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GRACE MCCALL: Welcome to "NFJP Performance and Reporting" webinar.

So without further ado, I'd like to turn things over to our moderator today, Steve Rietzke, division chief, Office of Workforce Investment, Division of National Programs, Tools and Technical Assistance. Steven?

STEVE RIETZKE: All right. Thank you, Grace. Good afternoon everyone, or good morning for those of you in the Western time zones, I'm Steve Rietzke. As Grace already said I'm the division chief for National Programs, Tools and Technical Assistance in the national office for ETA, the program office for NFJP as you well know. Thank you all for joining us today happy end of April. I'm joined today by Dr. Andrew Wiegand of SPRA who you also know well; as well as Marcia Hampton and Aaron Mitchell from my office here in DC.

So let's talk a little bit about what we want to cover on today's webinar. We've got a few things we want to discuss. Andrew it's going to walk through the annual performance data from PY17 and talk about how that data is being used as the baseline for 2019 performance targets. And in particular he's going to talk a little bit about the regression model that we're using which I think many of you saw under WIA a few years ago.

But we're finally at the point where we are using it for the first time under WIOA. So we're excited about that and we're going to walk through some of the nuances of that. We will also talk a little bit about the training and employment guidance letter TEGL 14-18 which we released back in March. And this is the TEGL that formalizes the policy guidance on WIOA primary indicators of performance across 15 programs. So it's a big TEGL with a lot in it, but includes NFJP and there's a specific attachment related to NFJP.

So we'll talk a little bit about that. And we also just want to highlight a couple of performance reporting technical assistance tools and a tool related to grants management. So a few things to cover today. Before I hand it over to Andrew to talk about the performance in the regression model, I just want to highlight a few things in terms of where we are in the program year and what's coming up and what to expect. So the slide we're looking at now, how is this webinar tied to the upcoming allotment process?

In particular we're highlighting the regression model and how the inputs work for that. Because we're really hoping to both get the proposed targets based on the regression model out to you all very shortly. And actually have any negotiation that we need to do in advance of you sending in the grant documents. So I think that'll be a cleaner process both for you all and for us in terms of needing to modify your grants later. If we're able to do that upfront it'll just be less grant paperwork which I think everyone likes.

We do anticipate our allotment TEGL for program year 2019, that's the program year that starts July 1st 2019. We expect that to be out within the next couple of weeks, knock on wood. It's been through the bureaucratic gauntlet that it goes through here. And it's right next to the finish line. So hopefully I don't eat those words later, but we do expect that to go out within the next couple of weeks. And so once that does come out, you'll see the instructions in there.

We're requiring the same documents as in previous years, there's the 424 application form, the 424-A budget form, a budget narrative and any updates that are necessary to the program plan. You'll be submitting documents into grants.gov and emailing them to your FPO. We've done some work this year to try and make the instructions clearer for how this process works. So fingers crossed that it's a little bit clearer this year and goes a little bit more smoothly.

So I mentioned a second ago before you submit – before you complete and submit your updated grant plans, we are expecting to send an email from the NFJP program office with proposed new targets for PY19 based on the regression model that Andrew will talk about in a second. So if you accept those new proposed targets, you'll incorporate those into the PY19 program plan. If you don't then we'll ask you to set up a negotiation with your FPO immediately, or as quickly as possible.

And then once those targets are negotiated, you'll enter those into the PY19 program plan. So again we expected this allotment TEGL to come out within the next couple weeks. And at the same time separate from that TEGL we'll be sending out this email with the proposed targets and instructions for any negotiation that you might want to do. A couple of reminders on process and there will be similar language in the TEGL that's upcoming. There was similar language last year.

But I just want to remind everybody when it comes to the beginning of the program year, we always know that it's a big concern in terms of the timing of the money. Because everybody's looking for the next program year's funds to hit as close to the beginning of July as they can. As always, we will process grant awards as close to the beginning of July as possible, but there's some machinery that we have to go through here in order for the funds to be released and in order for us to get the money on the grant.

And that all takes a little bit of time, it's not all instantaneous. So like last year and years before that we don't expect to actually be able to have funds available to grantees until about mid-July, or maybe a little bit before. But it's essentially impossible for it to be July 1st. Now as in the past couple years we're hoping that the fact that we have periods of performance that now go to September 30th instead of June 30th may alleviate that for some of you. If you haven't spent every dollar before June 30th you may be able to float the first couple weeks of July.

If you're really worried about it, we ask that as soon as you can you flag it for your FTO, flag it for NFJP@dol.gov and we'll do what we can on our end to put you to the top of the list when we're executing grant awards. Obviously, we have to do someone's first and so if you're really concerned about cash please flag it for us and we'll do what we can. So you'll see the same paragraph in the TEGL, we had similar language in there last year. And I think based on the conversations I had with many of you and I think it worked reasonably well.

