

# **FY01 (PY00) Annual Report**

## **Adult, Dislocated Worker and Youth Activities Workforce Investment Act of 1998, Title I-B**

submitted by the  
Commonwealth of Massachusetts

to the  
United States Department of Labor  
Employment and Training Administration

December 20, 2001

Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
Jane Swift, Governor

Department of Labor and Workforce Development  
Angelo Buonopane, Director

Commonwealth Corporation  
Jonathan Raymond, President

Overview of WIA Title I-B.....	3
I. Required Narrative	
A. Title I Expenditures and Cost Effectiveness .....	12
B. Evaluation Activities.....	15
II. Required Tables	
Table A: Customer Satisfaction Results .....	17
Tables B – D: Adults .....	18
Tables E – G: Dislocated Workers .....	19
Tables H – I: Older Youth .....	20
Tables J – K: Younger Youth .....	21
Table L: Other Reported Information .....	22
Table M: Participation Levels .....	22
Table N: Cost of Activities .....	23
Table O, Parts 1-17: Local Performance	
25005 Boston .....	24
25015 Hampden County .....	25
25020 North Central (No. Worcester) .....	26
25025 Central Mass.(So. Worcester) .....	27
25030 Metro North .....	28
25035 Brockton Area .....	29
25040 Bristol County .....	30
25045 Northern Middlesex .....	31
25050 Berkshire County .....	32
25055 Lower Merrimack .....	33
25060 Southern Essex .....	34
25065 South Coastal .....	35
25070 Metro South/West .....	36
25075 Franklin/Hampshire .....	37
25080 Cape Cod & Islands .....	38
25085 Greater New Bedford .....	39
25 Massachusetts Totals .....	40

## **Overview of WIA Title I Implementation**

This introductory section to the *FY01 (PY00) Annual Report on Adult, Dislocated Worker and Youth Activities under Title I-B of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998* highlights key system reforms implemented during the first full year of WIA in Massachusetts and discusses the Commonwealth's increased commitment to effective workforce investment activities. It then illustrates how these WIA-driven systemwide reforms and increasing levels of state commitment translated into specific accomplishments and challenges in the implementation of adult, dislocated worker, and youth activities.

### ***WIA Successes in System Reform***

The Workforce Investment Act (WIA) has provided the Commonwealth of Massachusetts an opportunity to begin the process of reform toward the creation of a new comprehensive workforce development system. WIA (Title I) supersedes the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) and amends the Wagner-Peyser Act (Title III), the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (Title II) and the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1998 (Title IV). The system is intended to be customer focused, assisting job seekers to access high quality information and workforce development services, and assisting employers in finding skilled workers to meet their needs.

The Department of Labor and Workforce Development (DLWD) has been designated as the agency responsible for implementing the Workforce Investment Act as the grant recipient for Title I funds. The Commonwealth Corporation acts as the oversight agency for Title I activities. As this *FY01 (PY00) Annual Report* illustrates, DLWD and Commonwealth Corporation have played a critical role in the successful implementation of WIA and in establishing the foundation for a more responsive and comprehensive workforce development system. In addition, the development of strong partnerships between DLWD, Commonwealth Corporation, and other workforce development agencies in the Commonwealth including the Division of Employment and Training, the Department of Education and the Department of Transitional Assistance has contributed directly to the success during Massachusetts' first full program year under WIA.

One of the highlights during this first full program year is the development and certification of Local Workforce Investment Boards in all sixteen workforce areas of the Commonwealth. A second highlight is the establishment of a statewide network of One-Stop Career Centers as the primary vehicle for the coordination and delivery of services (including Title I activities) through the Five Year Plan and local Memorandums of Understanding with Chief Elected Officials, Fiscal Agents and partner programs. A third highlight is closely related to the level of coordination provided by the statewide network of One-Stop Career Centers and involved the implementation of an integrated management information system, the Massachusetts One Stop Employment System (MOSES). Developed by the Division of Employment and Training, MOSES is the principle vehicle for the tracking of job seeker and employer customers of the One-Stop Career Center system.

## Increased State Commitment to System Reform

In addition to these WIA-driven efforts to create a more comprehensive and effective workforce investment system, the Commonwealth has increased its commitment to increasing the overall effectiveness of workforce investment activities during this first full WIA program year. On April 11, 2001, Governor Jane Swift created an inter-agency Task Force to Reform Adult Education and Worker Training, and charged it with reviewing existing state and federal training programs to determine how they can better serve working families and businesses. The primary goals for the Task Force set forth by the Governor's Executive Order included: assessing existing adult education and training services; analyzing funding streams to identify and leverage existing resources; reviewing performance measures to ensure accountability and effective service delivery; and evaluating the overall structure of the workforce development system.

The Task Force summarized its findings in *Climbing the Ladder*. This report offered concrete policy recommendations and proposed specific programmatic strategies to further the process of building an integrated workforce development system that addresses the needs of the Massachusetts labor force and private employers. Title I activities will be greatly enhanced by their implementation. The primary recommendations of the Governor's Task Force are:

- 1. Commit to the development of an integrated workforce system** so that each programmatic activity at the various agencies supports a common mission and strategic purpose, with funding resources aligned to explicit, measurable statewide objectives. In an integrated system, decisions about investing public funds need to be based on a data-driven analysis of need, a clear understanding of system-wide priorities, and a targeting of resources for the greatest overall impact.
- 2. Build the capacity of the State Workforce Investment Board (SWIB)** to assume a leadership role in the development of workforce policy. During the past year, the SWIB has successfully put in place the infrastructure to implement the new federal Workforce Investment Act. The next phase of its mission is to provide leadership in developing policies and goals that will support continuous improvement. The Executive Committee of the Board should assume the responsibility of shaping and stewarding a strategic vision for the workforce development system, which should serve as a common denominator for adult education and workforce services across all state agencies.
- 3. Launch a new initiative to help meet the demand for more highly skilled workers through a model of integrated workforce development services.** The Task Force designed the Building Essential Skills through Training (BEST) Initiative to carry out this recommendation. The Initiative will fund regional proposals that give front-line workers a foundation of skills to achieve wage and career advancement, while reducing persistent job vacancies in key sectors. BEST leverages existing resources from various state agencies and programs, including Title I, to model system reform and stimulate the integration of existing services. It also encourages greater investment by employers to develop the skills of their front-line workers.

