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JENNIFER JACOBS: So again, we want to welcome you to today's WIOA Wednesday effectiveness in serving employers, another look webinar, and if you haven't already done so, please introduce yourself in that chat window.

Now, without further ado, I'd like to turn things over to our moderator today, Shelia Lewis, workforce analyst at the Division of Strategic Planning and Performance for the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration. Shelia?

SHELIA LEWIS: Thank you, Jenn. And good afternoon and welcome to our webinar and panel discussion. Today's webinar and panel discussion is sponsored by the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration and the Department of Education's Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education and Rehabilitative Services Administration. Today's webinar has two parts. Part one is our basic presentation on this indicator, and part two is a panel discussion where we have – we've invited six state teams who will provide information on their experience so far with this indicator.

Part two will be moderated by Kimberly Powell. She's a workforce development specialist from ETA, and our sessions will be presented – our presenters for the webinar will be Melinda Giancola. She's chief of the Data Collection Analysis Unit, Rehabilitation Services Administration, U.S. Department of Education. And Andy Ridgeway of – he's the unit supervisor, Adult Performance Unit, Office of Workforce Investment, ETA, Department of Labor. And Jay LeMaster will also be helping to field any questions from the audience. He's from the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education.

Our panelist teams are Alabama, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Tennessee, Washington, and Wisconsin. And during that session Kim will introduce our panelists.

So now, without further ado – well, we'll go back to our poll questions at the beginning. We asked you two questions. The first one was, which of the list below are the three possible approaches for measuring the effectiveness in serving employers? It looks like we have some people that are still completing theirs, and looks like pretty much everyone is right. The first one will be repeat business customers, retention with the same employer, and employer penetration rate. So everyone did a good job with that. Looks like a few chose employer happiness index.

OK. Our next poll question was, if you represent workforce or adult education, did you report the approaches chosen for the pilot program in your annual report submission? And it looks like most of you did. We're showing about 75 percent said yes, and about 25 percent did not. Thank you very much for participating in our poll questions. There will be a few more throughout the presentation.

Today's agenda, again, part one will be the overview of the indicator. We'll discuss the importance of the indicator and the fact that it's a shared indicator. We'll review the pilot program, reporting, and we'll also go over some frequently asked questions. And again, part two will be a state panel discussion, and that will be the bulk of our presentation. And after the panel discussion you will be able to type in some questions into the chat room. And, Melinda, take it away.

MELINDA GIANCOLA: All right. Thanks, Shelia. Good afternoon, everyone. Andy and I are going to take a few minutes to just kind of highlight the indicator before we turn it over to our panelists, since I'm sure that's who most of you are here to listen to. OK.

So let's start by talking about why we would want to measure the effectiveness of serving employers. Well, as you know, the state workforce development system has two customers, the participants or the jobseekers, which we're measuring our performance through five of the performance indicators, and then employers. So we'll use this effectiveness of serving employers measure to measure the state's performance in serving that particular customer.

So this indicator was designed to ensure that businesses are receiving high-quality services by gauging three – (inaudible) – that were identified by business through a series of business round tables and through our rule-making process. And these services are providing employers with skilled workers, providing quality engagement, and developing productive relationships that extend over periods of time and providing quality engagement services to all employers within the state and the local economy.

And some examples of that would be providing training on legislation related to the rights of individuals with disabilities, such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, matching qualified job applicants to job postings, and developing training programs that will help fill skills gaps in a particular area.

So why is this measure unique? Well, it's a shared outcome. The other five performance indicators measure each of the particular core programs' ability to serve participants. This measure is looking at the state workforce development system as a whole. So rather than having each program report on how their program is individually serving employers, each of the core programs must work together to define the indicator and report it as the state workforce development system.

So each of you should have already met to determine what your three – which two of the three indicators you'll be reporting to the department. You'll need to figure out which agency is going to report that information, and you're going to need to figure out how that information is going to be shared across agencies through various data sharing agreements. And we're hoping that since this is a collaborative measure that it will discourage competition and encourage collaboration and state agencies to work collaboratively to create efficiencies in serving employers.

OK. So another reason this measure is unique is it's not fully defined. Congress was very prescriptive in the five participant measures defined in WIOA, but they kind of left this one up to the departments and stakeholders to figure out. So in program year 2016 and continuing in program year 2017 we're conducting a pilot to help us determine what the final effectiveness in serving employers measure is going to be. Through the pilot each state is required to pick two of the three indicators and report on those. States are also encouraged to design their own measure, and Andy will talk a little bit more about that one later.

OK. So I mentioned you're required to pick two of the three approaches, and those three approaches are retention with the same employer, employer penetration rate, and repeat business customers. So we'll talk a little bit more in depth about each one of those.

OK. The employer retention measure, this gets at when we had business round tables and talked to business, we heard that something that they were very concerned about was limiting turnover. As you know, when an employer has a vacancy, they're not getting any productivity out of that vacancy. It's costly to hire and train someone, and if they're having constant turnover, then they're having to repeat this process. So it's important to them to have employees stay in the position for a period of time.

So this measure is going to look at the percentage of participants who exited the program and are employed with the same employer in the second and fourth quarter after exit. States must use their unemployment insurance wage records to calculate this. And some of the pros to this indicator, you're already collecting this information as part of the joint PIRL. It's also the least disruptive to the employers because you aren't having to contact them. You're going through your unemployment insurance office rather than making contact with employers to verify it.

Some of the cons that we've heard, if an employee is with an employer for a year, it doesn't necessarily mean the employer is satisfied with the employee. We've also heard that many people believe that this indicator directly contradicts the other customer and part of the mission of the workforce development system because, if an individual has the chance to take a better paying job or a job that's better suited for them between the second and fourth quarter, then that's good for the employee.

However, this measure is looking at the effectiveness of serving employers and what makes the employer happy, and if the employer is having a vacancy and having to fill that and train someone, then it's really not helping the employer, which is the goal of this particular measure.

OK. Our next measure to talk about is employer penetration, and this measure captures the percent of business establishments in the state that receive services from the workforce development system within the program year.

To calculate this measure, we'll need two pieces of information, the first being the total number of business establishments that were served by the workforce development system in the year, and the second is the total number of business establishments in the state, the denominator. That number, the total number of business establishments in the state, is captured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages or QCEW program.

