Using Data to Drive Innovation and Improve Services: Workforce Development in Chicago
Workforce Development
City/County Collaboration Plan
## Goals of Workforce Development Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>How to get there</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduce costs</strong></td>
<td>• Consolidated board will require less staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced overhead administrative costs for the City and County</td>
<td>• Non profit staff for WIA processing will create cost savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced overhead administrative costs for third party providers</td>
<td>• Third party providers will have single RFP to respond to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved service for residents</strong></td>
<td>• More data sharing within the region will help improve programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Streamlined, improved, customized programs</td>
<td>• Regional LWIA will be able to determine best practices and share region-wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional LWIA will have increased visibility, more flexibility in using funds to customize programs to residents’ needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consolidated board will have greater ability to lobby and apply for funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job creation and economic growth</strong></td>
<td>• Smaller board will lead to greater participation by business community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater ability to integrate job creation and job filling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guiding principles

- Workforce development should provide prospective employees with training and development options to meet the demand of employers.

- Because Chicagoland is a regional labor market, workforce development programs should have a regional outlook.

- Workforce development should not be reliant on a single source of funding; it should be supported, but not limited, by Federal WIA money.

- Workforce development covers many potential population segments; we need to be explicit about which ones we’re serving, and how.

- Workforce development efforts should be focused on data-driven outcomes; while different segments may require different or additional measures, success should be defined by:
  - Dollars spent per outcome
  - Total regional employment
Target State

Current organizations

- CWIC - 501(c)(3)
  - 14 members
  - $5M
- Support Staff (12)
- Chief Elected Official: Mayor of Chicago
- Chicago Workforce Investment Board (162 members)
  - Provides service through Delegate Agencies
- 2C City of Chicago Support Staff

Combined organization

Chief Elected Officials (co-signatories)

Chicago / Cook County Workforce Investment Board
(16 members: 8 appointed by Mayor, 8 appointed by Cook County President)

52 - 66 Support Staff * - Non profit 501(c)3

New structure will deliver

- Reduced costs
- Improved services
- Support for job creation and economic development
Timing

---

**Analyse**  
*(Oct-Nov)*

**Design**  
*(Nov-Dec)*

**Implement**  
*(Jan 2012-?)*

---

**Key activities***

Agree on principles, issues and approach

**Segmentation**

- Define workforce segments to be served
- Define sources of demand (business segments to be served)

**Current state mapping**

- Map all current funding sources, and which positions they support

**Best practices**

- Research and codify best practices and innovations within and outside Chicago/Cook County (e.g., Cleveland, State of Georgia)

---

* See Appendix for details
Timing

Analyze
(Oct-Nov)

Design
(Nov-Dec)

Implement
(Jan 2012-?)

Key activities*

Infrastructure

- Determine legal structure of new organization
- Define purpose/mission of new organization
- Define key inter-org relationships
- Define size, roles, membership requirements and recruiting strategy for board
- Define staff functions required
- Define size of staff and develop staffing plan
- Define desired funding sources and amounts
- Identify and resolve existing liabilities
- Develop single policy letter
- Determine physical location of board/staff

Responsibility

TBD

* See Appendix for details
Timing

Analyze

*(Oct-Nov)*

Design

*(Nov-Dec)*

Implement

*(Jan 2012-?)*

---

**Key activities***

**Gap analysis**

- Identify gaps between current state and desired state
  - Legal requirements
  - Staffing
  - Funding
  - External relationships

**Implementation**

- Agree on timing, tied to existing calendars
- Develop transition plan for unique programs, grants and mandated committees
- Develop legal instruments for any required funding transfers
- Identify priority RFPs to be issued
- Develop brand/logo/web site

**Responsibility**

TBD

---

* See Appendix for details
**Tentative Transition Timeframes**

### Deliverables
- Structure, design and implementation plan to minimize number of board(s)
- Structure, design and implementation plan to minimize number of staff(s)
- IGAs and new processes for making investments
- Transition plan, existing funding
- Transition plan, provider contracts
- Identify legal requirements (waivers, board establishment, funding transfers, etc.)
- 3/31: New agency legally established
- 3/31: New board in place
- 4/30: RFPs issued
- 6/30: NFP staff plan implemented
- TBD: Government staff plan implemented
- 7/1: New Program Year

### Key events/activities
- Listening Sessions with stakeholders, including: delegate agencies, businesses, clients, Board members and staff.
- Biweekly updates to Mayor & President

**Analysis & Design**
- Oct 24

**Implementation Phase 1**
- Dec 31

**Implementation Phase 2**
- Jun 30

**TBD**
Next steps

- Continue System design/strategy meetings
- Host additional listening sessions (delegate agencies, community colleges, key stakeholders)
- Complete comprehensive transition plan
- Issue PY ‘12 RFP
- Legally establish Chicago Cook Workforce Partnership
- Implement staffing plan for CCWP
- Submit formal request for reorganization to State WIB including:
  - Board structure (size and composition)
  - Agency structure
  - System design
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About the Chicago Jobs Council

• CJC works with its members to advance employment and career opportunities for people living in poverty.