4. **Create consistent and meaningful performance measures to apply system-wide.** The need to evaluate the effectiveness of state and federal investments in adult education and workforce development activities is not always possible using the distinct measurement tools employed by each program. The Task Force has already made significant progress toward implementing this recommendation, developing cross-program measures that build upon Title I and other partners.
5. **Comprehensive review of existing workforce programs** by the SWIB to program effectiveness and the extent to which various programs support the shared mission and statewide objectives of the workforce development system. The Task Force, and Tactical Planning committee of the SWIB, have already started this process by cataloguing state supported workforce programs and documenting their resources and services
6. **Expand adult education opportunities in the Commonwealth.** The MassINC report<sup>1</sup> outlines the challenges we face in providing literacy, numeracy and adult education for the thousands of people who are languishing on waiting lists. This challenge exceeds the existing federal and state resources. The Governor has proposed and will continue to advocate for additional state investment in the Adult Basic Education system.

### *Accomplishments and Challenges in the Implementation of WIA Title I-B Activities*

#### **Title I Adult and Dislocated Worker Programs**

During the first year of the implementation of the Workforce Investment Act, state and regional efforts were directed toward developing partnerships, integrating services, and collecting and using customer feedback data to improve customer services. In addition, workforce investment boards focused on strategic planning. More specifically, FY01 (PY00) successes included:

- ◆ **Developing partnerships and increasing coordination and integration of services.** Working across the state within local areas to develop and execute Memoranda of Understanding and forge partnerships has created opportunities to integrate community services through One-Stop Career Centers, as the following examples from selected regions illustrate.
  - *The Franklin Hampshire Regional Employment Board is collaborating with a local community program that provides job readiness services for low-income fathers. In a letter of support for the program, the REB Director wrote, "The activities of this program are an excellent complement to the services of our One-Stop Centers. Our REB can ensure that the project is coordinated with One-Stop services and that non-custodial fathers receive the full array of core services available."*

---

<sup>1</sup> MassINC is a nonpartisan think tank. MassINC published *New Skills for a New Economy*. The Governor's Task Force referenced this report on several occasions. This report examined the skill requirements of the New Economy and estimated how many workers lacked these skills. In addition, it assessed the effectiveness of the adult basic education system and evaluated the institutional linkages between this system and other workforce development systems and services in the Commonwealth. Among other things, the report called for greater levels of coordination and for increased investments to meet unmet demand for adult basic education services.

- *Services are being integrated within the career center system in Bristol and are offered both in-person and electronically. The Fall River Housing Authority collaborates with the career center to exchange housing and job information. Bristol Community College has also become a partner and brings the capabilities of doing satellite broadcasts to outlying areas.*
  - *In Boston, the Private Industry Council convenes a workforce advisory group that meets regularly with representatives of CBOs, career centers and targeted populations (e.g., housing agencies, DTA, linguistic minorities). The group reviews how WIA resources are managed, coordinated, and integrated with community resources.*
  - *As the Lower Merrimack area faced the downsizing of Lucent Technology, the WIB created an advisory group to assess the needs of the affected workforce and to develop and coordinate services for these workers. This group is comprised of the WIB, Career Center, Lucent human resources staff, Northern Essex Community College, the Alliance (union), the Economic Development Council, and staff from Commonwealth Corporation. This group contributed to the development of a National Emergency Grant and will continue to collaborate as services are provided to these workers.*
  - *Five workforce investment boards in the Southeast region of the state (South Coastal, Bristol, Cape Cod, Brockton, and New Bedford) developed a partnership and were successful in being awarded a USDOL funded community audit demonstration grant. Through their work on this project they will analyze labor market and community resource data, identify gaps in service to business, industry and the workforce in the Southeast region, and develop collaborative initiatives to address these gaps.*
- ◆ **Soliciting and Using Customer Feedback.** To develop services that are responsive to the needs of Career Center customers, local areas actively engaged in seeking customer feedback and using this information to design and re-design customer-friendly services, as these vignettes illustrate:
- *Northern Middlesex, in an effort to better satisfy customers, publishes a newsletter. The newsletter is a mechanism to market the activities of the career center and to communicate customer comments about the services of the center. A section of the newsletter is entitled “Customer Feedback.” This section of the newsletter reports customer comments gained through surveys and provides information about the center’s response to customer feedback.*
  - *Southern Essex embarked upon an extensive program of staff development to improve customer focus, create process improvement teams, and begin the work of continuous quality improvement. As a result of this work, South Coastal will be doing similar work during fiscal year 2002.*
  - *Metro Southwest emphasized customer service by using customer feedback to determine and re-design the content and scheduling of workshops.*

- ◆ **Initiating LWIB Strategic Planning.** Strategic planning was a focus of the Massachusetts Workforce Investment Board Association in fiscal year 2001. Several monthly directors' meetings and the Association's annual conference were devoted to this topic.
  - *Hampden County conducted an extensive strategic planning process. Through a collaboration with Commonwealth Corporation, this process was documented and resulted in the publication of a manual entitled "Practical Strategic Planning for Workforce Boards." The manual has served as a technical assistance tool for boards across the state.*
  - *Building on this work, Berkshire and Franklin Hampshire have conducted strategic planning. It is expected that this work will continue into fiscal year 2002.*
  
- ◆ **Coordinating Trade (TAA and NAFTA/TAA) programs with services available through the One-Stop Career Center partner programs.** In many workforce areas, an important partner program providing additional funds for training dislocated workers is the Trade program. With program expenditures exceeding \$2,000,000, the Trade Programs served 533 workers, with 303 entering occupational training and 230 served in basic education and ESOL training. An important focus of Trade programs in Massachusetts is the coordination of trade adjustment assistance with services available through the One-Stop Career Center partner programs, including co-enrollment in Title I Dislocated Worker services.
  - *Examples of this coordination are the services provided to former employees of Globe Manufacturing, Tamfelt and Commonwealth Sprague Capacitors. Workers were laid off months before the Trade certifications were complete. In partnering with other funding, not only were the workers able to access core and intensive services immediately, but training resources were also made available before the companies were Trade certified. Instead of workers having to wait to access training, reducing the available cash benefits while in training and their options for longer term training, workers started school utilizing WIA Dislocated Worker funding. Following the companies' certification, the remaining training costs were paid for with Trade funds allowing WIA funds to be available for other non-Trade customers needing training.*
  
- ◆ **Formalizing the coordination between Rapid Response activities, local WIBs and One-Stop Career Centers.** There is a long history of success with Rapid Response in the Commonwealth that has continued under WIA. Five regional teams provide statewide early intervention and re-employment services to companies and their employees affected by layoffs and closings. Quality on-site outplacement services provide an effective and smooth transition to new employment for affected employees. To ensure that Rapid Response services are coordinated with local WIBs and One-Stop Career Centers, a Memorandum of Agreement was developed with each of the sixteen workforce areas.
  - *Rapid Response provided various types of services to over 300 companies and provided over 5,200 workers with referrals to One-Stop Career Centers. By developing relationships with businesses with skill shortages and referring qualified laid-off workers, Rapid Response was able to make hundreds of pre-layoff placements. Policy and procedures were also developed for the distribution of over \$1 million in Rapid Response Additional Assistance funds to local WIBs. This set-aside fund has provided much needed*