It's important to know what QCEW defines an establishment as as you're calculating this measure, which is a single economic unit, such as a farm, a mine, a factory, a store that produces goods or services. And establishments are typically at one physical location and are engaged in one or predominantly one type of economic activity that a single industry code can be applied. For example, if your state has a large department store chain, the business establishment is the physical location at, say, 123 Main Street, not the entirety of the company located within your state.

So if you have any more questions about QCEW, feel free to visit the BLS website or contact your LMI shop. QCEW is actually a federal state cooperative program. So most of your BLS data is provided through your LMI shop.

OK. One of the cons to this one that we hear is that business – or I'm sorry – the workforce development system has a budget, and it's not going to be possible for you to serve everyone in the state. And the number of employers that you actually serve is going to be kind of a small percentage.

So educating our data users here that we're not going to ever be able to get 95 percent or a high number like that, that we'll need to get over the stigma that 5 percent is a bad number, when in this case it could be a really good number and your your state workforce development system is doing a very good job serving employers.

We've also heard, particularly from the VR side, that this indicator prioritizes the breadth of service rather than the depth of service. And we know in VR in particular that you place a lot of emphasis on developing these in-depth relationships and will often spend many years working with employers before we're at a point where we're able to place an employee in that establishment.

OK. And our final measure, repeat business customer. So this measure is the unique count of employers who have received services from the workforce development system more than once in a three-year period. So the calculation, again, requires us to know what the definition of a business establishment is to calculate the denominator, which is the unique count of establishments that have received a service from the workforce development system in a year.

And the numerator would be the count of establishments that have also received a service in one of the three prior program years. And this approach is useful in determining whether employers who receive services from the workforce development system are satisfied and come back as repeat customers.

And one of the cons we've heard to this one is that it's going to force the workforce development system to serve larger employers because oftentimes smaller employers will receive a service and then not need one again for several years. And we did try and account for that by having the measure over a three-year period, but there were some concerns that that might not be long enough.

All right. So I'll turn this over now to Andy.

ANDY RIDGEWAY: Thanks, Melinda. And I think what we'll do next is do a quick poll again real quick, and we'll go ahead and put that up and give everyone a few seconds to look at that. It basically is, true or false? The effectiveness in serving employers indicator is reported quarterly. True or false? And I would say reported to DOL or Education quarterly is the qualifier for that.

While we take in time to do this vote and this poll, I'd like to – I see we've started to get a few people asking questions. I'd encourage you throughout the webinar, if you have questions you want to ask, go ahead and type that in the Q&A chat box in the bottom left part of your screen. We can't promise that we'll be able to get to all of them, but we will have the record of them so that we can try and answer them in future webinars or future publications. So just wanted to allow people to go ahead and, if you have questions, go ahead and type them in as you go.

Looks like we've got quite a few responses to this, and the majority is correct here. That is false for number three. The effectiveness in serving employers indicator is an annual measure that's reported on the WIOA core programs. And again, just to go over what Melinda said momentarily ago, the outcomes will be shared by all WIOA core programs because it is a shared indicator covering all core programs.

Reported outcomes for this indicator will be by state rather than by the program. So there's a process, and we'll be getting into that a little bit later with the state panels where we talk about how some of the states have tackled this issue because it is a new concept for us and there's just – again, there's no distinction between the titles for this indicator.

So moving forward back to the presentation, again, there it is. So talking about reporting briefly here. So we talked about, it's a shared measure across all programs. So states are generally have the flexibility to determine a lead agency. So we know that between Titles I and III and II and IV that oftentimes you're across different entities in state government. And so as part of this measure, when you report it and as part of your process of working together, you're to designate a lead agency for who's responsible for reporting that information, tabulating, and aggregating it.

So anyways, we wanted to make sure that distinction was done because that is a new concept. And then we're past the point for annual reporting for the Titles I and III program, although some states are still reporting, but we did want to just go ahead and go over that states were not required to have to report on this indicator for PY 2016. And you probably have known that by now, but we wanted to be sure and make that clear for PY '16, which just ended this past June. There was no requirement that you would have the data for that yet. So just wanted to share that.

And I think what we'll do is we'll do another quick poll just to do a knowledge check again. Give everyone a little bit of time to see that. I'll just read it. Once the two approaches are selected, as Melinda went over, a state must use the same two approaches throughout the entire pilot. True or false? Give people a chance to kind of weigh in on that. OK. Got a pretty good turnout, and actually, the answer to this is false, even though the majority have true.

States may change the approaches that they decide to report during the pilot period. So I guess that's the key point there is that, while we're in this pilot stage, if there is a measure that – or one of the measures that all of a sudden it's like this doesn't provide us value or anything like that, you do have the ability to change.

If a state does decide to switch to one of the approaches that requires data elements from prior years, such as repeat business customer, the state will need the data from the prior years looking back to July of 2016. So I guess I want to caveat that, that you can switch, but you do need to be able to have data that can go back and look from there. So just wanted to share that quick poll, and then we will move forward here.

Melinda talked a little bit about that, in addition to the three measures that the states may choose from, of which they pick two, states do have an option to pick additional measures that they want to decide to use. And we're actually going to talk about that a little bit later.

In fact, I would ask, if you or your state has decided to do something in this space that's outside of the three measures, if possible and you're willing to share, we would love for you to type that in the chat box what it is that your state's doing, what you're calling it, and, if possible, how are you measuring it because, like we said, we're piloting these three measures not because we think we're rock – we're for sure going to do those in the future after the pilot period. Part of this is just learning what's out there, what are ways to measure things.

So we do ask that they be quantifiable and something that could be brought to scale across the country. We'd love for you to share that because we would love for states to be able to share best practices, share any insights they gathered in this measure, and later in the presentation my colleague Jay will kind of recap all of the different measures that the states are exploring. And during the state panel discussion I believe we'll also talk a little bit about what some of the states on our panel have decided to do. So we look forward to that part of the conversation as well.

And then quickly we'll do one more poll. So give you a second to go ahead and fill these out, and this is another true or false to recap kind of what we said before. The DOL-funded agency is responsible for developing the indicator and reporting on it. True or false? OK. This is accurate so far. The correct answer here is false.

The DOL-funded agency may be responsible for developing it, but that's a process that you decide at the state level. So in some states you may – the Title IV agency or the Title II agency may be the ones responsible for it, or the Title I and III agencies may be. So that's a – that's part of the process that you at the state level are to decide as you're figuring out which measures you're wanting to do, how you're going to do it. That's a process that we aren't mandating who does it, just that the state finds a way and picks an agency that's going to do that. So I was glad to see that most people had that correct.