So we hope to be able to do the same thing this year. One other thing I wanted to flag that actually I wasn't bold enough to write down and put on the slide, we do expect to see a small amount of funding under PY18 that's essentially being restored to the grant that was set aside at the beginning of the year for other purposes. We wound up not using it for the other purposes and we expect it to go back to the grant. You may recall that we did this last year, so we're in the same boat again.

I think it's a similar amount of money, it's really not a ton especially once we divided among all the grantees. So we expect to publish a TEGL with some updated allotments for program year 18. Again this is separate from the PY19 TEGL. And essentially what it will have is an allotment number for the grant that's for PY18 and that would be money that you need to spend by September 30th of 2019.

And it would give you the option if it's such a small amount of money that it's not even worth the paperwork, it'll give you the option to decline it. But if it's enough to make it worth it then it's there. So that's another submission of a 424 and 424-A process that we're going to ask you to do in addition to the upcoming PY19. The good news is it's a little bit of money. So if it's enough that it's worth the trouble it may come in handy. In terms of PY18 closeout activities as in other years grant closeout activities must be completed for PY18.

Two financial reports are required for the September quarter. If you carry any funds over from PY18. So if you're spending PY18 dollars past June 30th then you have to do a report on that. As well as anything you spend on PY19 funds. And then PY18 results will be incorporated into an annual report once the data is available. So those are my introductory remarks. Although, I guess I forgot to change the slide. And here's what I was just talking about for the last 5 minutes.

That's my introduction, I threw a lot at you all at once. So we do have you on open chat. If you have questions about anything that I just covered feel free to put them in the chat window. I think for right now I'm going to turn things over to Andrew Wiegand and he's going to talk about 2017 performance and the regression model. And then if we get a bunch of questions, we can take a break as appropriate and try to answer some of those.

So Andrew, that's my long-winded introduction of you.

ANDREW WIEGAND: Thank you Steve that was – I call it short-winded. I appreciate it and I will try to carry on with useful information. What we're showing right now is a chart that has the performance for the program over the last several quarters. Including the most recent quarter of data which was 2nd quarter PY18. And most of you have seen this information, it was up to the prior quarter. And it's telling a fairly familiar story by this point.

At the very top of this you see the goals for PY2017 for each of the performance measures. And then below that you see the last three quarters successively performance information. You can see some trends and what you see in this is that there's a little bit of a dip between 4th quarter PY17 and first quarter PY18. I attribute that dip primarily to switch from reporting to SPR and reporting in WIPS. I think WIPS is capturing information fairly correctly at this point.

But I do think that some grantees haven't been certifying their data and so as you see moving from 4th quarter PY17, to first quarter PY18 numbers there's a drop in several of the performance measures. And I think that's more about who were counting there than it is about actual performance. And so for 2nd quarter PY18 where the vast majority of grantees certify their data and therefore that allows us access to those data.

We see performance back to quite strong levels and in the 2nd quarter employment rate creeping up near 80 percent. So substantially exceeding the national target. The 2nd quarter median earnings is a little under $5,300 still it's exceeding the target, but I think there's room to improve there. The 4th quarter employment rate has crept up over the last few quarters to almost 70 percent as well. So again exceeding the target.

The credential attainment rate is doing quite well and this is a change from early on under WIOA as I think grantees we're getting used to the credential measure. So now the credential attainment rate is at around 71 percent which usually exceeds the overall target and the measurable skills games as well as seeing some good improvement and I think this is a good – again, it was a new measure. It is a new measure under WIOA.

And I think what's happened is grantees needed some time to get adjusted to how to measure it and how to accurately report on it. And now we see the rate climbing over the 50 percent mark which is good improvement over the last several quarters. The bottom two rows on this chart just show you some comparisons for the WIOA adult program and the WIOA dislocated worker program. And as you can see the farmworker program is doing quite well in comparison to the other programs.

They're exceeding those other programs' performance on the 2nd quarter employment rate by a good margin. Again, the median earning is a little bit lower than might be ideal. So I do think there's room to improve there. But the 4th quarter employment rate also showing rates that are substantially higher than the adult and the dislocated worker program. Credential attainment rate also very strong in comparison and measurable skills games as well.

So for the five measures the NFJP is fairly substantially exceeding performances of other programs. And then the one measure where it's a little bit of a different story is the median earnings in the 2nd quarter after exit. And so I do think there's room to grow there and an opportunity to focus in on how we might improve those numbers. My summary of the performance data is that the performance is generally quite strong.

And again four to five measures doing quite well in comparison to other programs. We still can't compare to some of the other national programs because those programs have yet to officially transition to the WIOA measures which I think that that just also speaks well of the NFJP program and its ability to adapt and move under from WIA to WIOA because you've been using these measures from the outset of WIOA implementation.

