

8. MEASURING ONE-STOP PERFORMANCE AND PLANNING FOR SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

GOAL 1. DEFINE PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR THE ONE-STOP SYSTEM	8-1
Strategy 1. Design One-Stop Performance Measures at the State Level	8-4
Strategy 2. Initiate One-Stop Performance Measures at the Local System Or Center Level	8-6
GOAL 2. IMPLEMENT ONE-STOP PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT	8-7
Strategy 1. Emphasize the Use of Process Measures During the First Phase of One-Stop Performance Assessment.....	8-8
Strategy 2. Emphasize the Use of Customer Satisfaction Measures During the First Phase of Performance Assessment	8-10
Strategy 3. Emphasizing Outcome Measures Already in Use in One or More Categorical Programs	8-11
GOAL 3. USE PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	8-13
Strategy 1. Train Local Staff in How to Use Performance Information to Support Continuous Improvement Efforts.....	8-13
Strategy 2. Use Customer Feedback to Guide System Improvements.....	8-14
Strategy 3. Create Incentives for Improved Performance by Local Offices and Staff	8-15
RESOURCES	8-17

This page intentionally left blank.

Insert blank page here when making double-sided copies.

8. MEASURING ONE-STOP PERFORMANCE AND PLANNING FOR SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

INTRODUCTION

One of the guiding principles established by DOL is that One-Stop systems be both performance-driven and outcomes-based. Policy makers and program managers are to be held accountable for achieving specific goals in the transformed One-Stop environment. They are also encouraged to use information about customer satisfaction and the quality of customer outcomes to imbed continuous improvement processes into the fabric of day-to-day One-Stop operations.

In this chapter of the Practitioners' Guide, we describe approaches that states can take to:

- Define performance measures for the One-Stop system.
- Implement a system for measuring One-Stop performance.
- Use performance measures to guide program improvement.

GOALS AND STRATEGIES TO MEASURE PERFORMANCE AND PLAN FOR SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

GOAL 1. DEFINE PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR THE ONE-STOP SYSTEM

The U.S. Department of Labor has identified the four themes of *universal access*, *customer choice*, *integrated services*, and *outcome accountability* as federal objectives of the One-Stop initiative. However, each implementation state is encouraged to interpret the federal One-Stop vision and goals in ways that address local economic conditions, respond to local employer and job-seeker needs, and take into consideration workforce demographics and local service delivery system features.

Thus, rather than impose a standardized federal framework for the measurement of One-Stop system performance, DOL has encouraged each One-Stop implementation state to identify its own performance measures based on the state's One-Stop system transformation goals. Some states are choosing to design comprehensive workforce development performance measurement systems whose overall goals provide an

“umbrella” for and encompass the performance goals and measures of a number of individual categorical workforce development programs. Other states are choosing to develop narrower One-Stop performance measurement systems whose goals and measures supplement the goals of individual categorical programs.

In the spring of 1997, DOL convened an interagency Workforce Development Performance Measures Policy Committee at the federal level. This marked the beginning of a collaborative process undertaken with participation by federal and state agency representatives to (1) promote the coherence and comparability of One-Stop performance measures used across states and, within states, across local workforce development systems, as well as (2) encourage the standardization and convergence of performance measurement approaches across different workforce development programs and funding streams.

The Performance Measures Policy Committee is attempting to achieve consensus about a common *menu of performance measures* with standard definitions that can be adopted by all levels and subsets of the workforce development system, from the national level to the state and local community levels. The resulting menu of measures will be available as a pool of possibilities from which state and local workforce development systems can draw in assessing their own One-Stop performance.