OK. And quickly, before we get to the state panel, I did want to shed light on a couple frequently asked questions in this space that we've done, and we did put the link to it. So I will quickly go over a couple of those before we hand it off to the panel and go from there.

So the first one is, describe the pilot for the effectiveness in serving employers indicator of performance. And so, basically, if you go and click on the FAQ, we're going to talk a little bit about the pilot. So the pilot for this indicator began on July 1st, 2016.

However, due to the timing of available data under such definitions, the departments understand that complete data will not be available for reporting in October of 2017, which we are now past. States will begin reporting outcomes on this indicator in October of 2018, so next year.

The Department of Labor is in the process of conducting an evaluation of the pilot period beginning in the fall of 2017 and I think in the future we'll be able to share more of what that looks like but I know it's in the very early stages. We will be doing an evaluation of these indicators – of these measures for the indicator to kind of get an idea of what these measures are doing, what are they telling us, and are they doing what we want them to do. So anyways, more to come on that side.

And then the last FAQ we're going to share is, for the effectiveness in serving employers indicator, how will states report to their respective agencies?

And the departments recommend that data for this indicator be submitted by one lead agency, like we've discussed. All data for each of the core programs should be combined and reported to the Department of Labor or Education by the state as one set of data.

For Titles I, which is the adult, dislocated worker, and youth formula programs, and Title III, the Wagner-Peyser Act Employment Service, the state will decide on how the data are compiled and reported to the state. The effectiveness of serving employers performance indicator will not be reported in the PY 2016 annual report. However, Titles I and III were to report in the – report on which indicator they are using in the ETA-9169 report.

Reporting in this manner should continue until Titles I and III WIOA annual report narrative has been approved, and then in the future we may explore doing this through a narrative report. So that's really just applies to our Title I and III grantees. We just wanted to make sure that in the 9169s you've indicated that you have picked which measures you're doing going forward.

So I believe that's going to wrap up our FAQ portion of it. Now, we're going to get to the part that we're actually most excited about, which is the state panel discussions. And my colleague Kim Powell will be moderating this part of the presentation. So, Kim, if you're there and ready, I'll hand it over to you.

KIMBERLY POWELL: OK. Thank you. This is Kim Powell from the Employment and Training Administration, and I'm thrilled to welcome an esteemed panel we have from all over the country, representing many different agencies. So we're going to just do some quick introductions. From Alabama, Leslie Dawson, state administrator, business relations program, Resources for Employment and Disability Information Network at the Department of Rehabilitation Services. Tammy Wilkinson, Workforce Development Division, and David Walters, state director for Alabama adult education.

Illinois, Patti Schnoor, technology and performance manager at the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity. Jennifer Foster, deputy director for adult education and workforce. Sergio Estrada, manager, federal performance reporting. Todd Lowery, state manager for business services at the Department of Employment Security. And Neely Schlosser, performance manager, Office of Employment and Training, Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity.

Pennsylvania, Keith Bailey, director, Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry, Center for Workforce Information and Analysis. Washington state, Dave Wallace, research unit manager for Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board. Tennessee, Ryan Allen, workforce services director, WIOA performance, Tennessee Department of Labor and Workforce Development. Also joined by Mike Nadell (sp), who's on that team as well.

Wisconsin, Bryan Huebsch, WIOA performance planner at the Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development. Patti Johnson, strategic initiatives advisor, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Julie Tyznik, state director of adult education for the Wisconsin Technical College System. Amy Hansmann, section chief, Bureau of Job Services, Department of Workforce Development.

And from Missouri, Clint Flowers, performance research manager at the Missouri Division of Workforce Development. Ellen Clapper, policy development coordinator, Missouri Department of Social Services, Rehabilitation Services for the blind. I actually had a couple of other people from Missouri. I'm not sure if they're here because they're not on the slide, but I'll just go ahead and introduce them because I think they had a couple more people on their team. Elaine Bryan, state director, adult education and literacy with the Missouri Department of Rehabilitation Services. And Neil Harms, field operations manager with Missouri Vocational Rehabilitation.

So you can see we have a full house, and we're excited to get started and hear about what some of their experiences are. So let's jump right in on the first question. We're going to have all the panelists speak to this first question, and then as we move through some of the later questions I'll call on individual states to respond. We're going to start with Alabama for the first question.

So which measures did your state decide to use? Did your state opt to develop additional measures, and why? So what was the value that you saw in the different measures? So I'm going to turn it to Leslie Dawson. Can you kind of start us off with your representatives from Alabama?

LESLIE DAWSON: Sure. I'll be glad to. Tammy and David and I are on the call. I'm glad to share with you today. So the two approaches that Alabama chose to use is retention with the same employer and repeat business customer. Now, Alabama has also chosen to do an additional measurement that we are working on ourselves, and we'll probably talk about that a little bit later in the question and answering session. But I'm going to ask Tammy and David to talk about why exactly we chose retention with the same employer and repeat business customer.

TAMMY WILKINSON: Hey. Good afternoon. This is Tammy Wilkinson. After the cohort meeting in February where we were – we met with the other states and we came back and talked to our management in our departments and let them know that we had this pilot and what the three options were for the approaches, as well as we could design our own. After meeting with our partner agencies and our management, we decided that we would present the retention with the same employer and repeat business customers.

We opted not to do the employer penetration rate because I think it had been mentioned previously that, when we looked at it with just tentative data, we found that it was less than 5 percent, and some of our management had real concern that that wasn't really representative of how well our system was serving employers.

So we talked to the state board members and our management all agreed and our partner agencies agreed and we presented it to the state board and they had approved on August 31st at the state board meeting that we would do the retention with the same employer and the repeat business customers. And our state board is heavily populated with business individuals, and our board was real excited that we had thought about and had opted to create our own measure. So they wanted to give heavy input into that one.

MS. POWELL: Thank you. OK. We're going to turn next to representatives from Illinois, if there's someone from Illinois, Patti or Jennifer, who wants to start us off.

MS. SCHNOOR: Hi. It's Patti Schnoor. I'll start. In Illinois, just to set the stage, we have six core WIOA programs in Illinois and overseen by the four separate agencies. Department of Commerce has Title I, Employment Security, Title III, Community College Board, Title II, and Human Services is Title IV; and each agency also has its own information technology platform system for collecting and reporting.

