

DECEMBER

2011

5809 Program Close-out

Prepared by the

Employment Security Department

Published December 2011

Washington State Employment Security Department
Paul Trause, *Commissioner*

The Employment Security Department would like to acknowledge the contributions of staff from the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board and the Washington Workforce Association for their assistance and collaboration on this report.

For more information, contact Tammy Fellin, *Legislative Liaison*, Government Relations & Executive Operations at 360-902-9407.

Report prepared by Andrew Greenwell, *Economic Analyst*.

The Employment Security Department is an equal-opportunity employer and provider of programs and services. Auxiliary aids and services are available upon request to people with disabilities.

Contents

Executive summary	2
Key findings.....	2
Legislative mandate.....	3
Implementing E2SSB 5809	4
Expenditures on education and training	5
Number of students receiving training.....	7
Training completion, employment rates and wage levels.....	10
Efforts to provide training leading to employment.....	11
Efforts to develop capacity in occupations that are of particularly high demand.....	11
Enhancements to ensure additional training in high-demand occupations is accessible to low-income and dislocated workers	11
Student demographics: institution & program data	12
Conclusion	13

Executive summary

Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill (E2SSB) 5809 passed during the 2009 legislative session. The intent of the legislation was to use General Fund-State dollars to leverage additional capacity for workforce training targeting low-income adults, dislocated workers or anyone who received or exhausted unemployment-insurance benefits. The law provided \$7 million in state funds to distribute to local Workforce Development Councils (WDC). The WDCs then contracted with community and technical colleges and employers to provide training in high-demand occupations.

The state funds provided a match for each federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA) dollar spent to increase post-secondary education and skill development for low-income adults, dislocated workers or anyone who received or exhausted unemployment-insurance benefits. Under the bill, each WIA dollar spent to create a new class garnered 75 cents in state incentive funds for the local WDC. In addition to incentive funding for new classes, the legislation also provided a 25 percent match for each local dollar spent to help students pay for tuition or books through Individual Training Accounts (ITA).

The legislation required the Employment Security Department, in collaboration with the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board, Workforce Development Councils and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges to submit a report describing implementation of the act by December 1, 2010.

That report was provided as required. However, at the time it was published, outcome data relating to employment and wage rates after completion of training was not available. That information was requested to be delivered in 2011. Unfortunately, employment and wage data is not yet available, as participants continued in training through June 30, 2011. Therefore, final outcome data will be provided in late 2012. The following provides an update, including total expenditures, participants and credit completion data through the life of the program.

Key findings

The program was in place from May 2009 through June 2011, and required all funds to be earned and spent during that period. During that time, WDCs expended nearly \$15.5 million in federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA) formula and American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) funds in order to earn available state funds.

The legislation initially provided \$7 million in state funds. However, the legislature took action to reduce that appropriation due to budget shortfalls. In all, the WDCs contracted for just over \$6 million in state funds during the period.

The combined total of \$21.5 million provided support and training to nearly 8,700 individuals, including WIA-supported training: nearly 5,000 people participated in training who otherwise may not have had the opportunity. The balance, just over 3,700, received training-related support funded through WIA. Therefore, we know that nearly 8,700 individuals received training or other training-related support through 5809.

According to the legislation, training was required to be in high-demand occupations. In addition to being in high demand, the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) also identified which of those were higher-wage training programs. Of the students enrolled in newly-created classes and a workforce development program, nearly 43 percent were enrolled in higher-wage training programs, approximately 27

percent were enrolled in middle-wage training programs and nearly 16 percent were enrolled in lower-wage training programs.¹

Credit completion rates of E2SSB 5809 participants were 94 percent for those with state-funded ITAs and 89 percent for those in contracted training, which exceeded the 81 percent credit completion rates of all workforce students. Additional support, such as paying for books and tools, and case management services to all participants, including those not eligible under WIA, provided through 5809 and affiliation with WorkSource may have contributed to these students' success.

The WDCs prioritized training in high-demand occupations that had significant waiting lists at the colleges. By pursuing training in occupations needed by employers and desired by students but unavailable due to limited college resources, the WDCs ensured that the training met the intent of E2SSB 5809.