One-Stop performance measures can address a wide-range of accomplishments. Different performance measures will be of interest to stakeholders and program managers at different levels and will be useful for different purposes. A comprehensive One-Stop performance measurement system might yield “snapshots” of One-Stop accomplishments from a number of different perspectives, including the following:

- *Measures of overall system performance*, including service utilization rates, the extent that potential employer and job-seeker customers are aware of and use the One-Stop system, overall customer outcomes, and the overall level of satisfaction of current customers.
- *Measures of the effectiveness of different services* within the One-Stop system, such as self-access services, guided or group services, and intensive services, such as education and training services.
- *Measures of how the system is performing for different customer groups* with differing employment objectives, such as employers versus job-seekers; and youth versus new labor market entrants versus experienced workers.

- *Measures of how the system is performing for individuals likely to need more intensive or specialized services*, such as individuals with limited basic skills or limited English, individuals with disabilities, or individuals making the transition from welfare to work.

Comprehensive One-Stop performance measurement systems may examine a number of different aspects of One-Stop performance, using:

- *Visibility and market penetration measures* that assess the extent to which potential customers are aware of and use One-Stop services.
- *Process measures* that assess progress in implementing qualitative aspects of One-Stop organizational, service design, and service delivery goals.
- *Outcome measures for job-seeker customers* that address goals for improving customers' employment and earnings, skill attainment or educational achievements, self-sufficiency or other outcomes.
- *Outcome measures for employer customers* that address goals for helping employers recruit new workers, increase the skills of their current workforce, or accomplish other business objectives.
- *Customer satisfaction measures* that address goals for improving job-seeker and employer satisfaction with One-Stop services.
- *Cost and efficiency measures* that address goals for using resources in a cost-efficient and cost-effective way.
- *Equity of access measures* that address goals for serving relevant customer subpopulations, such as minority groups, veterans, individuals with disabilities, older workers, or particular types of businesses.

The issue paper on *Workforce Development Performance Measurement: Options for Performance Measures* (Social Policy Research Associates, March 1997) describes a number of specific measures that states and local areas might consider within each of these performance domains. In developing One-Stop performance measurement systems, states and local areas usually have to make compromises between comprehensiveness of measures and practical implementation issues, such as data availability, cost limitations, simplicity, and usefulness of measures for program managers. (Attachment 8-A at the end of this chapter summarizes 14 guiding principles for selecting performance measures identified by the Workforce Development Performance Measures Policy Committee.)

Strategies to establish performance measures for state and local One-Stop systems may include (1) designing performance measures at the state level, (2) initiating or refining performance measures at the local system or center level.

Strategy #1. Design One-Stop Performance Measures at the State Level

Designing One-Stop performance measures is typically a state-led effort. States are usually interested in developing One-Stop performance measures that reflect state One-Stop goals and can be implemented on a statewide basis. However to ensure that performance measurement systems are viewed as useful tools by program managers at all levels, states often invite local program staff to participate in the planning process and encourage local systems to tailor state performance measurement frameworks to meet local system needs and goals.

Examples of State-Initiated One-Stop Performance Measures

Example #1—Establishing Statewide Performance Measures and State and Local Performance Goals. The performance goals established for the Indiana One-Stop career center system were designed to mirror four general principles:

- Employment is the objective of workforce development.
- Customer satisfaction is key.
- Accountability measures should be based on easily accessible information.
- Performance measures should recognize the customer-centric orientation of services and the importance of self-service modes of delivery.

During 1996 a state–local workgroup refined a performance measurement approach based on the following performance elements:

- *Employment outcomes*, including placement rates, secured employment rates, and long-term placement rates.
- *Customer satisfaction*, measured for employers and job seekers who use One-Stop services, with a goal of improving customer satisfaction over time.

- *Market penetration*, measured by dividing the number of job openings listed by a One-Stop system by the number of new hires within the service area.
- *Level of utilization of self-service opportunities* for job seekers and employers.

Examples of specific state performance goals included:

- A 10% reduction in the proportion of UI claimants who exhaust their benefits.
- The receipt of career center services by at least 50% of all secondary school students sometime before they complete 9th grade.
- A 10% decrease in the proportion of staff time spent in data entry tasks and a 10% increase in the proportion of time spent in face-to-face interaction with customers.
- An increase in the number of sites where individuals can access basic workforce information.