*supplemental monies for local programs, especially as National Emergency Grant proposals and Trade-impacted company certifications are developed.*

In addition to the above successes, the first full program year of WIA Title I-B adult and dislocated worker activities also posed some considerable challenges. These included:

- ◆ **Developing an eligible training provider list.** Given the number and diversity of local workforce investment areas in the relatively small area of Massachusetts, developing a State List of eligible training providers for individual training accounts, while respecting local involvement, authority, and control, presented a set of challenges. Further increasing the challenge was the desire to have the list reside electronically on the newly developed Massachusetts One-Stop Employment System (MOSES). Through the efforts of a workgroup comprised of representatives from local areas, training providers, and state-level staff, the initial eligibility process was developed and the list was made available on MOSES. Over 300 providers and over 2,800 programs were made available during the program year for Title I ITA customers. As the workgroup develops the subsequent eligibility process, this system will be refined and enhanced.
- ◆ **Clarifying Local Area Roles and Authority Relationships.** As the state continues its efforts to build an effective statewide, coordinated system of workforce development services, a continuing challenge is the process for defining the roles and lines of authority within local workforce areas of workforce investment boards, administrative entities/fiscal agents, career center management and partner agencies. This sometimes results in a lack of clarity, which, coupled with limited financial resources within the system, can sometimes create particular challenges to the coordination and collaboration required among local partners to deliver responsive, effective services. As the system evolves, work will continue to tackle this challenge.

### **Title I Youth Programs**

Most key goals were accomplished during the first full year of WIA implementation of youth activities.

- ◆ **Establishing youth councils and procuring youth services.** Almost all workforce areas completed the process of establishing a youth council and procuring youth services in a timely manner. Of the sixteen workforce areas, only two were significantly late in selecting youth vendors. Both of these areas were still able to obligate at least 80% of their formula youth funds prior to June 30, 2001.
- ◆ **Meeting expected participation rates.** Statewide, the youth enrollment levels achieved 90 percent of plan (3,501 out of planned 3,869). Twelve of the sixteen workforce areas experienced participation rates at least 80 percent of expected levels. The service goals for younger youth (aged 14 to 18) were basically met (3,093 of a planned 3,115) but enrollments for older youth (19-21) only reached 54% of plan (408 out of 754).

- ◆ **Securing access to ten WIA service elements.** In general, it appeared that the sixteen youth councils were successful in providing youth with access to all of the required program service elements. Service providers and vendors were contracted to provide services in all ten elements in almost every workforce area.
- ◆ **Transitioning from summer-based to year-round services.** Youth councils demonstrated success in converting from a culture of JTPA summer jobs to WIA year-round services. Very few workforce areas retained an exclusive focus on summer employment; most began to experiment with a wider view of services and service elements.

The following implementation issues became apparent during the first year of WIA implementation:

- ◆ **Recruitment and enrollment of eligible youth can be a concern.** Several of the workforce areas experienced lower-than-expected participation rates because they had not adequately designed local strategies for youth recruitment and engagement. Youth eligibility is a time-consuming process that has proven difficult to administer. Mid-year changes in tactics have helped, but many workforce areas need to review recruitment issues.
- ◆ **Workforce areas that did not centralize their framework services are finding it difficult to meet WIA's expectation for multiple services over time.** Framework services that are contracted to content vendors end up being vendor-driven rather than youth/client-driven.
- ◆ **Follow-up services have proven difficult to operationalize.** Follow-up services are one of the ten required 'content' service elements under WIA – they are not included within the Act as one of the program design framework services. However, it has proven difficult for youth councils, for youth program operators, and for youth service providers to predict the cost and adequately provide staff to accomplish follow-up services. Many youth councils are finding that 'follow-up' is better treated as a framework service yet must go through a procurement process in order to centralize follow-up within the organization that provides framework services.
- ◆ **Time required to shift the WIA culture from its defining characteristics as vendor-driven contract procurement to a vision of networked youth services.** Massachusetts exhibits a strong amount of coordination and leverage. Youth councils are well known for coordinating WIA funds with school-to-career connecting activities, and with funds that support academic remediation. Even in this climate of demonstrated success, it will take additional time to shift the WIA culture from its defining characteristics as vendor-driven contract procurement to a vision of networked youth services.

In addition to the above accomplishments and challenges, it is important to point out how WIA system building efforts at the state level have facilitated system reform and promoted local successes. These efforts included:

- ◆ **Issuing of system building grants.** Commonwealth Corporation designated a total of \$250,000, from the WIA 15% reserve, for statewide activities for use as discretionary incentive grants to youth councils. The Corporation partnered with the Massachusetts Department of Social Services (DSS), which matched the WIA funds with monies from the Chaffee Foster Care Independence Act. This Act allows DSS to provide a range of independent living preparatory services to youth and young adults who are in DSS custody and who will age out of the system without returning home or being adopted as well as youth who have already aged out of foster care. Most of these youth have been in DSS custody for a number of years and have experienced multiple placements. As a consequence, they have endured multiple losses and disruptions in their lives which have resulted in poor school performance, little successful employment experience, no positive support network, negative self esteem, etc. These young adults are in need of support with educational/vocational assessment and training, job readiness skills, job placement and support, life skills training, and other services.

This project has the dual purpose of (a) building capacity within community youth development systems to coordinate and connect resources from different categorical programs and (b) enhancing program services to foster youth. The capacity-building component will result in the integration of such administrative functions as intake/co-enrollment, assessment, service planning, case management, follow-up, and performance measurement. The enhanced program services will result in the delivery of career development, academic, employment readiness and other services through a network of local youth providers that includes One-Stop Career Centers, local offices of the DSS Adolescent Services Unit, and organizations that provide WIA-specified program elements. CommCorp awarded three grants under the RFP – to the youth councils for the Cape Cod & the Islands, Metro South (Brockton), and Hampden County (Springfield) workforce investment areas.