Legislative mandate

Section 6 of Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill (E2SSB) 5809 directed the Employment Security Department, in collaboration with the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board), workforce development councils (WDCs) and the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, to submit a report to the Governor and Legislature by December 1, 2010. This report described the implementation of the act and outcomes related to the following measures:

- Amounts of expenditures on education and training
- Number of students receiving training
- Types of training received by students
- Student demographics and institution/program demographics
- Efforts made to ensure that training provided would lead to employment
- Efforts to develop capacity in occupations that are in high demand
- Specific enhancements made in the workforce system to ensure that additional training in high-demand occupations is accessible to low-income and dislocated workers.

However, two required reporting elements—training completion and employment rates and comparisons of pre-5809 and post-5809 wage levels—were not available at the time of the report. Because participants continued in training through July 30, 2011, such outcome data is still not available. These outcomes will be provided in late 2012 in order to include adequate employment and wage data to measure the effectiveness of 5809.

¹ Data was not available on the specific program for the remaining 14 percent.

Implementing E2SSB 5809

E2SSB 5809 was passed by the Washington State Legislature in April 2009 and signed into law by the Governor on May 19, 2009. The bill directed the Employment Security Department to distribute state funds to the WDCs to expand training capacity in high-demand occupations for targeted populations. That funding came in the form of a \$7 million General Fund-State appropriation to Employment Security beginning July 2009, to be distributed to the WDCs by March 1, 2011, and spent by June 30, 2011. The program was in place from May 2009 through June 2011, and required all funds to be earned and spent during that period. During that time, WDCs expended nearly \$15.5 million in federal Workforce Investment Act (WIA) and American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) funds in order to earn available state funds. Under this program, nearly 8,700 individuals received training and associated support for training, including WIA-funded training.

The initial appropriation was \$7 million. Through a combination of the state legislature rescinding funds to assist with a statewide budget shortage, and a small portion of unspent funds being returned to the State General Fund, the WDCs received more than \$6 million in matching funds under the program.

The legislative intent drove the basic constructs of the program.

- The state funds provided an incentive for local WDCs to invest their federal WIA formula or Recovery Act funds on training. Each dollar spent to contract for new classes earned a 75-cent match. A 25-cent match was provided for each dollar spent on individual training accounts (ITAs).
- Eligible beneficiaries of state-funded training and support services were low-income adults, dislocated workers or anyone who had received or exhausted unemployment benefits.
- Eligible training was for high-demand occupations, with priority given to training programs in aerospace, forestry, health care and energy efficiency.

Employment Security began implementing E2SSB 5809 by creating separate policy and performance work groups composed of representatives from the Employment Security Department, the Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board), the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and the Washington Workforce Association, the organization that represents the 12 WDCs.

While federal law regulated the allowable uses of the initial WIA investment used to earn the state funds, the policy work group delineated the allowable uses of the state funds as follows:

- All training and support was to be focused on WIA-eligible, low-income adults and dislocated workers or unemployment-insurance claimants and exhaustees.
- Training was required to be in high-demand occupations, with emphasis placed on aerospace, forestry, health care and energy efficiency. Allowable training included contracting for new classes, individual training accounts, skills training, customized training, incumbent-worker training, on-the-job training and Integrated Basic Education and Skills Training (I-BEST) which pairs workforce training with adult basic education or English as a second language education.

- Funds could have been used to develop new training programs in emerging sectors (e.g., energy efficiency) not currently identified as high demand. The WDC was required to provide evidence of anticipated demand. Development costs could have included equipment and curriculum development necessary to support those programs, release time for faculty for curriculum and professional development, and substitute instructors to support the release time.
- Funds could have been used for WIA support services and direct services provided to students to help them succeed in their training.
- Funds could also have been used for “wrap around” services by community and technical colleges (including, but not limited to, child care, transportation, housing, food, other direct financial assistance, tutoring, counseling and educational plan development), provided directly to students to help them succeed in their training. For example, a direct service in the contracted class setting is a college-retention specialist assigned to individuals in I-BEST.
- Up to five percent of the fund amount could have been allowed, on a case-by-case basis, to support overhead and case-management activities by the WDCs, with Employment Security approval.
- Employment Security also had authority to approve other uses on a case-by-case basis.

Employment Security also convened a workgroup of interested legislators and partners to guide implementation of the legislation through periodic updates. This workgroup met twice during the life of this program.

