan.

## **WORKFORCE SYSTEM PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

Still in the planning stages of the Workforce System Performance Measures (WSPM). This system will attempt to compile unduplicated performance measures among the many workforce programs within Missouri. Clients served by programs such as WIA, Wagner-Peyser, Veterans, TANF, Vocational Rehabilitation, Adult Education & Literacy, and Welfare-to-Work will be reported in a single, system-wide outcome measurement system. The measures will assess the system in regards to the client's success in obtaining and retaining employment, increasing earnings, rising above the poverty level, achieving goals, leaving governmental cash assistance, obtaining training, and customer satisfaction. These outcomes will be reported to the State's workforce council, MTEC, for use in policy development.

## **THIRD PRONG: STRATEGIC EVALUATION SESSIONS:**

As a third component of our State Workforce Development Evaluation Activities, we are discussing the establishment of information-sharing sessions to develop strategies for implementation of WIA programs that will result in improvements in the performance systems. We seek to staff these sessions with State program managers and local practitioners to explore the cause and effect relationships with activities and performance. Once established, the teams will explore strategies to deliver activities in a fashion that will have the greatest increases in WIA performance. The local area staff will serve as liaisons with their respective WIBs to insure the resultant state strategies are in concert with local strategies. This will be a forum for future development strategies as well.

# Success Stories: Good Programs and Good People in Missouri's Workforce Investment System

At the 2002 Governor's Conference on Workforce Development, the following awards were presented for workforce excellence.

## **Leadership:**

**Wayne Voltmer,  
Presiding Commissioner of Holt County**

Commissioner Voltmer has motivated county residents and business leaders to increase the number of jobs in the county. He played a major role in bringing Golden Triangle Energy to Holt County. The 14 million-gallon capacity ethanol plant employs 30 people and has created a new market for local corn growers.

His priorities include serving on many boards of directors and committees that have a connection to job development and assisting people whose lives could be improved through better employment. Commissioner Voltmer stays current on programs that can help people learn the skills and abilities they need to get a decent job. He then shares the information he gathers with the people in need.



## **Innovation:**

### **Y-Line “Youth-to-Youth” Call Center Springfield, Missouri**

The Y-Line is a peer-to-peer, non-crisis telephone call center designed for local youth customers and operated by local youth. This Springfield center provides youth with advice, referral to local agencies and resources for specific needs, and an outlet for them to talk to someone they can relate to. The program is operated under a grant by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Division of Workforce Development. WIA Youth Participants serve as the call center operators. A WIA staff member who is educated and experienced in individual counseling and family therapy supervises the center.

The call center is an innovative concept that serves a dual purpose as a work experience site for WIA participants and it provides a much-needed service to the community. This program has helped hundreds of youth by giving them a place to call and talk about issues they face, changed the attitude and action of scores of youth, saved several from potential family or spousal violence, and even saved lives by stopping suicides and drug abuses or overdoses.

## **Private Sector Participation:**

### **Nestle Purina Pet Care/Friskies St. Joseph, Missouri**

Some companies go the extra mile to make sure their employees have every opportunity to be successful in their transition when faced with a layoff.

When the Rapid Response team learned that a layoff was eminent, they met with company management to explain what Rapid Response is and how the company could work with the team to help employees access Dislocated Worker services. Company management agreed to hold rapid response meetings on their premises. To encourage participation, the meetings were held on company time.

When management learned that an October 1<sup>st</sup> layoff date would hinder those employees wanting to start school in September, they agreed to give employees the option of leaving September 1<sup>st</sup> without adversely affecting severance packages. The company has been supportive of their effected workers and made every effort to make transition from Friskies employment to future career opportunities a positive one.

**Collaboration and Integration:  
Work Incentive Initiative Consortium  
Kansas City, MO**

The Work Incentive Initiative Consortium is a partnership of diverse agencies and organizations that unified to bring about a system change within the Workforce Development System to enhance services for job seekers with disabilities. Partners include:

- The Full Employment Council
- The Rehabilitation Institute
- The Jewish Vocational Service
- The Helping Hand of Goodwill
- The Greater Kansas City Chamber of Commerce
- The Local Investment Commission
- The Missouri Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
- Rehabilitation Services for the Blind
- The Governor's Council on Disabilities
- And the Business Leadership Network

The consortium came together in January 2001 with funding from the Department of Labor to design an infrastructure within the Workforce Development System to provide a seamless delivery of services to job seekers with disabilities. Historically, these job seekers have been served utilizing a specialized and/or segregated model of service delivery. The unintended effects of this was to deny job seekers with disabilities universal access to services from the Workforce Development System and refer job seekers with disabilities to a single source – Vocational Rehabilitation.

The consortium collaborated in creative ways to integrate services and resources within the Workforce development System to meet the unique needs of job seekers with disabilities.