- ◆ **Developing and implementing a framework for Youth Council development.** The Center for Youth Development and Education of the Commonwealth Corporation created a ‘framework for youth council development’ for Massachusetts. The framework provides a broad blueprint for supporting youth councils in using WIA as a foundation for building an effective youth development system within the local community. The framework describes a range of developmental levels – beginning with a narrow view of system building (defined as WIA-compliant) to a broad view that serves the education and workforce needs of all youth. The framework was designed to give youth councils a perspective on system building, as well as identify some practical steps for connecting with other youth-serving resources and programs. The framework is not mandated by the state, but is intended to serve as a general guide for youth council actions. Several councils are using it to guide their strategic planning and development.

**Providing additional forms of WIA system building support.** The Commonwealth Corporation provided a wide array of training and technical support to the sixteen youth councils within the Commonwealth. CYDE staff pursued three strategic avenues in developing technical assistance activities.

1. **Support for youth council development.** This strategy was directed at helping youth councils get organized and begin exercise appropriate authority over youth policy. The Commonwealth provided \$20,000 per workforce area to support youth council staffing. In addition, CYDE (a) provided on-call customized one-on-one workshops; (b) developed and published a 'how-to' manual that contains a series of planning tools for youth councils [Helping All Youth Succeed: Building Youth Development Systems in Our Communities]; and (c) convened a monthly workshop series to train youth council members and staff in aspects of WIA implementation.
2. **Support for youth operations.** This strategy was directed primarily at the organizations that provide WIA youth program design framework services. CommCorp recognized that many of the operational details of how youth will be served under WIA needed to be developed. Through workshops and working groups, CommCorp (a) developed a comprehensive ISS document for use by localities; (b) established statewide policy on eligibility and documentation; (c) provided an analysis of FY01 WIA procurement strategies; and (d) advocated for design changes to the statewide MOSES system.
3. **Support for youth service providers.** This strategy was directed to the organizations that provide youth services either under contract to an LWIB/youth council or through a non-financial agreement with other local service providers. CommCorp supported the statewide Reaching All Youth network, which convened youth service providers on a regular basis to share ideas on program design, resource development, and effective practices within the youth field.

**State Name: COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS**

**Date Submitted: 12/20/2001**

**Grant Recipient: Department of Labor and Workforce Development**

**Administrative Entity: Commonwealth Corporation**

**WIA Title I-B  
Annual Report Form (ETA 9091)**

**I. Narrative Section**

**A. Cost of workforce investment activities and effects on the performance of participants.**

Review of Overall Expenditures

For state Fiscal Year 2001 (federal Program Year 2000), the Commonwealth of Massachusetts received a WIA Title I-B allotment of \$39,029,858. In addition, at the completion of JTPA close-out activities in December, carry-in funds in the amount of \$3,597,212 became available for WIA Title I-B activities. Of the combined total of \$42.6 million, approximately 77%, or \$32.7 million, had been expended by June 30, 2001. Of the remaining balance of \$9.9 million, almost \$4.4 million was already obligated as of June 30, 2001. The Commonwealth's end-of-year total of expenditures and obligations was, therefore, \$37.1 million, representing 87% of total availability, meeting and exceeding the WIA goal of 80%. Chart 1 on the following page shows availability and expenditure detail by program reporting categories.

There has been concern at the national level over the low rate of expenditures in WIA Title I-B. While the Commonwealth's expenditures are close to plan, and certainly exceed the national average, we do anticipate an increase in the expenditure rate during PY01. The somewhat lower rate of expenditures for JTPA carry-in was, in part, due to these funds not being available to local workforce areas until the last six months of the program year with the completion of the close-out of JTPA programs. There also were some delays associated with WIA transition and start-up activities in some workforce areas. Development of youth councils and new program strategies delayed the procurement of youth providers in some areas, resulting in less accrued expenditures (72%) and higher levels of obligations than planned as of June 30<sup>th</sup>. The implementation of policies and processes for individual training accounts (ITAs) affected adult expenditures (77%) in a few workforce areas. Dislocated worker funds were spent at the highest rate (83%), as changes in the economy put increased pressure on these funds during PY00. In the new program year, Dislocated Worker monies are being committed at an accelerated rate as a result of the events of September 11<sup>th</sup> and the overall downturn in the economy.

**Chart 1: WIA Title I-B Expenditures and Cost per Participant Ratios**

<b>Title I Expenditures (PY00 Allocation and Carry-In)</b>					
Total All Fund Sources	Available	Expended	Pct	Balance Remaining	Balance Obligated
Adult Local Program	\$10,290,695	\$7,906,168	77%	\$2,384,527	\$777,543
<i>Carry in Monies (non add)</i>	<i>\$1,221,202</i>	<i>\$406,346</i>	<i>33%</i>	<i>\$814,856</i>	<i>\$3,574</i>
Dislocated Worker Local Program	\$8,666,315	\$7,226,729	83%	\$1,439,586	\$790,149
<i>Carry in Monies (non add)</i>	<i>\$847,908</i>	<i>\$391,025</i>	<i>46%</i>	<i>\$456,883</i>	<i>\$125,000</i>
Youth Local Program	\$10,443,086	\$7,496,912	72%	\$2,946,174	\$1,974,313
<i>Carry in Monies (non add)</i>	<i>\$530,649</i>	<i>\$183,073</i>	<i>34%</i>	<i>\$347,576</i>	<i>\$0</i>
Out-of-School Youth	NA	\$2,657,960	(35% of youth expenditures)		
In-School Youth	NA	\$4,838,952	(65% of youth expenditures)		
Summer Employment Opportunities	NA	\$3,358,088	(45% of youth expenditures)		
Local Administration Funds	\$3,265,575	\$2,585,121	79%	\$680,454	\$100,935
<i>Carry in Monies (non add)</i>	<i>\$287,760</i>	<i>\$133,937</i>	<i>47%</i>	<i>\$153,823</i>	<i>\$1,534</i>
Statewide Rapid Response Funds	\$3,397,222	\$2,547,328	75%	\$849,894	\$550,553
<i>Carry in Monies (non add)</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>NA</i>
Statewide 15% Activity Funds	\$6,564,176	\$4,967,342	76%	\$1,596,834	\$165,241
<i>Carry in Monies (non add)</i>	<i>\$709,693</i>	<i>\$355,632</i>	<i>50%</i>	<i>\$354,066</i>	<i>\$140,988</i>
Combined Totals	\$42,627,069	\$32,729,600	77%	\$9,897,469	\$4,358,734
<i>Carry in Monies (non add)</i>	<i>\$3,597,212</i>	<i>\$1,470,013</i>	<i>41%</i>	<i>\$2,127,204</i>	<i>\$271,096</i>
<b>Costs per Participant</b>					
Program Strategies	Total Participants	Cost per Participant	Entered Employment Rate	Retention at Six Months	Post-Pgm Earnings Gain
Adult Program	2702	\$2,925	73.5%	77.5%	\$4,986
<i>Training/Education Services</i>	<i>1990</i>	<i>\$3,550</i>	<i>73.1%</i>	<i>78.2%</i>	<i>\$5,241</i>
<i>Core/Intensive Services Only</i>	<i>802</i>	<i>\$1,170</i>	<i>76.8%</i>	<i>72.9%</i>	<i>\$3,209</i>
Dislocated Worker Program	4831	\$2,005	78.0%	84.6%	122%
<i>Training/Education Services</i>	<i>2711</i>	<i>\$2,900</i>	<i>76.9%</i>	<i>85.0%</i>	<i>127%</i>
<i>Core/Intensive Services Only</i>	<i>2120</i>	<i>\$870</i>	<i>79.7%</i>	<i>84.1%</i>	<i>114%</i>
Youth Program	3501	\$2,140	60.7%	59.9%	NA
<i>Out-of-School Youth</i>	<i>805</i>	<i>\$3,300</i>	<i>63.9%</i>	<i>62.5%</i>	<i>NA</i>
<i>In-School Youth</i>	<i>2696</i>	<i>\$1,800</i>	<i>52.6%</i>	<i>53.6%</i>	<i>NA</i>