But it'll be nice to be able to have those comparative numbers once some of the other national programs come onboard as well. One concern I think for the program is that overall the numbers remain low. And again part of this is likely due to the fact that some grantees haven't certified the data within WIPS and therefore when we go in to extract it there's nothing for us to extract. So we're not counting everybody.

So I do think that's a useful next step, so as we head towards the May 15th reporting deadline, I think that's going to be important is that grantees get the data into WIPS and certify it and make sure that it's there so we can be counting everybody. But as of now when we extract the data on a quarterly basis what we see is fewer than 10,000 participants in a given program year. And fewer than 5,000 exiters which maybe there's a reason for that other than some general under counting. But I do think these numbers are a good bit lower than what we are used to seeing under WIA.

And so I think it's important for us to think about why it might be that case in addition potentially to just not all the grantees being recorded here. Because given the grantees that we have – we do have data for those numbers tend to be a good bit lower than what we were seeing under WIA as well. And so I think that's somewhat of a concern for the program is to ensure that all of the individuals who are being served are being captured and recorded on, so that we've got accurate information.

And if the numbers are down quite substantially from WIA figuring out what the reasoning for that is and coming up with explanations for that and also explanations for how we will increase those numbers if that's indeed something that needs to happen. We are going to be producing – we're in the process of working on a PY17 data book right now. And many of you who have been around for a while will remember the data book from WY8 days.

We produce a national data book that breaks out the information for the program as a whole and breaks it out into a whole bunch of different categories and tables. Breaks it down by different services people have received and a lot of different types of breakdowns by customer demographics and things like that. So we're going to be producing that soon and we'll be producing both a national data book and the state/grantee data books.

So you should expect to see those. It'll take us a few more weeks to get those done, but within the next month, month and a half we expect to have those to you and hopefully those will be useful to you and allow you to see what it is we're seeing from the data that you're inputting into WIPS and the data that you're sending us. So that if there are any concerns or issues you can reach out to us and say, "This is not what we expected to see." And we can work through those to make sure that we're getting all the accurate information that we need to. And so that when we're reporting on the program, we make sure we've got all the accurate information.

MR. RIETZKE: Hey Andrew. Can I just butt in? This is Steve and say, looking at those 17 numbers I feel like it's worth saying, give yourselves a pat on the back. A virtual round of applause. I think the numbers are looking really strong and as Andrew is saying we'll continue to trend up. And I want to say in particular thank you to all of you for sticking with it and your persistence in learning WIPS and learning everything that goes into that.

I know that we're still in the growing pains of phased in stage of WIPS implementation and that it's been a rocky road, but thank you to all of you for sticking with it and to Marcia and Andrew in particular for all the work that you're doing to support the grantees which I know is time consuming and labor intensive and complicated. So I just wanted to chime in and say that.

DR. WIEGAND: Thank you, Steve. I think that it's definitely worthy of a little celebration and some congratulations and a pat on the back. I've been doing this so long that I can still remember the days of 92 percent unemployment rates and so I have such high expectations for the program that I tend to look at it and say, "Yeah. They're doing better than all the other programs, that makes sense."

But it is true, that I think especially a transition to WIOA it was quite a change for NFJP and especially since so much of the information comes from individual level follow up extending out follow up period and additional quarters, I think that that was a daunting challenge and something that could have really dramatically affected performance for NFJP. And while in the very early days in PY2016 I think you saw something – the numbers bouncing around and those sorts of things.

It certainly seems based on this slide and the data that we're seeing that things have stabilized and the program has returned to generally just outperforming other programs with their performance. So I think that is a good thing and certainly a solid starting point for going forward. One of the things that we now can do because we have some actual performance and an entire year's worth of data upon which to draw is we can move toward using a regression adjustment model to adjust grantees' performance based on the characteristics of who they are serving and the areas in which they're serving them.

And for those of you who've been around for more than a few years, you'll remember we implemented such a model, there was a model like this. And for those of you who've been around forever, there was a model like this back in the JTPA days. Then when we moved to WIA there were a number of time – a number of years where we weren't using it, but then we implement it again I think for PY3, or 14.

And then when we moved to WIOA we had to table that again because you need data for the performance measures that you're going to be using in order to create a model like this. And so there'd been a period of a few years where we haven't been using this model and so as a result under WIOA all the grantees have been held to the same performance standards just a single target. Generally speaking I think there are one or two exceptions, but overall most of the grantees were using the same standard.

But of course the types of participants served can vary quite a bit from grantee to grantee in their educational background, and the vendor status prior work history, things like that. And then they also – obviously grantees are operating in different economic areas and so having a single standard for all grantees applies to every grantee. Masks the fact that people are serving different customers and they're serving them in different areas that may make it harder or easier to achieve the type of performance that is setting a target.

So what we plan to do and what we've been working on and have a draft of at this point is to develop a regression adjustment model that will adjust each grantees' performance target upward or downward based on the characteristics of those they serve and where they are serving them. And so to do so we're using a technique called regression analysis which again those of you who were around several years ago will likely recall this.