Expenditures on education and training

A variety of different training mechanisms were allowed under E2SSB 5809. The results for training expenditures and participants are reported in the following four training categories:

1. **Contracts for new classes or programs** between the WDCs and community and technical colleges, ranging from three months to two years. The contract was required to cover all costs of offering a new class, including instructor fees, classroom space, lab fees and tuition for participants. The WDCs recruited WIA-eligible students to enroll in these classes. In some cases, the WDC negotiated a cost-allocation agreement with the college to fill vacant seats with non-WIA students. As with the 2010 report, this analysis includes only the WIA-eligible students placed by the WDCs.
2. **Individual training accounts (ITA)** for WIA participants. Each ITA could have been used to fund something different, depending on the student’s needs. For students who had their tuition covered by another source, such as a Pell Grant, the ITA could have been used for books and supplies; for others, the ITA could have paid tuition. The amount of money provided to an individual was variable from quarter to quarter, depending on the availability of other financial aid. Rather than add new capacity to the educational system, ITAs covered tuition and other costs of enrolling in existing classes. Because Employment Security’s management information system does not distinguish between ITAs that fund tuition and those that fund other types of student support, this report counts all participants who were touched by an ITA from either funding stream tied to this legislation.
3. **Incumbent-worker training** involved a contract between the WDC and an employer to upgrade the skills of their employees. Incumbent-worker training could have assisted employees to stay current with

such things as technology or new manufacturing processes. It provided a number of benefits, including reducing the likelihood of being laid off, increasing the potential for higher wages and improving future job prospects. To receive funding from the WDC, employers were required to demonstrate what was at risk if training did not occur, how it benefitted employees and how much the employer contributed. Most incumbent-worker training programs were a few weeks in duration. Incumbent-worker training was limited to state funds under 5809.

4. **On-the-job training** was accomplished by the WDC contracting with an employer to hire and train a new worker, with a commitment from the employer to keep the individual after the training. In exchange, the WDC generally paid up to 50 percent of the employee’s wages. Although these agreements varied depending on the situation, this option was intended to help offset an employer’s cost of training and supervising the employee during the training period. On-the-job training was limited to state funds under 5809.

Figure 1 illustrates *total expenditures* connected to E2SSB 5809 in two categories:

1. WIA funds (both formula and Recovery Act) used to earn the state dollars; and
2. General Fund-State dollars.

Figure 1. Expenditures on training and education as part of E2SSB 5809 through June 30, 2011²

Fund Source	Contracts for New Training	Individual Training Account	Incumbent-Worker Training	On-the-Job Training	Total
WIA Formula and Recovery Act	\$ 7,454,000	\$8,037,000	N/A	N/A	\$15,491,000
General Fund State	\$ 3,640,000	\$1,111,000	\$407,000	\$828,000	\$ 5,986,000
Total Spent on Training	\$11,094,000	\$9,148,000	\$407,000	\$828,000	\$21,477,000

E2SSB 5809 stipulated that state funds could be earned at a rate of 75 cents for every WIA dollar spent contracting for new classes and 25 cents for every WIA dollar spent on ITAs. As shown in *Figure 1*, the WDCs invested nearly \$15.5 million of their WIA formula and Recovery Act funds on this program. The WDCs had not contracted for new classes in many years and were unlikely to spend their WIA funds on creating new classes if not for the incentive provided through this legislation. Thus, the legislation successfully drove WIA funds, and especially WIA Recovery Act dollars, to be invested in building training capacity at the state’s community and technical colleges.

With the \$15.5 million investment, nearly \$6 million of available state funds were spent by the WDCs as shown in *Figure 1*. All funds were required by the legislation to be distributed to the WDCs by March 1, 2011, and fully expended by June 30, 2011. At the end of the program, approximately \$200,000 that was earned by the WDCs was left unspent and was, therefore, returned to the General Fund-State. The result was that almost \$6 million in new state dollars were expended, as shown in *Figure 1*.

WIA and state funds tied to E2SSB 5809 were used to leverage other financial aid available across the system to ensure wrap-around support for the participating students. For example, the students who participated in

² WIA funds beyond the amount shown in the table were spent on ITAs; however, they were not used to earn the incentive and are thus not included in this analysis.

new training funded by WIA received approximately \$4.4 million in other financial aid from June 2009 through June 2011, according to data from the SBCTC. In addition, many of these students received WIA support services available through the state WorkSource system. Students who participated in training paid for through the E2SSB 5809 funds received an additional \$4.9 million in financial aid according to the SBCTC.