The state also called for One-Stop performance to be measured at the local office level, with quarterly monitoring of the percentage of UI claimants with individual service plans, the number of students using career center services, the percentage of successful job matches, the level of overall customer satisfaction, and the utilization of self-service options. **State of Indiana**

Example #2—Developing a State Performance Measurement System to Guide One-Stop Implementation Processes. In Wisconsin, the *Job Center Standards* represented the first phase of state performance guidelines for a performance-driven/outcome-based One-Stop system. The process standards were developed by a state-local interagency team and were approved by the state One-Stop policy board in February 1995. The standards described the characteristics of a well-coordinated local employment and training service delivery system (*functional standards*) and identified the minimum menu of services that all Job Center sites were expected to provide on-site to a universal customer base that included individuals and employers (*service standards*).

Thus, the Job Center Standards, which centers had to meet to be certified as One-Stop centers, consisted of functional standards pertaining to *how* specific services were to be delivered, as well as service standards pertaining to *what* specific services should be available. For example, one functional standard was that assessment be non-redundant across participating partners; one service standard was that testing and assessment be available to all One-Stop customers. **State of Wisconsin**

Example #3—Developing Performance Measures for a Transformed Economy. In Texas, the State Council was instrumental in developing a core set of One-Stop performance measures. Selected measures included labor market outcomes (entered employment rate, earnings gain rate, and employment retention rate), a variety of learning outcomes (educational achievement rate), access equity measures, and customer satisfaction/quality assurance measures for individual One-Stop centers.

The state tried to develop measures that would be appropriate for the transformed social contract between employers and workers, in which flexible and less permanent employment relationships have replaced “life-time” employment. Given this shift in employment trends, Texas staff decided that performance measures should be geared toward (1) success in “life-long learning” and (2) long-term employment security (minimizing periods of unemployment), rather than security in a particular job. **State of Texas**

Strategy #2. Initiate One-Stop Performance Measures at the Local System Or Center Level

Individual local areas may also take the initiative to develop their own performance measurement system for use by local system managers. Often locally-initiated systems will supplement or adapt state performance measurement frameworks to meet local needs.

Examples of Designing One-Stop Performance Measures at the Local System or Center Level

Example #1—Setting Local Production Goals. In their local One-Stop application to the state, the partners in the Baltimore CareerNet System set several performance goals for the first year of the implementation period (to be compared to performance during Program Year 1994):

- *A 10% increase in the level of coordination and collaboration of services across sites and funding agencies, as measured by the number of individuals served by more than one program.*
- *An increase in the uniformity of services available across different sites and agencies, as measured by the number of similar services.*
- *Maintenance of existing service levels for the funding streams administered by system partners, such as JTPA and Job Service.*
- *An increase in the number of customers receiving multiple services and the total number of services received by a typical Center customer.*
- *A 5% increase in the number of jobs listed in the automated Job Bank.*
- *An increase in the number of customers from the “general public” beyond the pool eligible for JTPA and other categorical programs, to 15% of all center customers.*
- *An increase in the number of customers who are already employed at the time they receive services, to 2% of all customers served.*

In an effort to establish integrated “production” goals for the Eastside Career Center, the local partners measured the following outcomes for Center customers on a monthly and annual basis: (1) the number of job placements for all customers as well as the number of job placements for JTPA customers; (2) the daily traffic flow through the Center; (3) the number of enrollments in the automated Job Bank; (4) the number of individuals attending a JTPA employment preparation seminar, participating in self-paced training in the local resource laboratory, or participating in GED training or a skills brush-up class. Production statistics were reviewed monthly as part of a Center “performance review,” which compared agency performance against goals. **Baltimore, Maryland**

Example #2—Developing Performance Measures at the Regional Level.