I'd like to say you'll fondly recall it, but I don't want to be a liar, so I'll just say you'll recall it. But this tool regression analysis allows us to look at which of in this case 27 different variables that we have and economic characteristics, demographic factors might significantly affect the employment, the earnings credential and the measurable skills gains outcomes. So we look at whether there are relationships between the different variables.

For example, is there a relationship between the local poverty rate if you have high – if you're operating in areas that have a higher poverty rate is that related to median earnings that you might experience? Or if you serve more individuals with limited English proficiency does that affect their 2nd quarter employment rates? Things like that. So looking to see which variables that we have access to that are associated with particular outcomes of interests.

So to create this model we use data from PY2017. Again, we created a model similar to this under WIA and we've used several years' worth of data. But once we switched to WIOA and there are new performance measures that earlier model doesn't apply because you need to look to see what factors are associated with the new performance measures. So we had to wait a period of time in order to have some actual data and actual performance on which we could regress on to the economic and demographic factors.

Going forward, we'll use data over in multiple program years which will strengthen the stability of the model. What we have now is based on a single program year and it's a perfectly valid approach and I don't think there are major problems with it. But the more data we have available, the more stable the model becomes and the more actually predictive it can become because you increase the variation in the underlying data.

And so as we go forward, we'll be able to use additional years' worth of data to incorporate into the model. And so the model will change slightly each year based on that additional data. The model that we're using really is identical in concept actually, but very similar to those used for other WIOA programs. But is unique to the NFJP program in using the specific data that we have for NFJP. And so the WIOA adult and dislocated worker programs and youth programs use a model similar to this to adjust performance targets for grantee for states and the regulations for WIOA say that NFJP should to the extent possible use a similar model.

And now that it is possible now that we have the available data that's what we're moving toward is implementing a very similar model to adjust targets upward or downward and based on who you're serving. So as I said we've run some preliminary regressions to develop this model and develop some tentative or preliminary targets based on them. In that process we found multiple variables that significantly affected the outcomes.

We then use the values calculated from the regression, or what are called parameters for each factor to adjust the grantees' performance targets. So you take the value for a given variable in the regression model, you multiply it by grantees and individual grantees deviation from the national average on that variable and that gives you the adjustment for that particular factor. So as an example if you're looking here – these just show you three variables limiting proficiency, lack of transportation and county unemployment rate.

And so if we're looking at an individual grantee let's say that that grantee in PY17 served – 43.1 percent of the individuals that they serve were identified as being limited English proficient. 13.6 percent were identified as having a lack of transportation or transportation being a barrier. And the grantee was operating primarily in accounting where the unemployment rate was 7.2 percent. If you then compare those to the national averages which are shown in the next column then you can get the difference between the grantees' average and the national average.

So the deviation between the grantee and the national. And so in this case the grantee served 4.5 percent percentage points more limited English proficient individuals. They served 4.2 percentage points fewer individuals with transportation challenges and the unemployment rate was 1.3 percentage points higher in their county. So we first subtract the national average from the grantees' average in all the differences.

In this case we show you three, but in some of the models there are 12 or 15 variables that are related, or are plugged into each measures formula to make adjustments to grantee targets. So if for example the regression rate, or parameter for limited English proficient was three, you would multiply three times – it would likely be negative three because it would be harder to say find employment for those who are limited English proficient.

So if that value is negative two you multiply that by 4.5 and you get negative nine percentage points and that would be – for that factor that's how you would just for their employment rate. And what you do is add up all of the positives and negatives for each of the factors. And if that turns out to be 2.5 in the aggregate then you would add 2.5 percentage points to the expected target rate.

And we used the current PY17 targets as our departure point. So if you overall had a 2.5 plus 2.5 you'd add that to the current target rate and that would become the grantee A's new adjusted target rate. So as I've said we've done this preliminarily and shown our national office the results. And right now our national office in determining whether to implement a cap on changes from the existing measures. Sometimes this is called a hold harmless or a stop gain.

And the kinds of caps that so far they've considered are say a 5 percent cap, or 10 percent cap such that no grantees' targets could be adjusted by more than 5 percent, or less than 5 percent, or more than 10 percent, or less than 10 percent. So if the 2nd quarter employment rate for example the target was go back to previous 69.9 or essentially 70 percent. If the cap was put at 5 percent then no grantee could have a target 2nd quarter point rate of more than 73.5 percent or less than 66.5 percent, because 5 percent of 70 is 3.5.

And so they're contemplating whether to do that, or whether to let the overall numbers vary exactly according to the model. And so we're in discussions with them about that and they'll be making decisions on that shortly. Then once that happens, we'll reproduce the model and the adjusted goals can be shared with grantees. I've been told that there still will be opportunity for negotiation.