Number of students receiving training

Figure 2 illustrates the number of students who received training in the same categories described in the expenditure section. It should be stressed that an individual student is likely to appear in more than one category listed below. For example, during the first quarter of a training program, a WIA-eligible student may have received support through WIA funds in the form of an ITA to attend an existing class. The next quarter, that same student may have participated in a newly-created contracted class that was funded through state funds. This is just one of many possible scenarios to illustrate why the number of participants listed below will not equal the approximately 8,700 individuals benefitting from 5809.

From May 2009 through the end of the program on June 30, 2011, there were 1,438 participants in newly-created contracted training paid for through WIA formula and Recovery Act dollars, and 1,135 who participated in newly-created contracted training paid for with state dollars. The largest category of participants in the program was through ITAs, including 4,541 funded through WIA formula and Recovery Act money and 3,887 ITAs funded through state dollars. While WIA funds were not used for either incumbent worker training or OJTs, there were 1,226 participants in incumbent worker training provided through state monies and 228 in OJTs. Again, these numbers cannot be summed due to the inclusion of participants in more than one training type and funding source.

By creating an incentive to invest WIA funds in building capacity at the community and technical colleges, E2SSB 5809 encouraged the WDCs to invest WIA funds in creating new training rather than on other services. It appears that the legislation had little effect in driving additional WIA funds to be spent on ITAs, as they had been commonly used by the WDCs before this legislation. However, none of the training directly paid for by the earned state dollars would have happened without this legislation. Thus, it can be concluded that E2SSB 5809 enabled nearly 5,000 people to be trained who otherwise may not have had the opportunity. In addition, just over 3,700 of the 4,541 WIA-funded ITAs identified above do not appear in other categories of training. Therefore, we know that nearly 8,700 individuals received training or other training-related support through 5809.

Figure 2 illustrates the number of participants in each category of funding and training connected to E2SSB 5809 through June 30, 2011

Figure 2. Participants in training through June 30, 2011³

	Contracts for New Training	Individual Training Account	Incumbent-Worker Training	On-the-Job Training
Fund Source				
WIA Formula and Recovery Act	1,438	4,541	N/A	N/A
General Fund-State	1,135	3,887	1,226	228

Source: SKIES, Employment Security WorkSource Standards & Integration Division, 5809 Program Manager Records, December 2011

Figure 3 shows the specific types of classes created through contract,⁴ arranged by wage category. The SBCTC categorizes workforce education programs into higher-wage, middle-wage and lower-wage fields of study based on the actual wages of students nine months after graduation. The median wage of graduates in higher-wage programs working in 2008-09 was \$20.92. The median wages of graduates in middle- and lower-wage programs was \$13.99 and \$12.33, respectively.

Of all participants included in Figure 3, nearly 43 percent of students were enrolled in higher-wage training programs, while nearly 28 percent were enrolled in middle-wage training programs. More than a third (35 percent) of all students were in training for a health-related field. The most frequent training programs, measured by the total number of students, were managerial and managerial support (a middle-wage program), associate degree nurse (a higher-wage program) and nursing assistant (a lower-wage program).

³ These participant numbers cannot be summed due to duplications across training types and funding sources.

⁴ The fields of study in Figure 3 are based on Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes, which are the identifiers conventionally used by educational systems to describe programs of study.

Figure 3 shows the categories of newly contracted classes, with number of participants

Figure 3. Topics of newly contracted classes, with numbers of participants⁵

Higher-Wage Programs	Number of Students	Percent of Subtotal	Percent of Total ⁶
Associate Degree Nurse	146	18.7	8.0
Practical Nurse	91	11.7	5.0
Other Health Tech	85	10.9	4.6
Welding	74	9.5	4.0
Information Technology	57	7.3	3.1
Transportation Operators	53	6.8	2.9
Engineering Technology	53	6.8	2.9
Industrial Technology (except electronics tech)	43	5.5	2.3
Machinist	25	3.2	1.4
Construction Trades	25	3.2	1.4
Electronics Technology	22	2.8	1.2
Drafting	21	2.7	1.1
Paramedic EMT, Operating Tech	19	2.4	1.0
Physical Therapy	16	2.1	0.9
Protective Services	15	1.9	0.8
Precision, Production, Crafts	13	1.7	0.7
Airframe/Power Plant	12	1.5	0.7
Medical X-ray	5	0.6	0.3
Legal/Real Estate Services	2	0.3	0.1
Med Lab Tech/Histology	1	0.1	0.1
Computer Maintenance Tech	1	0.1	0.1
Total Count	779	100.0	42.5