**Customer Focus and Satisfaction:  
Rita Wallinga  
Maryville Career Center**

Rita Wallinga is the Resource Room Coordinator for the Missouri Career Center in Maryville. She is employed by Maryville Community Services.

Rita assists job seekers with their registration in Missouri Works and then teaches them how to use the system. She develops a rapport with customers. Rita has a knack for assessing their needs in a way that makes the customer comfortable about discussing their personal situation.

Rita stays informed of job openings in the area and regularly tells customers about specific openings they might not have found on their own. When she learns of a job lead that is not posted in Missouri Works, she contacts the business and offers to post it for them.

Rita has become familiar with all of the services available through the Career Center System so that she can ensure that all customers are made aware of, and referred to, all appropriate services, including helping customers with Unemployment Insurance claim filing and reporting.

Rita's excellent customer service has resulted in an increase in Career Center traffic with many customers being referred by Rita's past customers.



# Alumni of the Year

In PY 2001, each Workforce Investment Area identified an alumnus that exhibited particular success in overcoming barriers. The list of recipients is followed by some of the success stories.

## 2002 Governor's Conference on Workforce Development Special Recognition Recipients:

Northwest.....	Gary Tantlinger
Northeast.....	Tiffany Rollison
Kansas City & Vicinity .....	Lisa Eisenhower
West Central .....	Bobbie Moulder
St. Louis City .....	Davis Moore
Southwest .....	Tabitha Messbarger
Ozark.....	Karen Glenn
Central.....	Gayla McGinnis
South Central .....	Susan Mann
Southeast.....	Tasha Lucas
East Jackson County .....	Laurence Fuqua
St. Louis County.....	Karen Freund
St. Charles County.....	Jamesetta Keller
Jefferson-Franklin .....	Christine Bowe

## SUSAN MANN, FROM THE SOUTH CENTRAL REGION

Susan Mann had worked as a sewing machine operator for 6 years when the plant shut down due to foreign imports. This proved only the beginning of many changes in Susan's life. Fortunately, the Poplar Bluff Technical Career Center was able to help her access TRA funds to pay for LPN training to establish a new career. Employment Security and Workforce Development partnered to provide Unemployment Insurance Compensation, tuition, books, supplies, and a transportation allowance so Susan could attend school.

Susan's determination to succeed was amazing! During her training she endured financial hardship, a divorce, a heart attack, and a lengthy recovery period. After recovery from the heart attack, she was diagnosed with an additional heart condition that limited her ability to complete her training, yet she prevailed with help from Family Services, the Community Service Block

Grant program, and the WIA program. She graduated in 2001 with her LPN license, but was not well enough to start working. By this time her Unemployment Insurance had run out and she had no income. The WIA Title 1 service provider was able to provide needs-based financial support and pay for a car repair so she could look for work.

In November 2001 Susan was hired as a LPN earning \$7.50 per hour. She is now working for Reynolds County Hospital earning \$10.00 per hour.

Susan has regained her health and her life. She is able to provide for herself and her daughter. In spite of all the adversity, life-altering conditions and struggle, Susan's determination helped her succeed.

## **TIFFANY ROLLISON FROM THE NORTHEAST REGION**

At the time of her divorce, Tiffany was working as a CAN earning minimum wage. She knew this was not enough to support her and her 2 year-old son, so she took a second full-time job. One year later her situation had not improved. Her ex-husband was not paying his child support and she was still working two full-time jobs to make ends meet. She knew she had to make a change.

Tiffany knew that as a registered nurse she could earn more than she was presently making from both jobs, but to achieve this goal, she would have to return to school. She could not afford to pay the tuition, so she solved that problem by getting a full-time clerical position with the Moberly Area Community College, which would allow her tuition to be waived. She received a Pell Grant to pay for her books and fee costs. In January of 1998 she began taking her prerequisite classes for the nursing program. In 1999 she was accepted into the Associate Degree of Nursing program.

Tiffany knew the demands of the nursing program would make it impossible to continue working full-time. She would need assistance to help with the training cost and living expenses. She went to the Career Center where she was directed to the JTPA service provider. It was determined that she would need Food Stamps and Temporary Assistance from Family Services as well as help from JTPA.

Through agency collaboration, a joint plan to meet Tiffany's needs was developed. A Pell grant and funding from Family Services would pay for tuition, fees, supplies, and transportation expenses. JTPA would cover any other necessary educational expenses. Her parents provided childcare for her son.

Tiffany maintained a "B" average and perfect attendance while continuing to work part-time. After graduation, she accepted a position as a Registered Nurse earning \$13.54 per hour. She became completely independent of all public assistance. She had finally reached her goal.

# Cost of Workforce Activities Relative to Perceived Benefits of the Activities on the Performance of the Participants

Missouri spent \$26,769,126 dollars of Workforce Investment Act monies during Fiscal Year 2002. Those monies were calculated (see table 1), and divided between Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Youth Programs (also see Table 1).