So if for some reason the model doesn't apply to you in the way you think it should, or the economics of your county have changed – or the areas you're serving are changed, or you're planning on serving us a somewhat different population than you did in PY17 you could use that as part of your negotiations to argue for lower. Or I suppose you could argue for higher targets. I'm guessing that more of you will weigh in on the lower rather than the higher, but we'll see.

And then the idea is that the goals would be put in place for PY2019. So I think my understanding is that the national office will be deciding within the next few days as to whether or not they want to implement a cap based on that. We can reproduce the numbers such that by early next week I think we would have draft numbers, revised numbers to the extent we need to revise them to the national office.

And then I would imagine that they'd be sharing them with you over the next few weeks, so that you could see those and that could become the basis for any negotiation that need to happen, or any discussions that you need to have about these adjustments. So that's where we are headed. And I think we're in good shape to get those numbers out in the fairly near future. I know that these models can sometimes cause some anxiety among grantees, because anytime you get your numbers adjusted upward – especially upward there can be some concerns about that.

But we're happy to talk with individual grantees about the model once the numbers have been produced and have been sent out. And we're happy to walk grantees through it if need be and help you understand how individual numbers for you were determined. And try to make this as painless as it can be. Generally speaking the results that we see in this model are – there are not a lot of wild variations. A lot of the measures don't have sufficient variation within one year to really see a whole bunch of wild swings.

And so generally speaking the numbers are in a relatively comfortable range I would say. But it is true that some grantees will see some increases in their adjusted targets while others will see some decreases again based on who they are serving and where they're serving them. So with that being said I've probably talked long enough as it is because talking about regression analysis usually causes people to go to sleep.

So I will turn it over to Marcie to take it from here.

MARCIA HAMPTON: Anyone that has questions for Andrew?

MR. RIETZKE: If folks have questions that are burning, feel free to type them in. I haven't actually seen any which hopefully means that we've explained things relatively clearly, or else you're just so confused you don't know what to ask. But all kidding aside, if you have anything you want to ask, go ahead and put it in the chat and we'll see questions pop up and can work through those. But seeing no questions now, I think go ahead Marcie.

MS. HAMPTON: Oh, this is Marcie Hampton the workforce analyst in NFJP. Thank you, Andrew you did a really good job of breaking a very complex topic into layman's terms. So I know that I always learn a lot more every time you present. For those of you in the field if you don't have your questions today, you can always send them to the mailbox too and we will take care of them if we get them, because I know that was a lot to take in.

So let's shift gears a little bit and talk about the actual PO that went out recently. So you guys all know that we've been – that WIOA requires all the funded programs to be compared on an even playing field. And so we've been trying to get the core program spanning on core programs including NFJP to start working towards this goal and we've all been working on that since PY16. But we're still cautious about the quality of the data since this is the first year that grantees are fully transitioning into the WIPS reporting.

So in the beginning you know that we discovered some problems with reporting including misunderstandings in the field with definition from WIA. Not understanding some of the definitions in PIRL etc. So based on that that's why we opted to wait for PY17's annual data before we talked about establishing these bassline goals. So you've just heard from Andrew that data is now available and he's incorporating it into these regression models to generate the 19 numbers.

So the formal guidance was issued for the six core programs through TEGL 10-16 and I think that came out back in December of 16 and then they put a change to it the following year. Once it was released then we started work on the remaining discretionary program. But I know there's a few people on the phone that really don't know what that is. So the six core programs are actually the adults, the dislocated workers, the Wagner-Peyser Adult Education and Family Literacy Act and vocational rehab program.

And the voc rehab and family literacy, those are run by education and the rest are run by labor. So these programs they are funded a little bit differently than the discretionary programs, but they wanted to make sure that they got the core program taken care of first and then we can start working on the non-core guidance. So you can tell just by the title of the TEGL what they were trying to do. They were trying to align everything together so that we would all be reporting from the same hymnal.

And so in conjunction with the release of the TEGL each program is doing some other things that we normally didn't do in the past. We're conducting training, [inaudible] contractor and we're doing webcasts. So these will be posted on WorkforceGPS systems that are completed and approved. And once they're on there you can see them any time. NFJPs webcast has been drafted and it has been approved, but I haven't actually recorded it yet.

I think that will probably happen maybe the week after next and so it should be posted pretty quickly. And I heard you wanted us to go and look at that one and also look at the ones that talk about the body of the TEGL because they'll be very useful to you just understanding the structure of the entire thing. I know a lot of people panicked when the TEGL went out and it was 160 some pages or something. They were like, "Oh, my god."

But there's a logic to it and I'll talk about it just for a few minutes here, but go and look at those webcasts when you get a chance because they'll really lay things out pretty easily for you. So the TEGL is broken up, it has a main body, it has appendances and it has attachments. And the appendances apply to all programs. And then the attachments are program specific. The main body is helpful in understanding the methodology in the actual calculation.