Middle-Wage Programs	Number of Students	Percent of Subtotal	Percent of Total
Managerial and Managerial Support	175	34.8	9.5
Medical Assisting	102	20.3	5.6
Accounting	57	11.3	3.1
Auto Diesel	49	9.7	2.7
Other Technical	31	6.2	1.7
Marketing and Sales	24	4.8	1.3
Other Services	24	4.8	1.3
Dental Assisting	20	4.0	1.1
Other Health Services	10	2.0	0.5
Commercial & Graphics Art	7	1.4	0.4
Pharmacy Assisting	4	0.8	0.2
Total Count	503	100.0	27.4

⁵ This figure consists of participants who were enrolled in a workforce development program as that was the focus of E2SSB 5809.

⁶ Data was not available on the specific program for the remaining 14.3 percent.

Lower-Wage Programs	Number of Students	Percent of Subtotal	Percent of Total
Nursing Assistant	138	47.6	7.5
Administrative Support	124	42.8	6.8
Culinary Arts	16	5.5	0.9
Social Services	10	3.4	0.5
Early Childhood Ed	2	0.7	0.1
Total Count	290	100.0	15.8

Source: State Board for Community and Technical Colleges Data Warehouse, December 2011.

Training completion, employment rates and wage levels

Participants continued in training through June 30, 2011. To provide an accurate measure of the outcomes accomplished with these funds, results will be reported to the Legislature in a third and final report in late 2012.

While outcome information for students served by E2SSB 5809 is not currently available, credit completion rates of participants are available and provide some insight into how well these students are doing, relative to workforce students overall.

Figure 4 shows the credit completion rates of all students enrolled through either state-funded ITAs or newly-contracted courses, from summer quarter 2009 through summer 2011, compared to credits taken by all workforce students (certain programs of study are classified as “workforce” by the SBCTC) during the same time period. Credit completion rates of E2SSB 5809 participants were 94 percent for those with state-funded ITAs and 89 percent for those in contracted training, which exceeded the 81 percent credit completion rates of all workforce students. Additional support and case management provided through 5809 and affiliation with WorkSource may have contributed to these students’ success.

Examples of the extra support include tutoring, coursework to address study habits, bus passes, books and supplies. In addition, many of the newly contracted training classes were shorter than most workforce training programs, which also may contribute to higher completion rates.

Figure 4. Completion rates of contracted training and state-funded ITA participants compared to all workforce students, summer 2009 through summer 2011

	Attempted Credits	Earned Credits	Credit Completion Rate
Participants in contracted classes	93,170	82,543	89%
State-funded ITA participants	72,151	67,826	94%
All workforce students at the community and technical colleges	7,932,951	6,442,220	81%

Source: State Board for Community and Technical Colleges Data Warehouse, December 2011.

Efforts to provide training leading to employment

Workforce Development Councils (WDCs) worked closely with partners to ensure that the training provided through E2SSB 5809 would lead to employment. Many WDCs issued requests for qualifications soliciting capacity-building training proposals. Criteria included short-duration classes that would lead to an employer-recognized credential and a high likelihood of employment based on past performance. Colleges responded to this charge by quickly putting together new courses.

WDCs consulted their demand/decline lists to ensure that classes offered were related to occupations that were in demand in the local area. This list classifies occupations as in-demand, neutral or in-decline based on labor market information. A unique list exists for each WDC and is tailored to local economic conditions. WDCs also consulted their employer advisory committees to understand which skills were needed locally. Industry skill panels consisting of regional employers, labor representatives and training providers provided advice about skill gaps in specific occupations that need to be filled through training. This partnership informed the training curriculum and ensured that the skills being taught were relevant to today's employers.

The WDCs prioritized training in high-demand occupations that had significant waiting lists at the colleges. By pursuing training in occupations needed by employers and desired by students but unavailable due to limited college resources, the WDCs ensured that the training met the intent of E2SSB 5809. In addition, the on-the-job training contracts required employers to commit to permanently hiring the people they train.

Efforts to develop capacity in occupations that are of particularly high demand

As mentioned in the previous section, WDCs consulted their local demand/decline lists to guide course selection. WDCs also worked directly with ESD to guide selection of occupations for training programs. Several WDCs met with local community and technical colleges, economic development councils, community-based organizations and public organizations to identify occupations that were or would be in demand in their regions.