## Cost Effectiveness of Program Strategies

A review of program strategies and expenditures (see again Chart 1) shows that the majority of WIA Title I adult and dislocated worker participants are receiving education, literacy and/or occupational training. As expected, the overall cost per participant in the adult program (\$2,925) is much higher than that of the dislocated worker program (\$2,005). Title I adults are more likely to have significant barriers to employment, to have less work experience and to have lower levels of basic skills. Almost three quarters (74%) of adult participants received some type of training and/or education service whereas about 56% of dislocated workers received training and education.

Based on information from WIA Plans and MOU Budgets, it is estimated that the cost per participant for adult individuals who received training services is \$3,550, about \$2,400 more on average than the cost for an individual receiving only core and intensive career center services (\$1,170). These estimates are based only on WIA Title I funds as it was not possible to calculate the impact of other partner programs on adult costs. Based on initial performance results, the investment in training services does result in most-in-need customers obtaining employment (73%) at a rate close to that of the more work-ready customers receiving only core services (77%). In addition, since the individuals receiving training are more likely to have lower pre-program earnings, they have a significantly higher rate of post-program earnings gain (\$5,241 vs. \$3,209).

In calculating the cost per participant for dislocated worker programs, it is possible to include with the WIA allocation estimates for some partner programs. In addition to Rapid Response additional assistance distributed to local areas, the majority of TAA/NAFTA training participants are co-enrolled in WIA Title I. An estimate of \$2.4 million from these programs was added to the \$7.2 million in Dislocated Worker expenditures to calculate the cost per participant on Chart 1. The cost for training participants is \$2,900, about \$2,030 more than the average for customers of core and intensive services only (\$870). As with adults, the entered employment rate for training customers is close to that of core services customers (77% vs. 80%) and their post-program earnings replacement rate is higher at 127% versus 114%.

For the youth program, only WIA Title I expenditures have been used in the calculations. While there are partner contributions to these programs, the types of contributions and service agreements vary greatly across the workforce areas and it was not possible to develop consistent estimates. WIA financial reports do allow, however, the breakout of out-of-school versus in-school expenditures. As expected, the investment for out-of school youth at \$3,300 per youth is almost twice that for in-school youth (\$1,800). Based on initial performance results, out-of-school are more successful in obtaining (and retaining) employment and/or post-secondary education and training, with a rate of 64% versus 53% for in-school youth.

## **B. Description of State evaluations of workforce investment activities.**

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in coordination with local Workforce Investment Boards, shall conduct a series of ongoing evaluation studies of workforce investment activities. The methods and findings from these studies will be utilized to continuously improve workforce investment activities in order to achieve high-level performance within, and high-level outcomes from, Massachusetts' workforce investment system. More concretely, these evaluation studies are designed to promote the efficiency and effectiveness of the statewide workforce investment system in improving the employability for job seekers and competitiveness for employers. The State will coordinate these activities with the evaluations provided for by the Secretary of Labor.

The Commonwealth Corporation will design and implement evaluation studies in conjunction with the State Workforce Investment Board, Local Workforce Investment Boards, and its partner workforce investment agencies. These studies will include an analysis of outcome and process measures in the statewide workforce investment system. The initial focus of these evaluation studies will be on outcome measures. Labor market outcomes of participants and eligible non-participants will be the primary outcomes of interest. Within this outcome category, the initial evaluation studies will focus on the earnings of low-income adults, dislocated workers, and welfare recipients. Other labor market outcomes and process measures may be added over time to the WIA Title I evaluation plan, based on the recommendations of the *Performance Measures Workgroup* of the *Governor's Task Force to Reform Adult Education and Worker Training*. This workgroup is responsible for identifying common outcome and process measures across workforce investment programs in the Commonwealth.

In subsequent WIA Title I Annual Reports, the Commonwealth will submit to the Secretary of Labor brief reports summarizing the results of any completed evaluation studies and progress updates regarding ongoing evaluation studies.

### Basic Questions that the Evaluation Will Address

#### *Outcomes/Process Evaluation Studies*

- What are the earnings growth trajectories of low-income adults, displaced workers, and welfare recipients?
- How do these earnings growth trajectories vary by selected individual background, workforce investment activity, vendor, and labor market characteristics?
- Do changes in earnings over time indicate that adults who participated in workforce investment activities move closer to economic self-sufficiency?
- Does participation in workforce investment activities explain the variation in earnings growth, controlling for selected individual background, workforce investment activity, vendor, and labor market characteristics?
- Are changes in earnings over time associated with specific programmatic activities and/or policies?

## Description of Evaluation Methodology

*Data Sources:* Outcome evaluations will initially consist of secondary analyses of longitudinal programmatic data on the JTPA and WIA Title I workforce investment activities of low-income adults, dislocated workers, and welfare recipients. Through an agreement with the Division of Employment and Training, quarterly wage record earnings data for pre-program and post-program periods will be used to describe and explain earnings growth trajectories of participants and eligible nonparticipants.

*Analytic Samples:* Samples for the first few studies will be created from JTPA Title II (adult) and Title III (dislocated worker) data for state program years 1998, 1999, and 2000 and WIA Title I data for program years 2001 and 2002. The size of samples will be sufficiently large to detect expected effects. Samples from additional workforce investment activities/agencies (e.g., WIA Title II) may be added over time, as deemed feasible by the State Workforce Investment Board, Local Workforce Investment Boards, and partner workforce investment agencies.