The definitions of reportable and participants in general terms and the definitions of extending common exit. And then the periods of participation for the program. And then the attachments go into the specific variations for each program. So I think you guys should pay close attention to the body and then appendix 3 which is table C for NFJP. Appendix 4 which is the PIRL Elements used in calculations. Appendix 6 which is supplemental wage information. And then attachment 7 which is the actual NFJPs attachment.

MR. RIETZKE: Marcie, there's a couple folks who've said they're having a hard time hearing you, but I know you're right on top of that mic. I wonder if this mic is working better. We're actually going to switch seats real quick because she's already talking right into it I'm not sure why it's that quiet. So phase 2 of Marcie's presentation.

MS. HAMPTON: Can you hear me now?

MR. RIETZKE: The folks on the chat, let us know if that's better because she's on a different mic and talking right into it this time.

MS. HAMPTON: We can do the next – (inaudible). Thank you. OK. So on attachment everything that I'm telling you guys you've heard it all before. So there's nothing new that I'm going to tell you. I guess just now it's formalized in guidance, but Andrew has been talking about it for well probably before I got here. And so I know that at least for two years we've been trying to make sure that you understand the different definitions and everything.

So I'm hoping that for most of you unless you're brand new to the program you're probably thinking, "Oh my gosh, we've heard that before." So that's a good thing. So key points from us are primarily definitional. So we are using the same wheel of primary performance indicators for both adult and youth. The difference is now that we broke down the PIRL Element 808 for the adult measures which includes the eligible fees no farmworker adults, migrant farmworker adults and qualifying dependent adults.

And then with the youth and with the eligible migrant farmworker using qualifying dependent use. So that's the key difference for now and 808 has made a big difference in the way we're able to capture a lot of these elements. Then we have the actual definitions for reportable and participant versus the other wheel of programs. And this really is the biggest key feature for us that what you've been doing your reportables only receive related assistant services that don't require significant involvement – (inaudible) – staff time and don't require career assessment of the individual skills, education or career objectives.

And this also includes the emergency assistance services, we don't trump those as the participants. But if participants need the eligibility determination, the career assessment and receive at least one of the five program elements which are either career service, a training service, a housing service, a youth service and/or the certain related assistance services which are defined as school dropout prevention and recovery, self-employment and business activities. Or occupational career and technical education.

So if you have time to go and read the rest of it, you'll see there are slight differences in their definitions of reportable and participants. And I know that at one point we had a little discussion about co-enrollment because there were some issues about how some of the states were defining NFJP. And so if you have time sometimes it's just useful to read it and see how other programs help some of these people just so you have an idea and you can be a little bit more knowledgeable on that topic.

So for housing – so housing people always feel left out of these discussions because most of it does span around career training and services. But even though your data is not currently going into WIPS, we do collect it through the QNR. And it's actually reported as part of our report to Congress in the second floor. So the housing data is part of the outcome. It's just not being collected in the same way.

We are going to ask for input into how we want to do WIPS for housing grantees in the future and we're going to start that probably maybe in the discussion we're having with housing grantees maybe this month, or we'll save it for next month. But we do know the PIRL has elements 22-12 which is temporary and permanent housing services, it's a break out. And then 22-27 the number of dependents under age 18; and 22-32 which is family status in NFJP.

So there was efforts to build in ways to collect the data. So now it's just a matter of figuring out what the right way is to get it out in the way we want and to make sure that we actually have ways to count it the way we need to match what the actual performance outcomes are. So it's not very far away and we haven't forgot about you, we just needed to get the rest of it up and running so that we can gear toward that direction.

But your outcomes are still counted and so we don't want you to think that they aren't, it's just we're doing it a little bit differently at this point. So appendix 3, table 3, this thing went through a few iterations over the two years that we were working on this guidance. But this table is going to help you determine which services count and which don't. So I just have a piece on the table, two different pieces actually, one with no's and one with yes's.

But if you go to the table it's about four pages long in the actual guidance. And the things you need to remember as you study, they'll help you figure out how they're reporting overall to make it consistent. But PIRL Element 1007 the date – the most recent report of individual contact. You have to record the most recent date on which the jobseeker had reportable individual level contact. So if you have services that don't trigger participation you need to have a date in this element.

And if you have services that are actual participant services then you have to have something in element 1004 which is the date of the most recent career service. So when you look at this table you can see across the top it has the benefit of the service type and whether it triggers or not. And then the category, and then the applicable PIRL-data element. And we went through several times with the last column trying to put the right things. And these are not all inclusive PIRL Elements that belong there, but they are the absolute ones that must be included, or it will reject.

And so that was the purpose of that column. And so on the second table it's just another break out, so that you can see what it looks like with yes's on it. On the left column if you see an "and" or an "or," obviously you have to pay attention to that. If it's an "and" you must have something plus something and if it's an "or" it's optional. And sometimes it's optional, you might have one, or you might have more than one.