<b>Table 1: Formulas for Deriving Actual Program Area Relative Share of Expenditure</b>		
<b>Adult Programs</b>		
Expended Adult Program Funds	\$7,456,462	
Relative Share of Local Administration Funds	\$586,328	
Relative Share of Statewide Activity Funds	\$1,900,271	
<b>TOTAL, ADULT PROGRAMS</b>		<b>\$9,943,061</b>
<b>Dislocated Worker Programs</b>		
Expended Dislocated Worker Program Funds	\$3,711,458	
Relative Share of Local Administration Funds	\$333,599	
Relative Share of Statewide Activity Funds	\$1,081,184	
Rapid Response	\$859,790	
<b>TOTAL, DISLOCATED WORKER PROGRAMS</b>		<b>\$5,986,031</b>
<b>Youth Programs</b>		
Expended Youth Program Funds	\$7,962,981	
Relative Share of Local Administration Funds	\$678,395	
Relative Share of Statewide Activity Funds	\$2,198,658	
<b>TOTAL, YOUTH PROGRAMS</b>		<b>\$10,840,034</b>

Much of the data for above chart is from the DWD Controlled Inventory Tracking System, while additional information is obtained from the State of Missouri State Treasurer's Fund Balance Report for 6/30/2002, adjusted for WIA formula monies only. Other fiscal information is based on the Statewide Advantage for Missouri (SAM II) financial system.

The figures above represent the total WIA monies expended by Missouri during the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2001, and running through June 30, 2002. This analysis intends to show benefits Missouri gained from the increased incomes for WIA participants, which we believe is due in large part to activities funded by the above WIA monies.

## **DETERMINATION OF PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS**

In order to calculate a monetary value to Missouri's gained benefit, it is necessary to determine some characteristics concerning the Adult, Dislocated Worker, and Youth populations covered by the funds reported above. Table 2 shows the total participants, total services provided, and the average number of services for the populations in regards to each program.

<b>Table 2: Total Participants &amp; Services, Fiscal Year 2002</b>	
<b>Adult Programs</b>	
Total Participants	7,306
Total Services	25,315
Average Services per Participant	3.46
<b>Dislocated Worker Programs</b>	
Total Participants	7,320
Total Services	27,970
Average Services per Participant	3.82
<b>Youth Programs</b>	
Total Participants	7,367
Total Services	22,181
Average Services per Participant	3.01

For each program, the numbers of total participants for the Fiscal Year are remarkably similar, with a difference of less than 1%. The range of "Total Services" and "Average Services per Participant" are slightly greater (20% and 21%).

But while the numbers of participants are, for all practical purposes equal, these populations are served with vastly different amounts of resources. The determination of a "cost-per" can now be affected.

<b>Table 3: Average Costs</b>	
<b>Adult Programs</b>	
Average Cost per Service	\$392.77
Average Cost per Client	\$1,360.94
<b>Dislocated Worker Programs</b>	
Average Cost per Service	\$289.44
Average Cost per Client	\$1,804.81
<b>Youth Programs</b>	
Average Cost per Service	\$576.40
Average Cost per Client	\$1,422.13

The differences in perceived efficiencies can be explained via an examination of the types of services provided. Approximately 11% and 13% of the Adult and Dislocated Worker total services respectively are in the form of “follow-up” services. In the Youth Population, follow-up services represented only approximately 4% of services. Additionally, 19% and 16% of Adult and Dislocated Worker total services respectively are in the form of “initial assessments”. In the Youth Population, initial assessment is not a reportable service, and thus accounts for none of the services counted above. Follow-up services and Initial Assessment services are, perhaps, the least costly services provided through WIA. The large number of these types of services accounts for the seemingly much greater efficient use of funds in the Adult and Dislocated Worker populations.

In fact, any comparison of a “cost-per” must bear in mind the differences in the populations. Experience shows that Youth participants tend to be in the system longer than the Adult or Dislocated Worker participants are. The focus of the programs, particularly for the Younger Youth group, is fundamentally different. More emphasis is placed on attainment of skill sets for youth. The object of the program is to build a life-long base for the participant, whereas the emphasis of the Adult and Dislocated Worker programs is more immediate—a return to productive and substantial employment. Differences in the focus also account for differences in the perceived efficiencies of the programs.

## **DETERMINATION OF A “COST-BENEFIT” COMPARISON**

The determination of the costs, both total and average, is relatively easy to calculate. The necessary items, such as total dollars expended in a particular time frame, total participants during that time frame, and total services provided during that time frame, are all carefully tracked and recorded. Thus that data is tangible.

The process of determining a tangible benefit that can be compared to that tangible cost is, however, much more complex. We can, for instance, look at the performance measures in an attempt to determine a tangible benefit. However, the performance measures represent partial populations within any of these groups. The Entered Employment Rate, for instance, excludes

those who were still employed at the time of registration. The Retention Rate only includes those who were successful in the Entered Employment Rate Measure. Furthermore, the costs in any given time period represent monies used for all participants, not just exiters.