So it's a challenge, and we're always – so from the unified plan to today we formulated multiple WIOA inter-agency strategic teams and tactical work groups. One of those is for data and technology performance group, and so that group met several times on different occasions and we finally settled on approach one and three would be the best choices for Illinois.

And mostly just boiled down to available data points, ability to share, match, combine, quantify the data. The work group passed the recommendation on to the Illinois Workforce Investment Board and so that had to be presented to the board and they had to make a motion to approve. And that was done on September 21st of 2017. So it's very recent.

In the meantime, we had been looking at the approaches and figuring out how we want to do our calculations and, again, get the data mined and how we're going to resolve them. And so just basically, we're capturing the percentage of participants who exit and employed with the same employer and the penetration rate.

MS. POWELL: Great. Thank you. OK. Next, I'm going to ask Dave Wallace from Washington to respond.

KAREN STAHA: Kim, before we move forward, this is Karen Staha, and I just wanted to ask the Illinois people. So we heard from Alabama that said they're – they did not opt for the employer penetration rate because their numbers were so low. And I wanted to know if Illinois, from their available data, are they seeing that same low rate?

And, I mean, I think if you start low, then there's the expectation – I mean, there's no expectation of what it should be. I don't think we anticipate that there's going to be even a 25 percent penetration rate because there are so many businesses in an area. But I'm just curious if Illinois had that discussion of what – having low outcomes for that metric.

PATTI SCHNOOR: For repeat business?

TODD LOWERY: Penetration.

MS. STAHA: Yeah. For employer – didn't you say you're using employer penetration?

MS. SCHNOOR: We're using employer – penetration with the same employer – employer – I'm sorry. Retention with the same employer and employer penetration rate. We're not using repeat business.

MS. STAHA: Right. And Alabama said they did not use – if I understood Alabama correctly, they did not use employer penetration because their data showed a less than 5 percent, and I'm just curious what Illinois saw with their available data.

MS. SCHNOOR: We had different ways that we were going to look at the denominator in this, and I think it was just because we're trying to take a very proactive approach with our business engagement – (inaudible) – coming out.

So it was something that we – rather than look at the repeat business, that we would actually try to take this measure and really go out there and look for businesses and profile businesses that we are doing a good job with and then look to go out and find identical businesses or ones similar that we can actually take the value from this and do employer penetration. And Todd also wanted to add something to this.

MR. LOWERY: I would just say that yes. You're correct. This measure was going to come up with a short percentage number, but we realized that and we felt like comparatively nationwide that it would be the same result. We have over 300,000 businesses in Illinois. So obviously, we can't get the penetration numbers that would reflect a good – a positive percentage, whatever that is to be determined. But we felt like that determination, if it was at 5 percent or less, would be a fairly standard one across the nation, and so that's why we weren't that concerned.

MS. STAHA: OK. Thank you. I appreciate it. All right. Thank you, Kim.

MS. POWELL: OK. Thanks, Karen. Feel free to pop in with any follow-up questions. I'm going to move on with this question to Washington, Dave Wallace.

DAVE WALLACE: Yeah. Hi. Dave Wallace from Washington, and in Washington we chose to go with the latter two measures, the repeat business consumers and the employer penetration measure. The rationale behind that was that we felt that the repeat business customer measure has – at least the assumption behind it is that it has something of a qualitative measure in the sense that, if you're getting companies coming back and using – engaging with our system, there's some sort of satisfaction going on.

And then secondly, the employer penetration rate we chose because we felt it gave some sense of the scope of the reach of our engagement with businesses across the state.

We did talk about developing alternative measures primarily to account for problems or shortcomes of these measures. So, for example, we talked about the idea of coming up with something that would give an indicator of the depth. So in other words, every time you engage with a business, it's not the same engagement.

Some is much more – it uses much more of your time and effort than other engagements. And then also, particularly for the employment for the penetration measure, it would be nice to have some kind of indicator by firm size because otherwise there's no incentive to work with employers of larger size. So anyway, that's what our decision was based on.

MS. POWELL: Great. Thank you.

MR. WALLACE: Sure.

MS. POWELL: OK. Missouri, I'm going to ask your team to chime in next. Please go ahead.

CLINTON FLOWERS: Yes. Hello. This is Clinton Flowers with workforce development in Missouri. I was happy to participate in the meeting this afternoon. In Missouri we work with vocational rehabilitation. We have a division for vocation – we have vocation services for the blind with workforce in UI partners. From the beginning we had a steering committee which was formed to implement WIOA and so we basically had individuals assigned to work on a performance measures group and that included the consideration of these measures.

We chose to work with repeat business services to employers and market penetration rate in Missouri. The greatest pro we felt with the retention measure, obviously, is it really does hold great value for those participants and agencies in vocational rehabilitation, but we also felt like the greatest con was that it is impacted significantly by individual choice. And so no matter what you do in terms of policy development and program implementation to move that measure, it might be undone by individual choice. And that's really how we resolved those two out of three.

We have considered the opportunity – we don't wish to be held accountable, but we've considered the concept of looking at market penetration within appropriate sectors within a region because each region is to highlight and emphasize significant sectors for their career pathways that it would be important to look at an incentive measure that would look at market penetration within certain sectors.

MS. POWELL: Great. Thank you.

MR. FLOWERS: You're welcome.

MS. POWELL: OK. We're going to move on to the next team, Wisconsin. I don't know. Bryan Huebsch, are you going to start off the Wisconsin folks for the first question?

BRYAN HUEBSCH: Yes. I'll go ahead and address this one. Thank you very much. So our – what we have in Wisconsin is a performance advisory committee, and it's a group that is represented by each of our core titles. We have a few of our workforce boards represented, also other key partners such as our Unemployment Insurance Division's jobs for veterans state grant trade adjustment assistance.

We have a mix of performance people, data people, management and what we do is we work together to develop recommendations and we advise our – what we call the WIOA leadership team. And that's just nothing more than the next higher level. We have senior managers from each of the core partners on that group, and so when we looked at this, we looked at – Wisconsin selected the employer penetration rate and the repeat use of the business services.