The state of Massachusetts identified four general areas against which the career centers will be held accountable, including customer satisfaction; customer outcomes; market growth and penetration; and gross product. Responsibility for operationalizing and implementing such measures at the regional level was given to the Regional Employment Boards (REBs), which were responsible for assessing the performance of individual career centers.

To respond to the state’s “competitive model,” the Regional Employment Board for Hampden County established performance criteria to: (1) provide information about whether the Center had accomplished state, regional, and local goals; (2) allow for comparisons of performance across local centers; and (3) inform the continuous improvement process within centers. To support these performance measurement objectives, the FutureWorks Career Center in Springfield implemented a sophisticated management information system to track customer service utilization and customer outcomes.

Springfield, Massachusetts

GOAL 2. IMPLEMENT ONE-STOP PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

Simultaneous implementation of all aspects of a unified One-Stop performance measurement system is rarely practicable, given the starting point, which usually consists of separate information systems for collecting and storing program data and distinct performance measures and goals for each categorical funding stream. Some states view the development of an integrated client-level management information and case management system as a necessary precursor to integrated One-Stop performance measurement. Thus, implementation of One-Stop performance measurement is sometimes “put on hold” while a new integrated management information system is developed.

Other states and local areas have chosen to implement One-Stop performance measurement systems gradually, as new performance measures are defined and become feasible to implement.

- Some state and local areas have chosen to emphasize process measures during the first year of One-Stop implementation. Although process measures reflect “intermediate” service design and service delivery outcomes rather than customer outcomes, they are often of critical concern during the early phases of system transformation.

- Some states and local areas have devoted substantial first-year effort to developing methods to obtain customer feedback and structure customer satisfaction measures so that they can become part of a formal performance measurement system.
- Some states and local areas have emphasized performance measures that are already in place for one or more categorical programs. However, these measures may not represent adequately all One-Stop system goals.

Strategy 1. Emphasize the Use of Process Measures During the First Phase of One-Stop Performance Assessment

During the first phase of One-Stop implementation, some states use process measures to assess whether the desired features of One-Stop systems have been achieved in specific local systems and centers. Assessments of how individual local centers and systems measure up against process measures can be completed using on-site reviews conducted by outside (state or peer) monitors or self-assessments performed by local One-Stop staff. A number of states formalize process measures as criteria that have to be met before local centers can be officially certified as One-Stop centers.

States that emphasize the use of process measures during the initial stages of One-Stop implementation often plan to expand their accountability systems during subsequent years to include customer satisfaction measures and customer outcome measures.

Examples of Emphasizing Process Measures

Example #1—Developing Process Standards and a Self-Assessment Manual for Local One-Stop Centers. As described previously, the Wisconsin Job Center Standards are a set of process measures that describe the characteristics of a well-coordinated local system (functional standards) and identify a minimum menu of services that centers are expected to provide to individual and employer customers (service standards).

To ensure that the second generation of One-Stop centers would learn from the experiences of the state's initial pilot sites, Wisconsin staff developed detailed descriptions of the process and service standards and offered "model case examples" of transformed systems based on the approaches developed by early One-Stop implementation sites.

During the first year of the federal One-Stop implementation grant, the state developed a self-assessment tool that local staff and state site visitors could use to determine whether the Job Center Standards had been met. **State of Wisconsin**

Example #2—Using Cross-Program Monitoring Teams to Compare Local Performance to Self-Determined Goals and Benchmarks. During the initial phase of One-Stop implementation in Ohio, the state decided to measure the success of local One-Stop systems using interagency monitoring teams to conduct individualized on-site evaluations of the progress of each One-Stop site. To support the assessments of local system operations by cross-program monitoring teams, the state developed an assessment tool and a method for collecting and organizing relevant information and providing it to the state One-Stop policy committee.