• 30-year old member-based, not-for profit organization with ~100 members

• Majority of members are community-based providers of workforce development services.

• CJC’s work includes: policy advocacy, stakeholder engagement, and capacity building

• www.cjc.net
Finding Data

• Does the workforce data we have answer the right questions?
• Do we have workforce data that answers policymakers’ or funders’ questions?
• How do we find the right external information to augment internal program data?
Requiring Data

• Different: sources of funding; reporting requirements; reporting formats
• Required measures can drive services in unintended ways
• Unequal organizational capacity to collect, report, use, apply data internally
Applying Data

• Program development and planning
• Understanding outcomes and results
• Communicating outcomes and results
• Fundraising
Carrie Thomas, Associate Director
carrie@cjc.net
312-252-0459
www.cjc.net
Looking inside the black box:

Identifying & measuring what makes workforce development programs successful

Elizabeth Weigensberg

Chapin Hall Child & Family Policy Forum
Chicago, IL
March 8, 2012

Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago
Policy research that benefits children, families, and their communities
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Overview of study

• Purpose
  – What’s inside the “black box” of successful workforce programs?
  – Understand program processes & contextual influences
  – Describe data/measures of successful factors
Conceptual model:
Factors related to successful workforce outcomes

- Based on ecological model
- Reflects multiple levels of factors from micro- to macro-level that relate to successful outcomes
- Captures important role of data/outcomes
Sample selection & methods

Sample selection:
- Expert nominations of successful workforce programs
- “Successful” defined as achieving job placement and retention outcomes
- Community-based programs
- Serve low-income, adult recipients (age 18+)
- Located in Chicagoland area
- Six workforce organizations/programs in final study sample

Methods:
- Site visits & interviews
  - 15 interviews with 16 staff members from 6 organizations
- Qualitative coding of interview transcripts & field notes using ATLAS.ti
Successful Factors: Participants, Program, and Practice

• **Recruitment and intake process** are unique for each program, but are always extensive and thorough.

• **Holistic approach** of programs addresses basic, psychosocial, workplace skills and other social service needs throughout time in program.

• **Job match and quality placement** are considered throughout the program.
Successful Factors: Provider and Organization

- Dedication to organizational mission

- Exhibit flexibility by adapting to changing environment, labor markets, and participant pools

- With shrinking budgets and current challenging times, need to diversify funding to allow for more flexibility

- Strong leadership and staff are essential, and acknowledge the importance of each other

- Program plans for growth balance broader vs deeper focus
Successful Factors:
External Relationships, Community and Policy

• Strong **employer partnerships** are necessary for job placements and programs aim to meet changing demands

• In addition to job placements, programs **engage employers** in program aspects and by providing services

• Collaborative **relationships among workforce programs**

• Strong **community engagement** to obtain referrals, provide support services

• **Community influences** where and what services programs provide and how program can promote economic development

• **Staff engaged in policy and advocacy efforts**
Role of Data and Outcomes

• Programs collect measures required by funders, but these offer limited view of outcomes/impact

• Programs sometimes use additional measures for self-assessment
  – Many individual characteristics collected
  – Some program and organizational measures, process measures used for program management
  – Often little data on external relations with employers, community partners, other programs
Data Challenges

• Limited scope of current measures/data systems
  – Not all participants captured by public data systems

• Multiple data systems used, repetitive data entry

• Programs want measures that can:
  – better assess participant progress & outcomes
  – demonstrate better understanding of program outcomes/impact
  – identify where improvements can be made
Measurement Recommendations

• **Improve measures for workforce development, by…**
  – establishing some common measures, but allow for flexibility
  – using longitudinal measures to assess outcomes over time
  – analyzing outcomes by subpopulations, barriers to employment

• **Expand what is measured to include…**
  – assessment data and continual development of skills
  – intermediate participant achievements
  – use of support services
  – economic self-sufficiency
  – achievement of industry credentials
  – employer and community engagement/outcomes
Data Recommendations

• Establish integrated data systems that...
  – minimize repetitive, redundant data entry in multiple systems
  – collect information on all program participants
  – provide programs with useful measures for self assessment & reporting
  – improve how programs report outcomes to funders
  – is flexible to meet the diverse needs of different programs
Conclusions & Policy Implications

- Multilevel set of factors influence successful workforce program outcomes
  - Individual participants
  - Program/practice
  - Provider organization
  - Community/external relationships/policy

- Many promising examples of programs using data and outcomes, but many important factors are not measured

- Programs could benefit from more data to assess these factors as they related to achievement of employment outcomes
Limitations & Next Steps

Limitations:
• Current study is a preliminary, descriptive study
• Limited to only successful 6 programs within Chicago
• Limited to only community-based workforce programs

Next Steps:
• Need to pursue additional research and data efforts to work with programs to collect and analyze data on all workforce program participants & assess broader array of factors
Thank you!