A couple of things that we liked about the measure is it did promote collaboration amongst the core partners and the business services team, and that was the part we liked the most. There were some things we didn't like, but of the two measures, we liked those two the most. The reason we didn't go with the repeat – I'm sorry – the retention with the individual employee, we just believed there were too many extenuating circumstances that weren't generally reflective of the work that was being done locally and through our programs.

And so we stayed with the two measures. The Governor's Council of Workforce Investment back in August of 2016 approved these measures, and since we've gone ahead and implemented those statewide, we are looking – actively looking at additional measures of performance. I have a work group that is meeting weekly, and we have about six or seven different approaches.

Some of them are just to modify the two we selected, and again, we're just looking for the – I always tell them we're looking for the Holy Grail of business services indicators, and we're just looking to tweak those measures and see what tells us the most and what gives us the most value. Thank you.

MS. POWELL: All right. Thank you. And Tennessee. Ryan, are you going to speak for Tennessee?

RYAN ALLEN: Yes. Thank you for the opportunity to speak for Tennessee today. Basically, a lot of the comments would be the same as some of the other states, but the first thing we did is formed a committee between our vocational rehabilitation partners and our adult education partners. Luckily, our state already had a system where we had been tracking employer services for the past couple years. So it was just a matter of adding some new services to our existing system, and since our Title III system already collected those employer services, what we decided to do is just add in the ability for our VR partners and adult education partners to gain access to that system.

So we ended up choosing the approach number two, which is the repeat business customer rate, and the employee penetration rate. We felt like those were the most representative of effectiveness serving employers, and basically, the same kind of comments from the other states. And we do not at this point have any additional measures.

MS. POWELL: OK.

MR. ALLEN: I will add on to the two measures that have to do with employer services, we still are in the process of making sure we can tell the difference between a different location in our reporting of those measures, but our initial look of the penetration falls somewhere between 3 and 5 percent.

MS. POWELL: All right. Thank you. And finally, for this first question I'm going to call on Pennsylvania. Keith Bailey is going to address this question and also get into a couple of other areas. He's unfortunately has a conflict during this time and is only going to be here for this first question. So once Keith is done speaking, we'll move on to the next question. Keith Bailey, Pennsylvania, please go ahead.

KEITH BAILEY: Yes. Thank you. So Keith Bailey, director of the Center for Workforce Information and Analysis, Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry. We are the responsible entity for reporting the federal performance measures, and we are also – I am staffed to the state workforce development board's performance and assessment committee in order to fully vet these measures and how we wish to use them.

What we have done in Pennsylvania is we have chosen the two measures of repeat business customers and employer penetration rate. To Karen's question regarding the low measurement of employer penetration, that was more of just an education opportunity to our state board members. When we look at some preliminary data for employer penetration, we are in the 3.5 percent range over a long period of time, and there was some consternation about that particular measure.

So when we looked at that, we simply educated the board. Quite frankly, said, there's no place but to go up from here. We also recognized that there are certain segments of the employer community that will not take advantage of the public workforce development system in its current state. So the policy and theory is to make the system more attractive to a greater range of the employer community and thus driving that measure up hopefully to be reflected in higher participation rates.

So we chose those two, but we really looked very closely at the retention with the same employer. You've heard some reasons why not to use that from other states. Our reasoning was reflective of many of those in that, as a public workforce system, oftentimes we are providing individuals with a first opportunity to engage in the workforce, and we don't wish the system to be detrimentally measured by an individual entering into workforce and, say, within three months, six months, nine months has an opportunity to further their career.

So we looked at the retention with the same employer as more of a kind of a mid-career measure, if you will, versus a just starting out. Since there were two other options, we essentially set that third one aside.

Moving to the process by which these were arrived, I mentioned previously our relationship with the state workforce development board, and we have engaged with them throughout this process. It was actually required that our proposals be discussed and submitted to the governor for approval of these particular measures, and the state board is the body through which those measures were vetted.

So that applies to the choice of the two out of three. And also, we are considering two additional measures. One is a modification of the existing repeat customer view. When we looked at preliminary data and looking back over a three-year period, mathematically and from a visualization, it becomes a really flat line.

The board was presented with the preliminary data and drew the conclusion that they don't know what they would be able to do with kind of a flat line or a very small movement in a line for repeat business customers. So we've developed a repeat business customer metric looking quarter to quarter.

We had two options. One was to look at those employers who engaged the system in the prior quarter and returned in the current versus looking at those employers engaged in the current quarter and then from that denominator, those that were engaged in the system immediately prior.

It became evident to us that the first approach looking at the prior quarter as the denominator and then of those who came back for services was much easier and palatable for the business community to embrace versus looking at the current quarter as the denominator and looking backward one quarter. So we're going to do the repeat customers on a quarterly basis. We see in the preliminary data measurable variations in that information, and also the board feels strongly they can use that for short-term and long-term planning processes.

The other measure that we are proposing to use in Pennsylvania, we are able to capture job referrals within our system of record under the public workforce system. So we see this as an opportunity to show the value add feature of having employers engage with our public workforce system by looking at active job orders and measuring of those active job orders how many also have a referral attached to them.

Again, we see this as the value add proposition to attract employers to the workforce system for Pennsylvania. So that I think answers for the first two questions. One is the alternative measures and the decision process by which these measures were selected.

The next question, the last question I just want to briefly touch on is the coordination of reporting these functions across the core programs. As with many states, we have a large and diverse grouping of core programs to include corrections, human services, aging, education. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation happens to reside within the Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry. So they are a sister bureau. Yet regulations and statutes still provide some challenges to link up the information, as well as their mission is holey distinct from a lot of the public workforce system.

So we have, essentially, a coordinating committee. We meet regularly with these individuals. We want to respect their own individual perspectives. What does it mean to connect with an employer? What is a value add service to measure? So for all of the common measures and also looking at these precise measures of employer engagement, our first step here is to understand what it means to engage with an employer.

And what we have found thus far is there's a general agreement that we're not necessarily looking simply at casual contact with the employer. It's what is an impact that we can measure? Where have we made the impact with an employer? So each entity is coming to the table trying to address that question.

Then we examine what's in our current system of record. We determine what we may have to change in the system of record, and the state board has also passed a resolution identifying the very strong need for education and training for the frontline staff who are asked with – are tasked, if you will, with capturing this information in the One-Stop system.