The Program Performance Work Team also undertook to recommend performance measures and methods for use across all local One-Stop systems. The Team identified overall assessment of local system operations as one of three important areas (along with customer satisfaction and customer outcomes) that needed attention in the development of a system to measure One-Stop performance. **State of Ohio**

Example #3—Using Process Measures in Combination with Other Performance Measures. Minnesota uses a certification process to guide local One-Stop system development efforts. A detailed checklist of "benchmarks" developed as part of the certification process describes the requirements for local areas in the domains of local partnerships, governance, and service designs. State benchmarks include measures of (1) integrated staffing; (2) co-location; (3) customer satisfaction; (4) inclusiveness and efficacy of governance structures; (5) comprehensiveness of services; (6) access; and (7) performance outcomes.

Progress in achieving most benchmarks is evaluated by collecting information on local One-Stop implementation processes. For example,

integration of staffing is measured by indicators such as the frequency of joint staff meetings and staff cross-training and the number of staff whose positions are funded from multiple program sources. **State of Minnesota**

Strategy 2. Emphasize the Use of Customer Satisfaction Measures During the First Phase of Performance Assessment

A number of states and local sites emphasize the collection of customer satisfaction information during the early stages of One-Stop implementation, because of the increased emphasis on implementing One-Stop systems as “customer-oriented” and “customer-driven” systems. Customer feedback can be collected using the following methods:

- Holding open-ended customer forums on a regular basis to stay informed about customer needs and interests.
- Conducting general “exit surveys” or periodic follow-up surveys with customers to assess overall customer satisfaction with One-Stop services.
- Surveying customers regularly about their satisfaction with specific services.
- Surveying the general public or employers or job-seekers who have not used the One-Stop system, to find out about the barriers to utilization of One-Stop services by additional customers.

Although a number of One-Stop states and local areas begin collecting customer satisfaction information during the early phases of One-Stop implementation, it is more difficult to decide how to analyze and summarize customer responses. Attachments 8-H through 8-L at the end of this chapter under *Resources* provide examples of how different states and local sites have measured and analyzed customer satisfaction as part of their One-Stop accountability systems.

Examples of Emphasizing Customer Satisfaction Measures

Example #1—Establishing a Customer Satisfaction Baseline. Early negative feedback from customer focus groups in Indiana on workforce development services prior to One-Stop implementation made it clear to public agency decision makers that dramatic changes in service design and delivery were needed. The state has called on all centers to use customer satisfaction surveys during their first year of One-Stop operation to establish baseline data by which improvement in this area can be measured. **State of Indiana**

Example #2—Setting High Customer Satisfaction Goals. Massachusetts is particularly interested in measuring the performance of its career centers in the area of customer satisfaction. The state seeks to support career centers in achieving 90% customer satisfaction rates within 100 days of opening their doors. Career centers are encouraged to use a variety of tools to measure their performances in this area, including surveys, focus groups, and service quality information systems.

Regional Employment Boards are responsible for ensuring that customer satisfaction data are collected. They are permitted some latitude in developing methods for collecting such data within the career centers.

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Strategy 3. Emphasizing Outcome Measures Already in Use in One or More Categorical Programs

Categorical program performance measures remain in effect in all states, regardless of the implementation of One-Stop performance measurement systems. Some states have adopted these existing performance measures to provide accountability while they develop new One-Stop performance measures. Other states have used existing measures as the basis for their new One-Stop performance measurement systems.

Examples of Emphasizing Outcome Measures Already Used by Categorical Programs

Example #1—Adopting Measures Developed for the ES and UI Programs. Connecticut was one of the few states that was able to implement a performance measurement system during the first year of One-Stop operations. The Connecticut system measures center performance on a quarterly basis. Quarterly performance reports not only display each center's measured performance, but also compare it to the normal performance range in the state, to benchmarks for best practice in the state, and to an absolute performance goal.