To determine a “tangible benefit”, it is possible to develop a derivative of one of the performance measures. In particular, the Adult Earnings Change measure provides useful data that can be developed into a comparable tangible benefit to compare to the above costs. The Adult Earnings Change provides a dollar amount per each successful exiter. Each exiter in a given time period who has Unemployment Insurance (UI) wages during the first quarter after their exit quarter is included in the measure. The data items for that measure are as follows:

- Total “pre-registration” UI Wages, from the second & third quarters prior to registration, for those exiters included in the measure;
- Total “post-exit” UI Wage, from the second & third quarters after exit, for those exiters included in the measure;
- The number of exiters included in the measure.

The actual formula for these three data items is:

$$\frac{\text{Total “post-exit” dollars MINUS Total “pre-registration” dollars}}{\text{Number of exiters in the measure}}$$

The outcome of the formula provides a per exiter dollar amount, which indicates the extent and direction of the Earnings Change for clients. In theory, this represents the impact of the WIA services on the group of exiters.

## **THE DERIVATION OF THE EARNINGS CHANGE MEASURE**

The derivation of this measure must find a way to include all participants-not just those who are eligible to fall in the measure.

The numerator of the measure (post-exit dollars minus pre-registration dollars) provides the appropriate dollar figure to include in the derivation. This figure represents the gross perceived benefit of the WIA dollars expended. Now, by dividing this figure by the total exiters (not just those who qualify for the measure) we can determine a perceived “benefit-per-client” rate. This derived rate now includes all exiters, and, as all participants will eventually exit, can be translated into a “benefit-per-client” rate.

The derived formula now looks like this:

$$\frac{\text{(Total “post-exit” dollars from successful exiters  
MINUS Total “pre-registration dollars from successful exiters)}}{\text{Number of all exiters for the time period}}$$

One potential question to be immediately raised from this formula is the failure to include the “pre-registration” and “post-registration” dollars from those exiters who were not initially in the measure. While that idea bears further consideration, and probably ought to be included in an additional derivation, for the purposes of this analysis that data was excluded for several reasons:

- First, The concept of a “benefit” in regards to the derived measure should not allow for a potential “gain” from clients who were not successful in the WIA program. Failure to obtain an Entered Employment for a client (which excludes them from the Earnings Change measure) is treated as a failure in the performance measures.
- Secondly, clients do move across state lines and potentially have UI wages in other states. That data is not available to Missouri at this time. Including Missouri “pre-registration” wages, while excluding “post-exit” UI wages from other states skews the concept.
- Finally, the purpose of this analysis to determine a comparable cost & benefit in Missouri for comparison. Use of wages outside Missouri skews the point of the comparison.

## **CALCULATION OF THE DERIVED FORMULA**

The Earnings Change measure has now been reported on an annual basis for two years. Because neither year exactly corresponds to the Fiscal Year of the cost data, use of an “average” earnings change is necessitated. The Earnings Change measure as reported in the PY2000 and PY2001 WIA Annual Reports provide the basis for the data.

PY 2000 Annual Report, Numerator, Adult Earnings Change:	\$ 7,882,875
PY 2001 Annual Report, Numerator, Adult Earnings Change:	\$ 6,286,036
<b>TOTAL DERIVED NUMERATOR:</b>	<b>\$ 14,168,911</b>

The denominator for the derived formula is the total number of exiters from the PY2000 and PY2001 Annual Reports.

PY 2000 Annual Report, Total Adult Exiters:	3,310
PY 2001 Annual Report, Total Adult Exiters:	3,874
<b>TOTAL DERIVED DENOMINATOR:</b>	<b>7,184</b>

The division of the numerator (\$ 14,168,911) by the denominator (7,184) provides a derived Earnings Change of \$1,972 per exiter. This figure then goes into the calculation to determine an “annual benefit” based on this derived Earnings Change.

<b>Table 5: The Derived Earnings Change Formula</b>	
PY2000 Numerator, Adult Earning Change:	\$7,882,875
PY2001 Numerator, Adult Earning Change:	\$6,286,036
<b>Total Numerator, Derived Formula:</b>	<b>\$14,168,911</b>
PY 2000 Total Adult Exiters	3,310
PY 2001 Total Adult Exiters	3,874
<b>Total Denominator, Derived Formula:</b>	<b>\$ 7,184</b>
Numerator:	\$14,168,911
Denominator:	7,184
Derived Adult Earnings Change:	\$1,972

The Derived Earnings Change figure of \$1,972 serves as an average for all Missouri exiters. Again, as all participants must eventually become exiters, we can multiply this derived figure against the total number of participants for the time period covered by the cost data (July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002). The total number of participants during this time period was 4,787. This calculation yields a figure of \$9,439,964 represents the six-month yield from the positive Derived Earnings Change. To annualize this, the figure is simply doubled to \$18,879,928. This figure represents the "benefit" WIA participants brought to Missouri as a result of the adult program.