So when you have time take a look at that table it should help you to work through how to report on the PIRL and make sure that it's not rejecting on those certain things for the common measures. So that's it for me I. I can talk to you guys individually if you have questions about the guidance. Specific things, there's a lot in there. And you really do need to read the sections that I told you. You don't have to read the other ones right away.

If you have time, it would be really useful just to see how NFJP compares to other programs, but do make sure that you go through the main body and our attachments. And if you have time do the webcast because it'll really help you to understand how it's laid out and how to figure out how to use it.

And now I'm going to turn it over to Aaron, he's going to talk about a couple of technical assistance tools that we created that should help you.

AARON MITCHELL: All right. Thank you very much, Marcie and good afternoon everyone. Yeah, we quickly just wanted to walk through a couple of the new TA tools that have been posted on Agricultural Connection. They're also available for download in this presentation. So hopefully these tools will be helpful to you in your programs. The first one that we most recently posted is a grants management resource tool.

And the purpose of this was to primarily need a virtual desk aide, also a welcome packet for new people coming on to the program. But the overall purpose was to help in effectively managing your grant. We took a funnel approach where we started with some of the higher-level grant operation and financial management links and resources including the core monitoring guy, the uniform guidance COX principles.

And then we hone in to NFJP and there's a link to WIOA and there's a link to the authorizing regulations. And then it gets a little bit more specific into NFJP including the eligibility and some of the corresponding tools and FAQs. And then the next section on performance management again it goes over the TEGL 14-18 that Marcie was just talking about. And it also looks at TEGL 10-16 on performance accountability.

And then just again more of the links to some of the various tools are resources out there including the sample MOU toolkit and then the MOU TEGL with NFJP and the monitor advocate system. And then the last couple our partner program and miscellaneous resources. Again feel free to take a look. This certainly isn't intended to be an exhaustive list, but we just wanted to provide some resources for you all. Kind of a one-stop tool. The next one I wanted to cover is the performance and reporting scenarios tool.

And this takes some of the performance reporting that Marcie has been discussing and Andrew certainly had a helpful hand in developing these. What we wanted to do is look at various scenarios for individual participants. And we tried to look at ones sometimes that flowed across multiple program years and just help walk you through how these might be reported. And you'll see five different scenarios there.

We've also received a number of questions about how to report you. And so the last two scenarios focused on participants who would be counted as youth. So feel free to take a look at this. Again it's posted on WorkforceGPS, it's also available to download here. And the last one very much corresponds with this. This is a tool that walks you through the performance measures. There's two tables here, the first one is for the adult measures and then the second page is for the youth measures.

And the three columns it goes over what the measure is and with that there is a link to the corresponding section TEGL 10-16 that focuses on that performance measure. The center column is just a brief explanation of that measure. And then the last part is reporting a resource. These were some really helpful webcast that were done to walk you through the – tutorials that walk you through each measure and the reporting of each.

And so we wanted to include those as well. So those are the three newest tools that we posted. There are a couple more in the pipeline, including one on rural transportation and one on business engagements that hopefully will be up in the next few weeks.

But in the meantime please let us know if you have any feedback on these, feel free to email the NFJP mailbox and your FPOs. And certainly let us know if there's anything that we can do to improve these, or if they've been helpful to you in your programs, we would like to hear that as well. But with that I'll turn it back over. Thank you, guys.

MR. RIETZKE: All right. Thank you, Aaron and Marcie and Andrew. We've got a couple questions that I think we can address. I see a couple of other folks typing. Do submit questions if you have them. First off, we had a question, is the next grant award period going to continue to be four years? I'm assuming this question is about the next competition which we're anticipating in advance of program year 2020. So that would be a funding opportunity announcement that would come out.

Don't quite quote me on this yet, but I would probably expect that by maybe early winter timeframe with applications due a couple months after that. And basically working backwards from making awards for the grant period that would start on July 1st 2020. The answer to your question though is it going to continue to be four years? I have no reason to think that it won't be for years. We haven't actually written the funding opportunity announcement yet. So we haven't totally nailed it down. But as Aaron was talking, I actually pulled up the regs and refreshed my memory.

There's a couple places in the regulations in section 685 where we make a reference to a four-year plan that you need to submit in response to an FOA. So I think it's really unlikely that we would deviate from that for some reason. So I guess my answer is 99 percent yes. It'll be a four-year period that would start with program year 2020.

So we had a specific question and Marcie tell me if you can answer this one. The question was about slide 17, key differences highlighted in attachment 7 states NFJP uses an expanded definition of family when describing eligible dependents. I haven't seen a definition of family in the guidance, can you elaborate?