*Measures:* Data on eligible participants and nonparticipants, participation, and quarterly earnings data will be combined to establish appropriate analytic samples. Multi-wave quarterly earnings data will make up the outcome variable. Predictors will include background, participation, vendor, and labor market characteristics thought to be related to earnings.

*Methods/Analytic Strategies:* To model changes in earnings within and between individuals over time, individual growth modeling will be used. This analytic strategy will allow Massachusetts to describe the change in earnings over time and explain variation in earnings growth using multiple predictors thought to be related to earnings growth.

## Timing of Feedback and Deliverables

During the second half of state Fiscal Year 2002, with input from the State Workforce Investment Board, Local Workforce Investment Boards, and partner workforce investment agencies, this evaluation plan will be finalized. It may also be modified by the recommendations from the *Performance Measures Workgroup* of the *Governor's Task Force to Reform Adult Education and Worker Training*. During this period, Commonwealth Corporation will obtain the necessary earnings data to initiate the first evaluation study.

By the end of state Fiscal Year 2002 (PY01), Commonwealth Corporation will issue its first brief report summarizing the results of the first completed evaluation study. This study will answer the first outcome evaluation research question: What are the earnings growth trajectories of low-income adults, displaced workers, and welfare recipients?

In Fiscal Years 2003 and beyond, research briefs will be issued reporting on the answers to the remaining evaluation questions. These reports will include a description of further change in earnings over time based on the availability of additional quarterly earnings data.

**Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
WIA Title I-B  
Annual Report Form (ETA 9091)**

<b>II. Table Section</b>
--------------------------

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

<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level - American Customer Satisfaction Index</b>	<b>Number of Completed Surveys</b>	<b>Number of Customers Eligible for the Survey</b>	<b>Number of Customers Included in the Sample</b>	<b>Response Rate</b>
<b>Participants</b>	70	76.3	1551	5318	2288	68%
<b>Employers</b>	70	65.4	1267	5221	2194	58%

**Table B - Adult Program Results At-A-Glance**

	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	71%	73.5%	942 1281
<b>Employment Retention Rate</b>	80%	77.5%	892 1151
<b>Earnings Change in Six Months</b>	\$3,700	\$4,986	\$5,354,718 1074
<b>Employment And Credential Rate</b>	60%	66.1%	896 1355

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

<b>Reported Information</b>	<b>Public Assistance Recipients Receiving Intensive or Training Services</b>		<b>Veterans</b>		<b>Individuals With Disabilities</b>		<b>Older Individuals</b>	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	68.1%	328	67.5%	27	65.7%	109	68.3%	28
		482		40		166		41
<b>Employment Retention Rate</b>	73.2%	271	65.6%	21	69.5%	82	73.5%	25
		370		32		118		34
<b>Earnings Change in Six Months</b>	\$5,096	\$1,758,022	\$5,310	\$143,367	\$5,148	\$561,166	\$5,813	\$156,959
		345		27		109		27
<b>Employment And Credential Rate</b>	63.4%	310	63.4%	26	56.2%	95	64.1%	25
		489		41		169		39

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

<b>Reported Information</b>	<b>Individuals Who Received Training Services</b>		<b>Individuals Who Received Only Core and Intensive Services</b>	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	73.1%	826	76.8%	116
		1130		151
<b>Employment Retention Rate</b>	78.2%	787	72.9%	105
		1007		144
<b>Earnings Change in Six Months</b>	\$5,241	\$4,921,450	\$3,209	\$433,268
		939		135

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

	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	77%	78.0%	2102
			2694
<b>Employment Retention Rate</b>	87%	84.6%	1779
			2102
<b>Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	92%	121.6%	\$22,408,527
			\$18,428,008
<b>Employment And Credential Rate</b>	60%	74.0%	1195
			1615

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

<b>Reported Information</b>	<b>Veterans</b>		<b>Individuals With Disabilities</b>		<b>Older Individuals</b>		<b>Displaced Homemakers</b>	
	<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	77.4%	202 261	74.3%	84 113	75.1%	241 321	NA
<b>Employment Retention Rate</b>	85.6%	173 202	79.8%	67 84	81.3%	196 241	NA	0 0
<b>Earnings Replacement Rate</b>	124.3%	\$2,192,306 \$1,764,147	112.3%	\$803,040 \$714,832	107.9%	\$2,325,072 \$2,154,935	NA	0 0
<b>Employment And Credential Rate</b>	75.3%	113 150	71.6%	53 74	72.4	139 192	NA	0 0

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

<b>Reported Information</b>	<b>Individuals Who Received Training Services</b>		<b>Individuals Who Received Only Core and Intensive Services</b>	
	<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	76.9%	1242 1615	79.7%
<b>Employment Retention Rate</b>	85.0%	1056 1242	84.1%	723 860
<b>Earnings Replacement Rate</b>	127.4%	\$13,545,116 \$10,631,959	113.7%	\$8,863,411 \$7,796,049

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

	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	63%	74.2%	207
			279
<b>Employment Retention Rate</b>	77%	69.5%	164
			236
<b>Earnings Change in Six Months</b>	\$3,150	\$4,071	\$887,478
			218
<b>Credential Rate</b>	50%	62.8%	201
			320

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

<b>Reported Information</b>	<b>Public Assistance Recipients</b>		<b>Veterans</b>		<b>Individuals With Disabilities</b>		<b>Out-of-School Youth</b>	
<b>Entered Employment</b>	76.9%	93	60.0%	3	64.7%	11	74.3%	185
		121		5		17		249
<b>Employment Retention Rate</b>	74.3%	78	75.0%	3	61.5%	8	69.5%	146
		105		4		13		210
<b>Earnings Change in Six</b>	\$4,416	\$432,748	\$3,298	\$13,192	\$2,938	\$35,252	\$4,399	\$787,369
		98		4		12		179
<b>Credential Rate</b>	61.9%	86	66.7%	4	55.0%	11	62.9%	183
		139		6		20		291

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

	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	72%	91.2%	3439
			3771
<b>Diploma or Equivalent Attainment Rate</b>	55%	59.3%	143
			241
<b>Retention Rate</b>	54%	55.1%	261
			474

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

<b>Reported Information</b>	<b>Public Assistance Recipients</b>		<b>Individuals With Disabilities</b>		<b>Out-of-School Youth</b>	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	92.8%	644	95.9%	566	88.0%	425
		694		590		483
<b>Diploma or Equivalent Attainment Rate</b>	57.1%	28	61.1%	22	53.5%	46
		49		36		86
<b>Retention Rate</b>	63.1%	53	47.0%	55	57.4%	167
		84		117		291