The benefit figure of \$18,879,928 is nearly double the costs expended in the adult program for Fiscal Year 2002. The actual net figure is \$8,936,867, or a ratio of 1.90 if expressed as a ratio.

While the actual benefits of increased earnings accrue first for the actual participants, the state of Missouri accrues actual benefits as well. State income tax is paid on those increased earnings. The State gains sales tax revenue as those increased earnings are spent. As the expenditure of those increased earnings occur, the money becomes income for another, and additional taxes are gained by the state. In addition, local governments within Missouri gain. As some WIA clients move outside of Missouri, those state and local governments gain benefits. And, of course, the Federal Government gains additional tax revenue based on those increased earnings.

## WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

**Table A: Workforce Investment Act Customer Satisfaction Results**

Customer Satisfaction	Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance - Level - American Customer Satisfaction Index	Number of Surveys Completed	Number of Customers Eligible for the Survey	Number of Customers Included in the Sample	Response Rate
Participants	67	83	315	8,977	381	82.7
Employers	69	77	535	26,070	709	75.5

**Table B: Adult Program Results At-A-Glan**

	Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level	
Entered Employment Rate	71	79.8	2,791
			3,498
Employment Retention Rate	82	81	2,547
			3,146
Earnings Change in Six Month	3,346	2,327	6,924,026
			2,975
Employment and Credential Rate	50	60.2	538
			893

**Table C: Outcomes for Adult Special Populations**

Reported Information	Public Assistance Recipients Receiving Intensive or Training Services		Veterans		Individuals With Disabilities		Older Individuals	
Entered Employment Rate	79	1,221	78	199	68.7	68	72.4	97
		1,545		255		99		134
Employment Retention Rate	79.4	1,115	74.7	165	74.7	59	84.5	87
		1,404		221		79		103
Earnings Change in Six Months	2,860	3,721,340	2,506	506,180	1,719	123,749	1,747	165,933
		1,301		202		72		95
Employment and Credential Rate	60.5	451	70.6	48	52.5	21	59.3	16
		746		53		40		27

**Table D: Other Outcome Information for the Adult Program**

Reported Information	Individuals Who Received Training Services		Individuals Who Only Received Core and Intensive Services	
Entered Employment Rate	81.8	579	79.3	2,212
		708		2,790
Employment Retention Rate	80.6	596	81.1	1,951
		739		2,407
Earnings Change in Six Months	3,466	2,311,784	1,998	4,612,243
		667		2,308

**Table E: Dislocated Worker Program Results At-A-Glance**

	Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level	
Entered Employment Rate	76	87	2,033
			2,338
Employment Retention Rate	90	88.9	1,808
			2,033
Earnings Replacement in Six Months	95	98.1	20,161,991
			20,558,842
Employment and Credential Rate	50	67.2	539
			802

**Table F: Outcomes for Dislocated Worker Special Populations**

Reported Information	Veterans		Individuals With Disabilities		Older Individuals		Displaced Homemakers	
Entered Employment Rate	85.7	203	87.2	41	81.6	231	62.5	10
		237		47		283		16
Employment Retention Rate	82.8	168	87.8	36	84.8	196	90	9
		203		41		231		10
Earnings Replacement Rate	87.7	2,137,468	99.9	344,649	75.7	2,070,547	88.2	67,846
		2,436,174		345,018		2,735,215		76,938
Employment And Credential Rate	70.5	43	72.7	16	45.9	34	50	3
		61		22		74		6

**Table G: Other Outcome Information for the Dislocated Worker Program**

Reported Information	Individuals Who Received Training Services		Individuals Who Received Core and Intensive Services	
	Entered Employment Rate	87.2	699	86.8
802			1,536	
Employment Retention Rate	88.8	621	89	1,187
		699		1,334
Earnings Replacement Rate	100.4	6,296,788	97	13,865,203
		6,269,843		14,288,999

**Table H: Older Youth Results At-A-Glance**

	Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level	
		Entered Employment Rate	60
315			
Employment Retention Rate	81	76.8	218
			284
Earnings Change in Six Months	2,805	2,229	599,707
			269
Credential Rate	37	39.4	158
			401

**Table I: Outcomes for Older Youth Special Populations**

Reported Information	Public Assistance Recipients		Veterans		Individuals With Disabilities		Out-of-School Youth	
	Entered Employment Rate	76.7	178	33.3	1	60	9	79.4
232			3		15		199	
Employment Retention Rate	76.5	153	0	0	46.2	6	80.2	146
		200		1		13		182
Earnings Change in Six Months	2,009	377,740	328	328	1,776	19,536	2,371	410,224
		188		1		11		173
Credential Rate	36.5	104	0	0	55	11	39.5	94
		285		3		20		238