So it is a not small undertaking to coordinate this amongst many agencies. The benefit we have is we have a lot of support from top leadership. The governor's office is strongly behind this. That makes things a little easier as far as getting to the finish line. It does not resolve the inherent issues of scheduling, but we are overcoming those issues moving forward. Our challenge in moving this forward in a timely fashion was, as I mentioned before, the state board is responsible to review that and finally approve or make recommendations for approval for these measures.

We have had some significant membership challenges at the state board level. We've had some changes in leadership. That has stalled our progress just a bit. We feel we're in a stronger position than we were six months ago, and from my colleagues representing education and OVR, those – you may have met Cindy and Amanda at the – for those states who were involved in the February convening. They are moving very quickly in their respective areas to put this together. So I think I'll close my comments at this time, and I appreciate the opportunity to share what's happening in Pennsylvania. Thank you.

MS. POWELL: OK. And thank you so much for joining us. We really appreciate your time.

And just following up on that theme, we're going to go on to the next question that Keith got into a little bit about the process. And I'm going to just limit this question to Washington. So, Dave Wallace, if you could, just quickly describe the how, how you decided the measures. Was there a decision-making process and if there were any specific factors that went into it?

MR. WALLACE: Sure. Thanks once again. Dave Wallace, Workforce Training Board, Washington. The approach that we took here in Washington – I represent our state workforce training board, and what we did as part of our state workforce plan was to create six implementation – WIOA implementation committees. One of them was oriented upon business engagement, and they were tasked with determining or coming up with a recommendation for these measures. And that group got together and made the recommendation to our board as a whole, and it was accepted. So that was the basic process.

I think what went into what we considered for the decision making, determining which measures to take, in addition to what I discussed earlier, what we considered was how meaningful the measures were and the ease of collection. So that was basically the metrics we used for that decision making.

MS. POWELL: OK. Thanks. That's helpful, and we're going to move on to the next topic. We would like to hear more and learn about collaboration amongst the partners. So for this question I'm going to start with Alabama, and then I'll ask Illinois, Missouri, and Wisconsin to add their comments.

So if you could describe the collaborative relationship with partners, if you could please describe any best practices and any challenges or obstacles and, if you were able to overcome them, how? So, Leslie Dawson, can I turn it back to you, please?

MS. DAWSON: Yeah. Actually, this – I'm going to give this over to David.

DAVID WALTERS: Good afternoon. Sorry. I had some issues logging in. Actually, we lost internet just a few minutes ago. So I had to log back in. So apologize for that, but let me just share with you some things that we were looking at and very fortunate here in Alabama.

We have a great group of agencies that are working collaboratively to really dive into this effectiveness in serving employers, and we were able to present multiple times to our state board and get their support and buy in. And then we also worked with two subcommittees under the state board, one, performance and accountability, and the other one was looking at workforce innovation. And so it's really designed around innovative strategies and workforce development in our state.

So both of those committee were very engaged as we started our process, and we worked very well as far as Title II, Title I, and then also Title IV as well. So the relationship there with us just from the standpoint of being creative and innovative when we approached this. We wanted to make sure that we put everything on the table, if you will, as we dived into looking at these measures and how we were going to capture the information on these.

So we looked at each of the three, which ones we thought that we could really validate from a data standpoint, especially when you look at Title II adult education. We have not captured some of this information before. So it's kind of new arena for us. So we looked into things that we felt like we could really fit into with our partners and really have an opportunity to work together.

So one thing that we did, real quickly, is that we got our teams together, our IT teams, and we had – we took a look at the system that rehab has been using to work with employers. They've been capturing data on employers for many, many years – 20-plus years. So that data system has really evolved over the years, and we were able to work with them and have our IT teams look at that and work with commerce to collect our Title I data here in the state of Alabama and actually be able to utilize that system. So we're going to be utilizing that system and working together.

So those are some of the quick points that I just want to get across to the audience is that, first, look at what you have. Don't try to reinvent the wheel. Look at working together collaboratively as much as you possibly can because, again, you don't want to duplicate something that's already out there. So we were able to get a quick win by looking at the system that voc rehab already had in place to actually measure some effectiveness in serving employers. So we were able to take advantage of that that was already developed.

MS. POWELL: All right. Good advice. And Illinois. Can somebody from Illinois speak to this question?

MS. SCHNOOR: Jennifer, are you still on? Were you going to take that? If we lost Jennifer, I will answer. This is Patti again, Illinois. So Illinois has done an incredible job of bringing together local, regional, state stakeholders to participate in the – from the state unified plan all the way through all of workforce, and it's a big state, both between the multiple agencies and just logistically. So we do a good job of getting together and continually talking and working on our goals and strategic plan.

So in implementing that plan Illinois – (inaudible) – to forge strong relationships with its core partners and the communication with the Illinois Workforce Investment Board and the local business leaders, community colleges, local workforce areas; continue to build better relationships and bridge the workforce and education programs together.

And with the adult education, even though it does not directly interact with the employers on a regular basis, they make sure that they're responsive to the needs, as outlined in the local and regional plans. For example, the curriculum that's developed for bridge programs and integrated education and training must be consistent with the needs identified in those plans.

If manufacturing is identified in the plan as being a key industry or focus, then the expectation for the office is that the adult education program will then develop an instructional service that meets that need. So they're constantly bouncing against what are the needs out there and basing their curriculum on that.

So the bridge and IET programs, they include employer input, and it's accomplished through various means including direct employer contact, local workforce partner conversations, training partners, community college, business, and industry and corporate training or postsecondary career technical education programs. The adult education will also be partnering with entities to ensure what is developed in terms of pathway curriculum, which incorporates the needs of employers.

Also, our Title IV rehabilitation services agency, they've developed a business engagement module for its case management system. This requires 18 types of services and contacts – (inaudible) – and enables the – (inaudible) – to link to individual participant records when businesses hire them. So working on some innovative things there with that Title IV service as well.

MS. POWELL: All right. And Missouri. Is that Clinton Flowers who's going to respond, or is there someone else?

MR. FLOWERS: Clinton Flowers here. I was actually delegated by my partners to speak on their behalf, but in Missouri we were gifted with opportunity because we had – for many years, actually, had a person that was a liaison with the vocational rehabilitation agency and spent much time working with workforce boards. And that kind of tumbled into the WIOA where we created a steering committee, and the steering committee is unofficial but is composed of all the appropriate partners and then staff.