**Table L - Other Reported Information**

	12 Month Employment Retention Rate*		12 Mo. Earnings Change (Adults and Older Youth)*		Placements for Participants in Nontraditional Employment	Wages At Entry Into Employment For Those Individuals Who Entered Unsubsidized Employment		Entry Into Unsubsidized Employment Related to the Training Received of Those Who Completed Training Services		
			or			12 Mo. Earnings Replacement (Dislocated Workers)*				
<b>Adults</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.2%	83	\$3,890			
		NA		NA		1151		894	1355	
<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	8.6%	181	\$6,423	\$12,653,295	69.1%	1116
		NA		NA		2102		1970		1615
<b>Older Youth</b>	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.0%	7	\$2,903	\$569,049	NA	NA
		NA		NA		236		196		NA

\*Not required for PY00

**Table M - Participation Levels**

	Total Participants Served	Total Exiters
<b>Adults</b>	2702	1261
<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	4831	2421
<b>Older Youth</b>	408	207
<b>Younger Youth</b>	3093	1533

**Table N - Cost of Program Activities**

<b>Program Activity (PY00 &amp; Carry-Over)</b>		<b>Total Federal Spending</b>
<b>Local Adults</b>		\$7,906,168
<b>Local Dislocated Workers</b>		\$7,226,729
<b>Local Youth</b>		\$7,496,912
<b>Rapid Response</b> (up to 25%) §134 (a) (2) (A)		\$2,547,328
<b>Statewide Required Activities</b> (Up to 15%) §134 (a) (2) (B)		\$2,331,739
<b>Statewide Allowable Activities</b> §134 (a) (3)	<b>Program Activity Description</b>	
	Providing capacity building to local areas.	\$420,202
	Conducting research and/or demonstration projects.	\$219,168
	Miscellaneous activities.	\$152,545
<b>Total of All Federal Spending Listed Above</b>		\$28,300,791

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 1 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b> <u>Boston</u>	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	348	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	270	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	47	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	361	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25005</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	94	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	80	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	1	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	323	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	78.4	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	69.1	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	69%	71.2%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	73%	68.3%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	60%	70.0%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	78%	82.7%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	83%	85.6%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	74%	70.0%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	47%	75.0%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3600	\$6057	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	86%	107.9%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$3025	\$4041	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	58%	61.1%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	56%	70.7%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	47%	58.8%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	48%	60.0%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	65%	97.8%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	3	14

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 2 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b> <u>Hampden County</u>	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	465	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	554	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	38	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	377	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25015</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	133	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	188	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	17	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	107	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	79.9	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	68.5	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	69%	78.1%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	76%	81.1%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	59%	73.3%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	78%	78.3%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	86%	83.2%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	73%	61.5%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	51%	61.9%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3300	\$4874	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	88%	97.6%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$2650	\$4778	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	58%	72.7%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	59%	70.6%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	46%	57.9%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	52%	54.2%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	69%	90.6%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	3	14

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 3 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b>  No. Central (No. Worcester)	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	63	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	117	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	8	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	115	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b>  <u>25020</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	33	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	73	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	5	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	93	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	76.5	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	66.7	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	71%	73.8%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	77%	75.5%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	63%	80.0%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	80%	70.6%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	87%	78.0%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	77%	75.0%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	54%	62.5%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3700	\$3675	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	92%	132.2%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$3150	\$2574	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	60%	68.3%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	60%	71.9%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	50%	80.0%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	55%	52.9%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	72%	68.0%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
None		NA	NA	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	9	8

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 4 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b> Central Mass. (So. Worcester)	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	114	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	260	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	22	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	369	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25025</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	89	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	180	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	9	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	58	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	78.4	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	65.1	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	71%	77.8%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	77%	74.0%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	63%	100.0%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	80%	80.0%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	87%	82.4%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	77%	62.5%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	54%	53.3%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3700	\$5863	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	92%	151.7%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$3150	\$5701	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	60%	73.8%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	60%	73.3%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	50%	100.0%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	55%	62.5%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	72%	78.2%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	5	12

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 5 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b> <u>Metro North</u>	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	229	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	401	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	35	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	150	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25030</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	157	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	221	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	26	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	78	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	74.8	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	65.8	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	67%	75.4%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	75%	78.7%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	58%	73.3%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	76%	77.2%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	85%	83.8%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	72%	69.2%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	54%	69.7%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3500	\$6435	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	90%	110.9%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$2925	\$4779	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	56%	70.2%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	58%	79.2%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	45%	58.8%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	55%	55.9%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	72%	84.7%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	3	14

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 6 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b> <u>Brockton Area</u>	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	75	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	319	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	27	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	166	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25035</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	30	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	192	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	5	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	11	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	71.9	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	68.1	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	71%	61.1%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	77%	79.1%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	63%	52.4%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	80%	77.8%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	87%	87.5%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	77%	69.2%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	72%	78.6%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3700	\$7055	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	92%	149.5%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$3150	\$2666	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	60%	50.0%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	60%	79.8%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	50%	47.8%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	55%	60.3%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	72%	99.1%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	8	9

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 7 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b> <u>Bristol County</u>	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	201	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	551	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	57	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	346	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25040</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	117	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	269	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	32	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	132	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	75.8	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	69.6	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	69%	62.6%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	75%	70.3%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	60%	71.9%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	78%	78.2%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	85%	83.5%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	74%	65.2%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	49%	48.9%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3250	\$3877	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	87%	138.7%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$2700	\$2653	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	58%	53.1%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	58%	69.4%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	47%	57.6%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	50%	66.7%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	67%	95.0%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	8	9

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 8 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b> <u>No. Middlesex</u>	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	63	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	199	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	13	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	198	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25045</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	29	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	128	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	9	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	157	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	78.3	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	64.9	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	71%	76.5%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	77%	83.1%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	63%	84.6%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	80%	74.2%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	87%	84.5%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	77%	72.7%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	54%	57.1%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3700	\$4715	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	92%	141.5%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$3150	\$4953	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	60%	66.7%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	60%	81.6%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	50%	76.9%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	55%	100%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	72%	100%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	4	13

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 9 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b> <u>Berkshire County</u>	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	64	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	229	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	17	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	92	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25050</u>	<b>Total Exitors</b>	<b>Adults</b>	38	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	138	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	14	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	90	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	75.4	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	64.3	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	71%	73.7%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	77%	84.1%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	63%	75.0%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	80%	74.3%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	87%	84.4%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	77%	80.0%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	54%	75.0%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3700	\$3392	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	92%	131.6%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$3150	\$4179	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	60%	67.4%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	60%	85.9%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	50%	66.7%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	55%	75.0%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	72%	96.6%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	4	13