**Table J: Younger Youth Results At-A-Glance**

	Negotiated Performance Level		Actual Performance Level	
	Skill Attainment Rate	89		88
				4,780
Diploma or Equivalent Attainment Rate	52		75.2	233
				310
Retention Rate	63		56.4	154
				273

**Table K: Outcomes for Younger Youth Special Populations**

Reported Information	Public Assistance Recipients		Individuals Disabilities		Out-of-School Youth	
Skill Attainment Rate	74.3	3,532	10.3	475	9	422
		4,755		4,605		4,666
Diploma or Equivalent Attainment Rate	71.2	161	91.2	31	49.3	35
		226		34		71
Retention Rate	52.7	96	55	11	47.1	40
		182		20		85

**Table L: Other Reported Information**

	12 Month Employment Retention Rate		12 Mo. Earnings Change (Adults and Older Youth) or 12 Mo. Earnings Replacement (Dislocated Workers)		Placements for Participants in Nontraditional Employment		Wages At Entry Into Employment For Those Individuals Who Entered Employment Unsubsidized Employment		Entry Into Unsubsidized Employment Related to the Training Received of Those Who Completed Training Services	
Adults	76.7	2,047	2,814	7,451,751	0.5	15	3,099	8,648,497	46.6	270
		2,668		2,648		2,791		2,791		579
Dislocated Workers	85.8	2,378	-6,113.4	-168,058	0.7	13	5,083	9,434,108	50.8	307
		2,771		2,749		1,856		1,856		604
Older Youth	74.6	358	2,660	1,263,587	0	0	2,046	497,188		
		480		475		243		243		

**Table M: Participation Levels**

	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Total Exiters</b>
<b>Adults</b>	<b>7,302</b>	<b>3,871</b>
<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	<b>7,320</b>	<b>3,369</b>
<b>Older Youth</b>	<b>1,388</b>	<b>401</b>
<b>Younger Youth</b>	<b>5,978</b>	<b>1,336</b>

**Table N: Cost of Program Activities**

<b>Program Activity</b>		<b>Total Federal Spending</b>
<b>Local Adults</b>		<b>\$11,957,157.00</b>
<b>Local Dislocated Workers</b>		<b>\$8,095,547.00</b>
<b>Local Youth</b>		<b>\$12,785,105.00</b>
<b>Rapid Response</b> (up to 25%) 134 (a) (2) (A)		<b>\$2,487,061.00</b>
<b>Statewide Required Activities</b> (up to 25%) 134 (a) (2) (B)		<b>\$5,346,702.00</b>
<b>Statewide Allowable Activities</b> 134 (a) (3)	Capacity Bld/Tech Assist.	<b>\$831,482.00</b>
	Research-Demonstr.	<b>\$215,176.00</b>
	AD/DW Activities	<b>\$565.00</b>
	Displaced Homemaker	<b>\$42,608.00</b>
	Carrying out Youth Activ.	<b>\$342,796.00</b>
	State Administration	<b>\$1,195,421.00</b>
	WIA Annual Report	<b>\$1,571.00</b>
<b>Total of All Federal Spending Listed Above</b>		<b>\$43,301,191.00</b>

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Central Region Workforce Investment Board, Inc.	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	Adults	491
		Dislocated Workers	487
		Older Youth	148
		Younger Youth	241
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	96
		Dislocated Workers	123
		Older Youth	19
		Younger Youth	69

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	67	83
	Employers	69	77
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	70	92
	Dislocated Workers	80	95
	Older Youth	60	88
Retention Rate	Adults	80	74
	Dislocated Workers	82	93
	Older Youth	80	81
	Younger Youth	66	25
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	2,676	3,319
	Dislocated Workers	80	106
	Older Youth (\$)	2,224	4,595
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	50	80
	Dislocated Workers	50	76
	Older Youth	46	60
	Younger Youth	52	50
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	90	96
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance			
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
	X		

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

Table O: Summary of Participants

Local Area Name: Northwest Missouri Workforce Investment Board	Total Participants Served	Adults	339
		Dislocated Workers	572
		Older Youth	43
		Younger Youth	144
	Total Exiters	Adults	128
		Dislocated Workers	213
		Older Youth	9
		Younger Youth	36

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	67	83
	Employers	69	77
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	69	88
	Dislocated Workers	54	96
	Older Youth	60	75
Retention Rate	Adults	82	75
	Dislocated Workers	81	87
	Older Youth	71	100
	Younger Youth	61	50
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,460	3,586
	Dislocated Workers	92	115
	Older Youth (\$)	2,660	2,517
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	45	47
	Dislocated Workers	45	72
	Older Youth	50	65
	Younger Youth	50	81
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	83	79
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance			
Overall Status of Local Performance		Not Met	Exceeded
			X

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Northeast Missouri Workforce Investment Board, Inc.	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	Adults	128
		Dislocated Workers	447
		Older Youth	34
		Younger Youth	107
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	30
		Dislocated Workers	134
		Older Youth	12
		Younger Youth	45