So we had the ability to have a subcommittee both for performance measures and a second subcommittee for employer engagement. And through that process our employer engagement committee even had local workforce development board directors. And so the discussion was very robust about the whole approach, the meaningfulness of these measures to the different agencies, and consistently we'd come up with the concepts that with career pathways and sector strategies it should be all about driving collaboration and integration of achieving these measures.

And we felt that repeat business services and market penetration would do that. In fact, you can develop quite an array of policies and incentives to drive the integration and collaboration around that. So that's pretty much where we – our approach that we used in Missouri.

The challenge that we have we are pretty sure lies in duplication. We have to de-duplicate, and we have some agreements in Missouri that will enable us to look at the common businesses and the common business identifiers, but we have to de-duplicate that to report it. So that's our greatest challenge.

MS. POWELL: OK. And finally on this question, someone from Wisconsin?

MR. HUEBSCH: This is Bryan Huebsch in Wisconsin, and I'd like to have each of my members – of our team members discuss a best practice, but first, I want to describe the collaborative relationship amongst our partners.

It starts with that performance advisory committee, and the best practice I think that's come out of our committee is the engagements and training that our – we do in a joint manner to our field – to our field staff. So they see, we're kind of role models to them. Look how the state level is working together overcoming the issues and challenges, and so that's the best practice I have. We have webinars and round tables that we tend to do that enforce the state commitment to collaboration. Now, Amy Hansmann is going to discuss another one.

AMY HANSMANN: Thank you, Bryan. One of the results of the joint collaboration was to develop and then disseminate some joint guidance in terms of reporting and the expectations of the usage and data collection in the system of record for the state of Wisconsin. So it was one of the first times that all the title partners had come together to develop this type of joint guidance that can then be used as a baseline for the – for everyone who's interacting with businesses.

MR. HUEBSCH: And Patti Johnson from our Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

PATTI JOHNSON: Hi. DVR had a voice in measurement selection and, now, we're well beyond that and we're in the implementation – design and implementation phase. In Wisconsin I think our collaboration and partnership extend well beyond the measure itself. We are – as Amy said, we're developing documentation standards. We're collecting data. We're learning more about what business wants and needs from our collective services, and we're learning more about one another's – our partner programs and services so that we can leverage all those resources to business' benefit.

MR. HUEBSCH: Excellent. And Julie Tyznik from the Wisconsin Technical College System, our Title II partner. She's on the phone in another location. Go ahead, Julie.

JULIE TYZNIK: Hi. One of the things that we bring to the table is we're doing some great work with career pathways. We work with the adult basic ed and the English language learning programs, and one of the ways we collaborate is we feel that we help support the students in getting the skills that our employers are looking for, and then we partner with our other Title I and other agencies to really help with that placement and working with the employers.

One of the ways – one of the collaborations we just actually did is last week we had a huge common ground conference, and what this was is we brought Title II and also our workforce partners together to really talk of how we can support each other and move this whole initiative forward. So the collaboration in the state is really moving forward and really is working well together.

MR. HUEBSCH: Thanks, Julie. And that's all from Wisconsin. Thank you very much.

MS. POWELL: All right. And it was great to hear from all the partners. Appreciate that.

OK. We're going to move on, and I'm going to ask Ryan Allen again to address the next question. Actually, the next two questions, if you don't mind. The first about coordinating the reporting function.

MR. ALLEN: Sure. Thank you. As far as coordinating the reporting functions, again, it was our different departments coming together through our committees. And basically, since we had the system in Title III, it was all decided that our Wagner-Peyser program would report both of the effectiveness serving employers metrics. So that's – basically, since we had the system already in place, that's kind of what ultimately led to the decision of that.

And the next one, states must determine the practice for data collection and setting goals with the local workforce boards. How are you working with local areas in implementing the measures? Again, as far as the data collection, we're – we already had the system to collect those employer services. As far as setting the goals with the local boards, the reporting functionality in our system right now can actually drop down to the local boards.

So we know consistently month to month we're recording about 20,000 employer services, and we can kind of drill that down to the local area to see how many each of the local areas are providing to that number. And then we also report those out through an employer – through a workforce dashboard to our state workforce board. So that's basically how we're setting the goals and setting performance targets.

MS. POWELL: OK. Great. Thanks. Yes. We wanted to hear about how you were working with the local areas.

All right. So we have two more questions, and I'm just going to ask Wisconsin to address these last two because I know we have audience questions that we're also interested in getting to.

So first, if your state could develop this indicator with fewer restrictions, barriers, et cetera, how would you create this indicator of performance? What would it look like?

MR. HUEBSCH: So earlier I mentioned in Wisconsin that we were looking at additional indicators to help us measure quality business services, and two of the methods we really just looked at revising the current piloted measures. And so one of the ideas we had was to look at the employer penetration rate.

Instead of looking at the establishment counts, maybe it's the FEIN, the Federal Employer Identification Number that we would count because one thing we were seeing is, because we have these low employer penetration rate numbers – I believe ours is between 4 and 5 percent statewide – is, well, maybe it's because we're serving the HR department that may be in the corporate headquarters and we're not getting out to all of those individual sites. So let's take a look at the FEIN. Maybe that gives us a better indication of how much or how well we're doing.

And similarly with the repeat users business services option, we're looking at both shrinking that time, the three years. Let's take a look at maybe a year, and then let's also look at extending that based on the size of the businesses.

So we understand that large businesses are going to use our labor market system an awful lot, a lot more than smaller businesses would. So let's look at those data elements, and let's see what happens and see if that tells us anything. So that's all I have on that measure – or question.

MS. POWELL: All right. Thank you.

MR. HUEBSCH: And so I'll go into the last one. So the other technical assistance and just vetting from the questions I've received and I know Amy has received quite a few questions from our field, we're – one of the things of course on my mind as a Title I focus person is, what will the data validation requirements be for employer effectiveness? This will be a paradigm shift I think in our state between – for our business services side where our participant-serving programs, they're very familiar with the Department of Labor's data validation guidance and requirements. What will that look like on the business services side?

We're also looking for best practices from other states. I think beyond performance measures there's really, what is it that you do that works? And so that's another big thing that we'll be looking for from the United States federal government, as well as we're also looking – as we see the evaluation that the Department of Labor and Education are undergoing, what is that statistical adjustment model?

What are the elements that are going to affect the adjusted levels of performance? How will that – what are the things that are really driving whether we're able to meet these measures or not meet these measures because those will be very important when it comes to telling our story about how well we're doing business services in Wisconsin?