Elizabeth Weigensberg, PhD, MSSW
Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago
Senior Researcher & CWICstats Coordinator
eweigensberg@chapinhall.org
A couple data points to put our services in context:

• 1,731,711 Illinoisans live at or below the federal poverty level (FPL).

• $22,350 is the FPL for a family of four.

• Since its founding, The Cara Program has placed over 3,000 individuals into permanent jobs.

• In the last year, 77% of those individuals celebrated at least one year on the job.

• These outcomes ultimately aggregate into $24,100,706 in social dividends.

• ... which is otherwise stated as a 545% return on investment.
Our Service Delivery

On-line participants can find an on-line version of this document at http://www.thecaraprogram.org/sites/default/files/uploads/TCP%20Service%20Delivery%20Model%200311.pdf
Our Key Performance Indicators

Performance Update
as of December 31, 2011

Performance Indicators

Employment Secured and Sustained
- 232 Permanent Job Placements
  (Goal = 300)
- 252 Transitional Job Placements
  (Goal = 230)

Communities Revitalized
- 899 Tons of Waste Collected
  Including 226 Tons of Recycling
- 38,098 Services to Homes in Foreclosure

A Fresh Start for Steven

While we unfortunately missed the mark on our employment goal in 2011 due to a challenging economy and an internal restructuring at The Cara Program, we are incredibly proud of the 232 students we did place into employment this year. Here is just one example of the lives that are transformed thanks to your support and that of our community.

In 2005, Steven’s world was turned upside down. With his 50th birthday just around the corner, Steven was let go from the janitorial position he had held for two decades. After several years of unemployment, he lacked confidence and was struggling to keep his childhood home in the family. Steven came to The Cara Program’s community center, the Quadrangle Communities for Working Families (QCFWF), in 2011 seeking assistance. After working with our Financial Coach, Deneen, and Employment Relations Specialist, Nadia, he began to trust that he could begin a new chapter in his life. With a new, positive outlook and coaching from QCFWF staff, Steven aced his interview for a position with ARAMARK. We are thrilled to see Steven gainfully employed and rebuilding the skills he needs to succeed on the job – and we are optimistic that his family home will be there for the next generation.

Mission Statement

The Cara Program prepares and inspires motivated individuals to break the cycle of homelessness and poverty, transform their lives, strengthen our communities, and forge paths to real and lasting success.

Comparative Indicators

One-Year
- 77% Employment

Monthly Wage
- $8.25

Annual Savings
- $10.50

Average of IDA Participants
- $767

Average of Employed Cara Students
- $199

Permanent Housing
- 86%

Comparative Indicators

Employment & Industries

Employment Facts
- For Cara Students placed into permanent jobs in 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Avg. Wage</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>$10.03</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Mgmt</td>
<td>$10.83</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$9.96</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>$9.73</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>$9.42</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels/Camps</td>
<td>$11.19</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>$11.71</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Servs</td>
<td>$10.59</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>$15.22</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$15.23</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On-line participants can find an on-line version of this document at http://www.thecaraprogram.org/sites/default/files/uploads/TCP_PU_2011_Q2.pdf
Our Key Performance Indicators

On-line participants can find an on-line version of this document at http://www.thecaraprogram.org/sites/default/files/uploads/TCP_PU_2011_Q2.pdf
Our Social Return

**Social Return on Investment (SROI)**

**Our Social Impact:**

- Annualized Contributions to Society: $1,261,663
  - Income Taxes Paid, Social Security, Sales Tax Dollars Spent
- Annualized Savings to Society: $6,508,221
  - Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food Stamps, Unemployment, Health Care, Substance Abuse Treatment, Housing, Recidivism and Rearrest for Prison and Jail, Children Returned though the Department of Children and Family Services, Medicaid

**Total One-Year Social Impact:** $7,769,884

**Determining the Social Return on Investment:**

- Present Value of Social Investments (Over Five Years): $24,100,706
  - 'Present Value' = 'Total One-Year Social Impact' x 5; then discounted based on 30-year treasury bond data, plus an additional 20% to acknowledge the risk inherent in this work.
- The Cara Program’s One-Year Program Cost: $4,423,270

**Social Return on Investment:** 544.9%
Maria Kim, Chief Operating Officer
The Cara Program

www.thecaraprogram.org
mkim@thecaraprogram.org
Questions for Panelists