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	67	83
	Employers	69	77
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	76	88
	Dislocated Workers	75	88
	Older Youth	59	80
Retention Rate	Adults	83	81
	Dislocated Workers	88	93
	Older Youth	80	100
	Younger Youth	65	83
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,851	2,783
	Dislocated Workers	86	88
	Older Youth (\$)	2,895	5,185
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	50	52
	Dislocated Workers	51	77
	Older Youth	53	60
	Younger Youth	55	90
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	59	84
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance			
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
	X		

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

Table O: Summary of Participants

Local Area Name: Kansas City Region	Total Participants Served	Adults	1,197
		Dislocated Workers	776
		Older Youth	255
		Younger Youth	1,031
	Total Exiters	Adults	632
		Dislocated Workers	422
		Older Youth	29
		Younger Youth	177

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level	
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	67	83	
	Employers	69	77	
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	65	81	
	Dislocated Workers	73	86	
	Older Youth	50	77	
Retention Rate	Adults	72	80	
	Dislocated Workers	87	85	
	Older Youth	77	84	
	Younger Youth	58	71	
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	2,800	2,509	
	Dislocated Workers	90	110	
	Older Youth (\$)	2,500	2,816	
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	44	58	
	Dislocated Workers	45	67	
	Older Youth	38	22	
	Younger Youth	48	73	
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	70	97	
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance				
Overall Status of Local Performance		Not Met	Met	Exceeded
		X		

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Workforce Development Board of Western Missouri, Inc.	<b>Total Participants                  Served</b>	Adults	275
		Dislocated Workers	548
		Older Youth	61
		Younger Youth	205
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	169
		Dislocated Workers	232
		Older Youth	24
		Younger Youth	78

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	67	83
	Employers	69	77
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	61	83
	Dislocated Workers	71	88
	Older Youth	33	100
Retention Rate	Adults	69	84
	Dislocated Workers	78	89
	Older Youth	64	100
	Younger Youth	48	30
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,200	1,878
	Dislocated Workers	79	85
	Older Youth (\$)	2,137	3,000
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	30	29
	Dislocated Workers	31	45
	Older Youth	33	75
	Younger Youth	40	43
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	69	88
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance			
Overall Status of Local Performance		Not Met	Met
		X	
		Exceeded	

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

Local Area Name: St. Louis City WIB	Total Participants Served	Adults	1,552
		Dislocated Workers	289
		Older Youth	203
		Younger Youth	1,128
	Total Exiters	Adults	1,150
		Dislocated Workers	185
		Older Youth	134
		Younger Youth	398

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	67	83
	Employers	69	77
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	71	79
	Dislocated Workers	76	82
	Older Youth	60	70
Retention Rate	Adults	76	80
	Dislocated Workers	90	90
	Older Youth	71	62
	Younger Youth	50	0
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	2,720	1,687
	Dislocated Workers	95	104
	Older Youth (\$)	2,250	1,413
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	40	42
	Dislocated Workers	50	45
	Older Youth	30	15
	Younger Youth	42	64
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	85	72
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance			
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
	X		

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Workforce Investment Board of Southwest Region	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	Adults	364
		Dislocated Workers	240
		Older Youth	35
		Younger Youth	310
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	230
		Dislocated Workers	120
		Older Youth	11
		Younger Youth	43

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	67	83
	Employers	69	77
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	69	67
	Dislocated Workers	72	77
	Older Youth	64	86
Retention Rate	Adults	83	80
	Dislocated Workers	92	87
	Older Youth	75	100
	Younger Youth	50	38
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,346	1,386
	Dislocated Workers	95	85
	Older Youth (\$)	2,630	-1,590
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	50	46
	Dislocated Workers	53	68
	Older Youth	29	29
	Younger Youth	52	71
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	89	73
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance			
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
	X		

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

Table O: Summary of Participants

Local Area Name: Ozark	Total Participants Served	Adults	286
		Dislocated Workers	670
		Older Youth	39
		Younger Youth	422
	Total Exiters	Adults	180
		Dislocated Workers	211
		Older Youth	16
		Younger Youth	183

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	67	83
	Employers	69	77
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	69	78
	Dislocated Workers	79	94
	Older Youth	56	92
Retention Rate	Adults	82	88
	Dislocated Workers	90	86
	Older Youth	80	73
	Younger Youth	47	60
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	4,306	3,495
	Dislocated Workers	95	104
	Older Youth (\$)	2,580	1,775
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	45	58
	Dislocated Workers	45	59
	Older Youth	50	53
	Younger Youth	50	57
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	90	89
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance			
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
	X		

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

Local Area Name: South Central Region	Total Participants Served	Adults	392
		Dislocated Workers	184
		Older Youth	81
		Younger Youth	391
	Total Exiters	Adults	176
		Dislocated Workers	92
		Older Youth	27
		Younger Youth	80