The system includes about 20 different performance measures, which were originally designed for ES and UI offices and then applied to One-Stop centers as well. As a result, the performance measures focus narrowly on the ES and UI services offered within One-Stop centers and do not address some of the goals that other states are attempting to measure, such as measures of wages and earnings, or attainment of new skills by individual customers. **State of Connecticut**

Example #2—Using Available Measures and Reporting Systems for the “Basic” Phase of Performance Management. Ohio's performance management system was designed to be implemented in two phases, *basic* and *enhanced*. During the *basic* phase, local sites used information currently available and continued to meet current reporting and performance requirements. In addition, the state encouraged local sites to use locally-designed tools—like comment cards, focus groups and telephone surveys—to measure customer satisfaction. A new measure of integration of services called “services received” was also created. This measure counted individuals who were tracked as moving into another program and who actually received services from that program.

In preparation for the *enhanced* phase, the state was developing new procedures for tracking individuals and services across different programs through the use of shared, automated case management tools. During the *enhanced* phase, an integrated individual service plan will become the yardstick by which One-Stop successes will be measured. During this phase, more systematic and in-depth customer satisfaction assessments will be conducted. Assessments of customer satisfaction will be conducted semi-annually for each One-Stop area and performance levels will be indexed against state performance. **State of Ohio**

GOAL 3. USE PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Performance measurement is not an end in itself; instead performance measurement is intended to be a tool that can be used to foster program improvement. States vary considerably in their approaches to implementing program improvement systems. Strategies used to encourage continuous improvement at the local level include: (1) training local staff in how to use performance information as part of a continuous improvement process; (2) using customer feedback to guide immediate and ongoing system improvements; and (3) making local offices and individual staff accountable for performance levels.

Strategy 1. Train Local Staff in How to Use Performance Information to Support Continuous Improvement Efforts

Many high-performing organizations have adopted the concept of continuous improvement as part of a workplace culture in which managers and line staff seek to evaluate and improve everything they do. The major premise of continuous improvement is that by systematically evaluating every process within the organization and constantly seeking to improve those processes, the organization will be able to achieve increasingly high levels of performance as measured by program outcomes and customer satisfaction.

The continuous improvement process consists of several discrete steps, including:

- Identifying areas to target for improvement.
- Diagnosing why performance is low and what is preventing the achievement of high performance.
- Planning changes to improve performance and specifying measurable goals for improvement.
- Implementing changes.
- Monitoring the effects of changes to determine whether they are having the expected results.

To ensure that information about One-Stop performance is useful for continuous improvement efforts, states and local areas can train managers and direct service staff how to use performance information to identify areas of problematic performance, diagnose why problems have occurred, set measurable goals for improvement, and monitor whether system changes have had the intended effect of improving performance in the targeted areas.

Examples of Training Local Staff To Use Performance Information as Part of a Continuous Improvement Process

Example #1—Teaching Staff from Local One-Stop Centers About Total Quality Management and Continuous Improvement Practices.

Minnesota's Department of Economic Security launched a "Workforce Excellence Initiative" funded in large part by a foundation grant. The objectives of this initiative included promoting customer satisfaction and continuous improvement based on total quality management (TQM) criteria. Workforce Excellence training was offered to groups of approximately 100 people at a time in a "train the champion" model. It was expected that about 80% of the individuals participating in training would be from local workforce centers. **State of Minnesota**

Example #2—Ensuring that Local Staff and Managers Understand the Relevance of Outcome Measures and Ongoing Performance Monitoring.

In Connecticut, performance measures were developed by the state with substantial input from local management and staff. Core measures were designed to have value to those working in the field, provide staff with a basis for comparing outcomes with other offices in the state, and give staff performance feedback that would enable them to identify needed changes. Quarterly reports, prepared for each center and for the state as a whole, presented this information in an easily understood way. Local staff participation in the process of choosing measures was seen as particularly important, since the state did not want center staff to feel that measures were "imposed" on them from the outside.