MS. HAMPTON: Well, we just mean that we have a whole list of dependents, that if you look at TEGL 18-16 we talk about it's usually what we consider a dependent is a lot more expensive than what a usual program would say it's just your own children, or parents and stuff. Our list is a little bit longer.

So we just like to make sure that people are referring to the actual guidance with TEGL 18-16. When you look at what – who qualifies as a dependent for our program. Because we're a little more flexible which I like. I think it's really awesome. But we want to make sure that people are using the entire definition and not just assuming that it's like other programs because it isn't.

MR. RIETZKE: So it sounds like it's more about who qualifies as an eligible dependent, not so much about the word family?

MS. HAMPTON: Right.

MR. RIETZKE: OK. Got it.

MS. HAMPTON: We can fix that in the slide to make it –

MR. RIETZKE: So the next question regarding credential attainment the first column states 4 quarters after exit and in the explanations it states one year. Should it be 300 and I assume that means 365 days after exit or at the end of the fourth quarter after exit?

DR. WIEGAND: I'll try to take this one. Actually – (inaudible) – it was 356 days just for the heck of it. But just to confuse everybody. The credential attainment as it's defined, is a one-year measure within one year of exit.

So that would mean 365 days, or 365.25 if you wanted to count the leap years. So it shouldn't be based on quarters. And that's how we've been calculating it. That being said some of the guidance I've seen or the specs that I've seen from the WIPS have suggested that they're using quarters and treating it as a four-quarter measure.

So I need to get clarification on that. The calculations we've made are based on a one-year period. So what we do is take the exit date add one year and identify whether the credential was attained within that time period. But like I said there have been some things I've seen that seem to suggest that the WIPS may be calculating as a four-quarter measure. So there's no reason for it to be that because the whole reason for the quarters is because the UI system is based on quarterly reporting, but credential rates and credential attainment doesn't – isn't reliant on such a system. So according to the original legislation and regulation this should be a one-year measure not a four quarter after exit measure.

MS. HAMPTON: I'll answer that because – (inaudible).

MR. RIETZKE: So the next question is, how will the negotiated performance measures change for next year? I'm assuming you mean for programming in 19, the programming that's upcoming starting July 1st. Do we have the option of just accepting what deal they'll put out, or each program responsible for negotiations? So assuming we're talking about for program year 19 this will follow the process we outlined. OK, yes, PY19.

This will follow the process that we outlined briefly toward the beginning of this presentation. I think like Andrew said, I think we're hoping that by about early next week we're going to have the performance targets for each grantee finalized. And then we'll be emailing those out. And we'll give some instructions for what to do from there. But basically, you'll have the option of either accepting the targets that you get and again those targets are going to be based on the results of the regression model using the PY17 data as the input along with all the factors of the regression model.

So either you accept those targets, or we'll ask you to contact your FPO and initiate a negotiation to talk through what your concerns are and go from there. Again, we're hoping to be able to do all of that as you're putting together your grant documents for PY19, so that those can be submitted with the negotiated final performance targets. Let me know if that answers your question, but I think that the answer is yes.

You do have the option, or you have the option of negotiating with us depending on how things shake out and what you want to discuss. All right. Good. So one other question. Are there any services that extend the last service date for reportable individuals? Andrew, or Marcie do you want to take that? I'm not sure of the answer myself.

DR. WIEGAND: Well, I'm trying to figure out the reasoning behind it. So reportable individuals have not formally enrolled in the program, therefore they don't normally exit from the program. They've received some basic non-staff assisted services and are in the data. And then once a new program year has started, they don't need to be reported on. So if they had a new service, a new basic service that wasn't in significant staff assistance in a new program year.

I think you would extend – you would have them in the reporting. But otherwise this wouldn't be really extending the service date. And they get reported on for a particular program year and then if they're not receiving – (inaudible) – that year they come in and these services they would be reported as an individual in that year too. (Inaudible) – some of the reasoning. It looks like it helped clarify.

MR. RIETZKE: All right. Thank you, Andrew. OK, we've got at least one person typing. So we'll give you a minute. All right. Now, no typing. I feel like the Jeopardy theme song should play. What's that guy's name that keeps winning everything? All right. No further questions at this point. Anybody have anything else for the order, questions, comments, concerns, complaints, compliments?

DR. WIEGAND: Oh, wait, did you say complaints? How much time do we have?

MS. HAMPTON: Thank everybody for being on the phone. We appreciate it.

MR. RIETZKE: Yeah. I'll reiterate that. Thank you everybody. Oh, we've got a couple of folks typing. Thank you. Thank you too, you're welcome. All right. Well, thank you again to all of you. Thank you to Grace, and Andrew, and Marcie, and Aaron. Thanks to you all for tuning in.

And you'll be hearing quite a bit from us over the next couple weeks and we'll answer any questions that you have as the process moves forward for PY19 and the loose ends on PY18.

All right. Thanks.

(END)