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	67	83
	Employers	69	77
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	75	82
	Dislocated Workers	76	90
	Older Youth	60	81
Retention Rate	Adults	80	84
	Dislocated Workers	80	90
	Older Youth	64	81
	Younger Youth	63	62
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,200	2,693
	Dislocated Workers	95	106
	Older Youth (\$)	2,200	2,931
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	70	77
	Dislocated Workers	65	71
	Older Youth	30	48
	Younger Youth	67	88
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	89	85
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance			
Overall Status of Local Performance		Not Met	Exceeded
			X

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

Local Area Name: Southeast	Total Participants Served	Adults	984
		Dislocated Workers	773
		Older Youth	324
		Younger Youth	1,194
	Total Exiters	Adults	299
		Dislocated Workers	301
		Older Youth	79
		Younger Youth	80

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	67	83
	Employers	69	77
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	67	79
	Dislocated Workers	77	81
	Older Youth	58	77
Retention Rate	Adults	80	86
	Dislocated Workers	89	88
	Older Youth	78	75
	Younger Youth	60	83
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	2,800	2,863
	Dislocated Workers	85	105
	Older Youth (\$)	2,400	2,192
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	47	56
	Dislocated Workers	50	63
	Older Youth	46	57
	Younger Youth	54	64
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	88	93
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance			
Overall Status of Local Performance		Not Met	Exceeded
			X

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> East Jackson County Region Workforce Investment Board	<b>Total Participants                  Served</b>	Adults	223
		Dislocated Workers	295
		Older Youth	33
		Younger Youth	184
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	122
		Dislocated Workers	199
		Older Youth	8
		Younger Youth	81

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	67	83
	Employers	69	77
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	66	74
	Dislocated Workers	71	83
	Older Youth	50	80
Retention Rate	Adults	69	82
	Dislocated Workers	80	87
	Older Youth	60	78
	Younger Youth	62	67
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,000	2,085
	Dislocated Workers	89	123
	Older Youth (\$)	2,500	1,247
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	43	54
	Dislocated Workers	40	57
	Older Youth	50	36
	Younger Youth	40	0
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	47	96
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance			
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
	X		

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> Workforce Development Board of Saint Louis County	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	Adults	786
		Dislocated Workers	1,237
		Older Youth	75
		Younger Youth	510
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	524
		Dislocated Workers	808
		Older Youth	17
		Younger Youth	47

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	67	83
	Employers	69	77
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	71	79
	Dislocated Workers	83	86
	Older Youth	67	81
Retention Rate	Adults	82	83
	Dislocated Workers	92	90
	Older Youth	83	88
	Younger Youth	64	61
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	2,800	3,115
	Dislocated Workers	84	89
	Older Youth (\$)	3,000	2,517
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	60	68
	Dislocated Workers	61	73
	Older Youth	42	54
	Younger Youth	65	100
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	90	98
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance			
Overall Status of Local Performance		Not Met	Exceeded
		X	

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

<b>Local Area Name:</b> St. Charles County Workforce Development Board of Directors	<b>Total Participants                  Served</b>	Adults	116
		Dislocated Workers	538
		Older Youth	25
		Younger Youth	29
	<b>Total Exiters</b>	Adults	82
		Dislocated Workers	248
		Older Youth	7
		Younger Youth	11

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	67	83
	Employers	69	77
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	70	83
	Dislocated Workers	64	90
	Older Youth	50	100
Retention Rate	Adults	50	96
	Dislocated Workers	88	86
	Older Youth	80	50
	Younger Youth	71	75
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,346	3,702
	Dislocated Workers	80	92
	Older Youth (\$)	2,805	791
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	50	100
	Dislocated Workers	50	76
	Older Youth	50	100
	Younger Youth	40	75
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	81	95
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance			
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
	X		

# WIA Annual Report Data

State Name: MO

Program Year: 2001

**Table O: Summary of Participants**

Local Area Name: Jefferson/Franklin County	Total Participants Served	Adults	169
		Dislocated Workers	264
		Older Youth	32
		Younger Youth	82
	Total Exiters	Adults	53
		Dislocated Workers	81
		Older Youth	9
		Younger Youth	8

		Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	67	83
	Employers	69	77
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	67	87
	Dislocated Workers	66	81
	Older Youth	63	100
Retention Rate	Adults	76	77
	Dislocated Workers	78	100
	Older Youth	80	67
	Younger Youth	75	100
Earnings Change / Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults(\$)	3,000	4,332
	Dislocated Workers	90	99
	Older Youth (\$)	3,000	1,624
Credential / Diploma Rate	Adults	41	76
	Dislocated Workers	40	73
	Older Youth	38	56
	Younger Youth	45	100
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	71	99
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance			
Overall Status of Local Performance	Not Met	Met	Exceeded
	X		