The state placed a special emphasis on training local staff in total quality management (TQM) and the analytical techniques that would allow them to design additional local performance measures and use outcome measures to promote continuous improvement of services. State staff worked intensively with local area staff to ensure that both managers and staff understood the relevance of the regular performance reports and could use performance information to support continuous improvement efforts. **State of Connecticut**

Strategy 2. Use Customer Feedback to Guide System Improvements

Another strategy, used either in combination with Strategy 1 or separately, is to ensure that information about customer satisfaction (and dissatisfaction) is used by staff

and managers responsible for planning program improvements. Procedures developed to ensure that customer feedback is used effectively include the following:

- Summarizing and analyzing findings from customer satisfaction surveys on a regular basis and circulating summaries to all staff, including continuous improvement teams.
- Reconvening “focus groups” with current and prospective customers periodically to obtain up-dated perspectives on customer needs and interests.
- Forming on-going interagency project teams to review the adequacy of services available to members of major customer groups, such as employers and job-seekers.
- Holding periodic center-wide staff retreats to review the responsiveness of services to customer needs and suggest improvements.

Examples of Using Customer Feedback to Guide System Improvements

Example #1—Establishing a Local Customer Satisfaction Team.

Respondents at the Arlington, Texas, Career Center indicated that measuring consumer satisfaction is increasing in importance because customers find their own jobs through access to unsuppressed job listings available through electronic bulletin boards accessed at a distance.

To elicit and attend to feedback from individual and employer customers, the center established a customer satisfaction team. Using assessment techniques recommended by sources such as the “Simply Better” technical assistance guides, team members have developed a form to collect customer feedback with room for suggestions, comments, or complaints. Completed forms are posted in the Resource Room and customer feedback is regularly reported to staff. **Arlington, Texas**

Example #2—Using a Center-Based Customer-Focused Problem-Solving Team.

In addition to implementing a management information system designed to track customer outcomes, the FutureWorks Career Center in Springfield, Massachusetts, has developed and implemented a procedure to promote and monitor high-performance outcomes. The “No Excuses”

Team is a cross-functional, rotating group of six FutureWorks staff charged with maintaining customer focus, designing mechanisms for customer feedback, and insuring that such feedback informs the continuous improvement process.

As a result of analyzing customer feedback, the Springfield center has developed a number of new job-search materials and workshops in which customers have expressed interest. **Springfield, Massachusetts**

Strategy 3. Create Incentives for Improved Performance by Local Offices and Staff

To motivate One-Stop center staff to improve center and system performance, several states and local areas have attempted to build in performance incentives at the level of the administrative unit or the individual service team or worker. A number of states have indicated that they will be developing positive incentives (rewards) for sites with high or improved One-Stop system performance and negative incentives (sanctions) for poor performance. Typically, incentives will consist of technical assistance to poorly performing centers and requirements to implement corrective action plans.

A few states have indicated their intention to apply accountability standards in conducting performance assessments for individual managers and One-Stop staff.

Examples of Creating Incentives for Improved Performance

Example #1—Linking Staff Performance Assessments to Customer Outcomes and Customer Satisfaction. The emphasis on performance outcomes at the Eastside Career Center in Baltimore has also influenced the development of a performance evaluation system for individual staff including instructors, employer account executives, and workshop leaders. Staff performance is assessed, at least in part, by the production outcomes and level of customer satisfaction reported by customers receiving services from each staff member. **Baltimore, Maryland**

Example #2—Developing Accountability Standards for One-Stop Program Directors and Center Managers.

An element of the increased state emphasis on accountability under the One-Stop system will be the implementation of accountability standards for state career center program directors and center managers. These managers will be evaluated based on their success in achieving systemwide goals, including the overall operation of their office, the use of the information resource area, the level of overall customer satisfaction and employer relations, and the extent of integration achieved between JTPA and other One-Stop partners. **State of Indiana**

Example #3—Creating Incentives and Sanctions to Encourage Continuous Quality Improvement for Local One-Stop centers.