MS. POWELL: OK. Well, thanks for sharing that. And I think we have some folks in D.C. who wanted to do a follow-up question, and then I think we have a few audience questions we're going to get to as well. So everyone just hang on for a few minutes, and I'll turn it back to I believe Karen Staha.

MS. STAHA: Thanks, Kim. Yeah. I – as I recall early in – earlier, Alabama indicated that they were – you all were looking at a state measure. I did not hear what that state measure was. So if you said it, could you repeat it, please?

MS. DAWSON: Sure. This is Leslie. We – actually, we didn't share the one that we are looking at coming up with, but I can give you some information about it.

MS. STAHA: Sure.

MS. DAWSON: So our – the way that we looked at it, we – we went back and respected that you guys have already done your round tables with businesses and looked at what their needs are. But we also recognize that needs tend to vary based on the business' location, the type of business, what their size is, and so forth.

And so we said, OK, we need a measure that's going to measure the actual outcomes of those businesses, what their actual needs are. So we compiled a taskforce that is coming together from all the partner agencies, as well as the businesses that are represented throughout the state on the regional workforce council – board and – to pinpoint what those needs are.

And then we're going to do a crosswalk of the services that are provided from each of the agencies to say what service actually met that need of the business. And we're just going to really keep it outcome-focused. Instead of just collecting numbers, we're going to say what specific need was met. And the goal is not to bother businesses with having to do surveys or saying, how did you really like this program, but to be able to say, they came to us with a need. What services were provided to fill that need? And kind of match those.

We're also looking at doing – for our reporting of the indicator, we're going to look at doing an app that every person in the partner agencies can utilize. And when that person logs into that app, it pulls up the services that that particular partner provides for businesses, and then behind the scenes it's actually going to match those services to the six employer services on the WIOA template because our thought was, well, if you're collecting these numbers, there's got to be a reason to collect it. So then we will match those numbers to the needs that were met by the employer.

And one other thing on our taskforce. We're also including a statistician from our – one of our state universities to help to make sure that the data meets those requirements that you all are looking for, such as is it collectible, reportable, quantifiable, and subject to your negotiation sanctions thing.

MS. STAHA: All right. That sounds very interesting. Looks – it sounds like you all have certainly put some thought and effort into developing additional metrics, and so I appreciate that.

I just want to circle back real quickly. Wisconsin asked what are our data validation requirements going to be, and I think, first, before we get that response – before we can answer that, we have to know what we're measuring first. And so we have to see how these pilots work, these metrics, and what information we get from that, and then we'll work on the data validation.

So I would encourage every state to work on getting the metric down and making sense and providing useful information and not worry so much about the data validation component. So I just wanted to address that since that came up, but now, I'm going to turn it over to my colleagues to go through the questions we received in the chat.

MR. RIDGEWAY: OK. Jay?

JAY LEMASTER: Yeah. OK. Thanks, Karen and Andy. This is Jay LeMaster from the Office of Career and Technical and Adult Education. I've been looking at the chat comments, and in response to the question that we had earlier about states developing a state option for this indicator, I haven't seen anything.

But we did see a question from one of our participants that I'd like to pose to the state panelists on the call, and that is they were asking about the possibility. Has anyone – have any of the state panelists considered placement in an in-demand occupation as a possible measure for effectiveness in serving employers? So it would be placement in in-demand occupations.

NEELY SCHLOSSER: Hi. This is Neely from Illinois. We have a state policy where we already – for our local areas we already collect information on this measure. We have a demand occupation list that our training providers use, and we've been collecting if you're trained in a demand occupation and then you find employment in that demand occupation you were trained.

And for incentive bonus awards we would go to each local area. It was like we had a bucket of money. So however many customers they put through the program and put in demand occupation and received employment in that occupation they trained in, they would receive incentive bonus award money. So we've already set that up in our system.

MR. LEMASTER: OK. Thank you. Anybody else? Is there anybody else on the panel who could talk about additional state measures that you might have developed for this indicator? OK. I guess that's the only question I had for the panel.

MR. RIDGEWAY: OK. Thanks, Jay. This is Andy. So I think – so keep typing in your questions. I don't think we'll necessarily have time to answer them today, but we will make sure that we try and answer those after the webinar is over.

And again, we want to be sure and encourage you to list out some technical assistance, if there's things in technical assistance you're looking for, to go ahead and type those out. We thought that this was – has been a good model to hear from peers and our state panelists about what this measure is doing.

And so, anyways, with that we wanted to thank everyone, again, for participating today and especially our panelists. There are a few resources we want to be sure everyone's aware about. Of course WIOA, our – the regs under WIOA, the performance guidance 10-16, Change 1, just want to make sure everyone knows that there is a change 1.

And I believe some of the questions that we got throughout the presentation, if people read TEGL 10-16, Change 1, that is where a lot of the material comes from on the effectiveness in serving employers measure. So I know there's some of the attachments have some information, as well as some of the how you operationalize the measure. So we definitely encourage you to look at that.

In addition, we also have the RSA and OCTAE technical assistance – basically, their versions of that guidance for their prospective programs. So depending on which side of the house you come from, there's the links to your versions of the guidance there. I'd also like to highlight the resource page, and I definitely want to highlight – this is new today. We have launched a performance workforce GPS on our WorkforceGPS platform.

So we want to make sure and encourage folks to check that out. We're going to be making sure that all TA in the performance space gets loaded up there. We do already have some stuff up there already. So we encourage you to go ahead and register and get updates, and hopefully, we'll be able to grow that site as we continue to unveil more and more technical assistance, not only on effectiveness in serving employers but also on performance in general. So definitely wanted to be sure and plug that while we have it today.

And with that we also want to highlight, if you have future questions that you weren't able to put in the chat box, definitely wanted to highlight both the ETAperforms@dol.gov as well as if you have any reporting questions using the WIB system, more so for the Title I and III programs, that you use that.

And with that I think we want to thank all of our presenters today for presenting and especially our panelists. We really appreciate the insights that you all brought to the table, and we look forward to possibly exploring this model in the future as we move from initial implementation to more sharing best practices and operations. We think this model might be a good one going forward.

So thanks again for joining us today, and I think we are ending with less than one minute to spare. So we really appreciate it, and have a good rest of your day.

(END)