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 10 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b> <u>Lower Merrimack</u>	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	232	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	130	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	38	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	326	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25055</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	113	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	79	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	28	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	277	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	79.4	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	67.7	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	70%	80.3%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	75%	75.4%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	60%	84.4%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	79%	70.5%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	85%	84.4%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	74%	75.9%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	52%	77.8%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3700	\$3952	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	92%	92.2%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$3100	\$4795	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	59%	73.2%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	58%	66.9%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	47%	79.4%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	53%	59.3%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	70%	99.8%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	3	14

TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 11 of 17)

<b>Local Area Name</b> <u>Southern Essex</u>	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	57	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	225	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	14	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	103	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25060</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	7	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	95	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	3	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	36	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	81.0	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	64.8	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	70%	82.5%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	77%	77.7%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	63%	88.9%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	79%	83.1%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	87%	85.1%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	77%	63.6%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	54%	59.1%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3450	\$4371	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	90%	144.2%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$2950	\$2847	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	59%	71.1%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	60%	78.7%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	50%	69.2%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	55%	50.0%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	72%	66.7%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	6	11

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 12 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b> <u>South Coastal</u>	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	93	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	114	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	1	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	27	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25065</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	37	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	44	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	0	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	3	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	84.1	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	62.2	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	71%	70.3%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	77%	82.2%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	63%	53.8%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	80%	76.5%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	87%	91.4%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	77%	71.4%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	54%	66.7%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3700	\$6412	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	92%	114.3%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$3150	\$8141	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	60%	65.7%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	60%	79.4%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	50%	53.8%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	55%	50.0%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	72%	80.0%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	6	11

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 13 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b> <u>Metro South/West</u>	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	60	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	451	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	5	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	13	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25070</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	33	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	231	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	5	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	11	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	79.7	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	66.4	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	71%	75.6%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	77%	79.5%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	63%	75.0%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	80%	73.2%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	87%	85.0%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	77%	63.6%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	54%	66.7%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3700	\$7989	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	92%	105.0%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$3150	\$4688	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	60%	69.8%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	60%	78.3%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	50%	73.3%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	55%	60.0%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	72%	100.0%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	4	13

TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 14 of 17)

Local Area Name <u>Franklin/Hampshire</u>	Total Participants Served	Adults	36	
		Dislocated Workers	158	
		Older Youth	5	
		Younger Youth	39	
ETA Assigned # <u>25075</u>	Total Exiters	Adults	14	
		Dislocated Workers	69	
		Older Youth	3	
		Younger Youth	27	
Performance Measure	Program Group	Negotiated Performance Level	Actual Performance Level	
Customer Satisfaction	Program Participants	70	80.9	
	Employers	70	66.6	
Entered Employment Rate	Adults	69%	77.8%	
	Dislocated Workers	75%	77.0%	
	Older Youth	59%	70.0%	
Retention Rate	Adults	78%	93.5%	
	Dislocated Workers	85%	90.4%	
	Older Youth	73%	87.5%	
	Younger Youth	51%	44.4%	
Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months	Adults	\$3250	\$5300	
	Dislocated Workers	88%	151.0%	
	Older Youth	\$2575	\$2893	
Credential/Diploma Rate	Adults	58%	72.5%	
	Dislocated Workers	58%	66.7%	
	Older Youth	46%	54.5%	
	Younger Youth	52%	50.0%	
Skill Attainment Rate	Younger Youth	69%	84.2%	
Description of Other State Indicators of Performance				
None		NA	NA	
Overall Status of Local Performance		Not Met: Below 80%	Met: 80% to 100%	Exceeded: 100% & over
		0	3	14

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 15 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b> <u>Cape Cod &amp; Islands</u>	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	149	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	194	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	28	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	74	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25080</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	82	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	104	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	18	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	24	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	71.1	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	68.8	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	64%	74.6%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	76%	86.9%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	53%	79.2%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	73%	68.6%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	86%	83.9%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	67%	57.1%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	45%	48.0%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3100	\$3052	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	88%	114.8%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$2400	\$3030	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	53%	63.0%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	59%	80.0%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	40%	57.1%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	46%	61.5%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	63%	98.0%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	5	12

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 16 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b> <u>Greater New Bedford</u>	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	453	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	659	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	53	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	337	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25085</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	255	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	330	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	32	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	106	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	70.6	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	69.3	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	67%	68.7%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	74%	78.0%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	58%	73.2%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	76%	79.8%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	84%	81.2%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	72%	75.0%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	52%	45.1%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3200	\$4150	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	87%	153.0%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$2600	\$4178	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	56%	61.1%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	57%	68.5%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	45%	58.3%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	53%	60.5%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	70%	96.5%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	3	14

**TABLE O – LOCAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY BY WORKFORCE AREA (part 17 of 17)**

<b>Local Area Name</b> <u>Massachusetts Totals</u>	<b>Total Participants Served</b>	<b>Adults</b>	2,702	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	4,831	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	408	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	3,093	
<b>ETA Assigned #</b> <u>25</u>	<b>Total Exiters</b>	<b>Adults</b>	1,261	
		<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	2,421	
		<b>Older Youth</b>	207	
		<b>Younger Youth</b>	1,533	
<b>Performance Measure</b>	<b>Program Group</b>	<b>Negotiated Performance Level</b>	<b>Actual Performance Level</b>	
<b>Customer Satisfaction</b>	<b>Program Participants</b>	70	76.3	
	<b>Employers</b>	70	65.4	
<b>Entered Employment Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	71%	73.5%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	77%	78.0%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	63%	74.2%	
<b>Retention Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	80%	77.5%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	87%	84.6%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	77%	69.5%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	55%	59.3%	
<b>Earnings Change/Earnings Replacement in Six Months</b>	<b>Adults</b>	\$3700	\$4986	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	92%	121.6%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	\$3150	\$4071	
<b>Credential/Diploma Rate</b>	<b>Adults</b>	60%	66.1%	
	<b>Dislocated Workers</b>	60%	74.0%	
	<b>Older Youth</b>	50%	62.8%	
	<b>Younger Youth</b>	54%	55.1%	
<b>Skill Attainment Rate</b>	<b>Younger Youth</b>	72%	91.2%	
<b>Description of Other State Indicators of Performance</b>				
<b>None</b>		<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	
<b>Overall Status of Local Performance</b>		<b>Not Met: Below 80%</b>	<b>Met: 80% to 100%</b>	<b>Exceeded: 100% &amp; over</b>
		0	4	13