The state's performance management committee was responsible for providing guidance and input on the development of new performance measures and of establishing performance benchmarks. It was also charged with developing recommendations for a system of incentives and sanctions to govern the continuous quality improvement of the local sites. **State of Iowa**

RESOURCES

EXAMPLES OF SETTING PERFORMANCE GOALS AND MEASURES

Attachment 8-A. Goals of the Workforce Development System and Guiding Principles for Selecting Measures (1997)

These two exhibits are excerpts from *Workforce Development Performance Measurement: Options for Performance Measures*, prepared by Social Policy Research Associates in March 1997 for use by the Workforce Development Performance Measures Policy Committee. The first exhibit summarizes eight workforce development system goals adopted by the Policy Committee. The second exhibit describes 14 guiding principles to be considered in selecting performance measures.

Attachment 8-B. Excerpts from Minnesota's Quality Assessment Annual Report (1996) for the Workforce Exchange Branch (ES and UI)

These excerpts from Minnesota's annual quality assessment report for the agency's Workforce Exchange Branch describe the different measures used by the ES and UI programs in Minnesota to assess customer satisfaction and product quality. The

excerpts review findings on internal and external customer satisfaction, quality placements, and market penetration.

Attachment 8-C. Minnesota Workforce Development System Strategic Framework (1997)

This memorandum describes the framework developed by the state of Minnesota to guide both system development and performance assessment for its comprehensive workforce development system, including (1) vision, (2) mission, (3) values, (4) strategic goals, and (5) systemwide and local measures for continuous improvement.

EXAMPLES OF MONITORING PROGRESS IN MEETING PROCESS GOALS

Attachment 8-D. Wisconsin's Self-Assessment/Monitoring Tool for Achieving a "Unified Employer Relations Function" (1996)

Wisconsin developed monitoring tools to guide outside monitors and One-Stop partners in determining whether they had satisfied the state's functional standards and service standards. This attachment reproduces a monitoring framework and format to be applied to local One-Stop employer services.

EXAMPLES OF TRACKING SERVICE UTILIZATION

Attachment 8-E. Statistics on Resource Area Usage at the Minnesota Workforce Center—Anoka County (1996)

This attachment summarizes customer usage of the personal computer lab and the job search area during an eight month period, with subtotals for "program-specific" customers and the general public.

Attachment 8-F. Early Statistics on Utilization of the Waukesha County, Wisconsin, Workforce Development Center (1995)

Attachment 8-G. Weekly One-Stop Client Flow at the Arlington, Texas, Career Center (1996)

EXAMPLES OF MEASURING CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

Attachment 8-H. Customer Satisfaction Materials from Minnesota

Included in this attachment are the following:

- (1) Excerpts from an Internal Customer Survey Report (1996)
- (2) A Customer Satisfaction Survey for Users of Labor Market Information

- (3) A Customer Satisfaction Survey for Job-Seeker Customers of One-Stop Centers
- (4) A Summary Sheet on “What Customers are Saying” About the Minnesota Workforce Center–Anoka County

Attachment 8-I. Customer Satisfaction Materials from Wisconsin

Included in this attachment are the following:

- (1) One-Stop Job Center Focus Group Interviews (1995)
- (2) Automated Survey of Job Seekers Through JobNet (1995)
- (3) Outline of One-Stop Customer Research Project (1996)

Attachment 8-J. Customer Satisfaction Materials from Connecticut

Included in this attachment are the following:

- (1) Exit Survey for Connecticut Works Center Customers
- (2) Survey Assessing Interest in Center Workshops
- (3) Customer Survey Assessing Workshops
- (4) Customer Survey Assessing Training

Attachment 8-K. Customer Satisfaction Results from Tarrant County (Texas) One-Stop Centers

Attachment 8-L. Indiana Customer Satisfaction Surveys for Job-Seekers and Employers