Once local in-demand occupations were identified and matched with relevant educational programs, several questions were asked to ensure that the funded classes increased capacity: Is the existing program full? If so, can the program be expanded? If a program did not exist, could one be created from existing courses and/or new courses? Because E2SSB 5809 allowed purchasing entire classes, including curriculum development, faculty pay and all infrastructure costs, classes could conveniently begin and end outside the standard school quarters, thereby allowing identified participants to begin their training right away.

Enhancements to ensure additional training in high-demand occupations is accessible to low-income and dislocated workers

The structure of E2SSB 5809 focused on WIA eligibility, which encompasses both low-income adults and dislocated workers. WIA funds are required by law to serve high-priority groups, such as welfare recipients, unemployment-insurance claimants and adults lacking basic skills. The policy work group directed that state incentive funds be used on WIA-eligible individuals, with exceptions approved on a case-by-case basis.

As specified in WIA law, all WDCs are partners in the state's WorkSource career-development system. The WorkSource business model dictates that anyone who walks into WorkSource is assessed by a counselor and directed to the services appropriate to his or her situation. This process enabled the system to identify low-income and dislocated workers who could benefit from the E2SSB 5809 program. Thanks to the federal

Recovery Act funding, the number of WorkSource staff increased dramatically in 2009, allowing the flood of customers seeking assistance to be served and assessed.

In many areas, WorkSource staff were co-located on community and technical college campuses, giving them the opportunity to find eligible students who might not have approached WorkSource. In general, all partners collaborated to ensure that they quickly identified eligible students from college waiting lists so that the many moving parts required to put classes together could be aligned and the funds could be spent within a tight timeframe.

Colleges and the WDCs focused on coordinating various resources and pathways so that low-income workers had sufficient financial support to enter and complete training programs. Pell grants, Opportunity Grants, Worker Retraining funds, Trade Act and WIA were all viewed as potential funding sources to support these students throughout their program of study. In many areas, Worker Retraining resources paid for the initial quarters of training, and E2SSB 5809 funds paid for the remaining quarters.

Student demographics: institution & program data

In *Figure 5*, the demographics of all participants in E2SSB 5809 are compared to that of all students in a community or technical college workforce program, where statistics are available.

- Fifty-nine percent of E2SSB 5809 participants are unemployment-insurance (UI) claimants.
- Forty percent of E2SSB 5809 participants are low income. The contracted classes funded by WIA included an especially high number of low-income participants because many were in the WIA Adult Program, which serves low-income adults.
- Eighty percent of E2SSB 5809 participants are 30 years old or older compared to 48 percent of all workforce students.

Figure 5.
Demographics of E2SSB 5809 participants compared to
all community and technical college students in workforce programs

	E2SSB 5809 participants (includes contracted classes, incumbent worker, on-the-job training and state-funded ITAs)	All Workforce students in the community and technical college system
Claimant Status		
UI Claimant	59%	Not Available
Not UI Claimant	41%	
Income Status		
Low-Income	40%	Not Available
Not Low-Income	60%	
Gender		
Female	53%	57%
Male	47%	43%
Race Ethnicity		
Asian Pacific Islander	7%	9%
Black	8%	7%
Native American	2%	3%

	E2SSB 5809 participants (includes contracted classes, incumbent worker, on-the-job training and state-funded ITAs)	All Workforce students in the community and technical college system
Hispanic	9%	10%
White	71%	70%
Other Unknown	4%	2%
Age Group		
Under 20	0%	11%
20-29	19%	41%
30-39	24%	23%
40 and above	56%	25%
Not Reported	0%	0%

Source: State Board for Community and Technical Colleges Data Warehouse and SKIES, December 2011. All workforce student demographics are taken from the fall quarter enrollment, as provided by SBCTC.

Conclusion

E2SSB 5809 was an innovative program that successfully guided WIA formula and Recovery Act investment in new community and technical college training capacity and provided the WDCs with one-time additional resources to leverage increased federal dollars to build workforce training capacity more broadly. The flexibility built into the program enabled areas of the state that had difficulty implementing new group training, due to the lack of a local college or a critical mass of students interested in the same kind of training, with the chance to offer in-demand training opportunities through ITAs and on-the-job or incumbent-worker training. The legislation also fostered collaboration among partners through the shared goal of quickly training people most affected by the recession.

The legislation provided training opportunities that otherwise might not have been available to nearly 5,000 people. Participants in contracted training classes have completed 89 percent of attempted credits compared to 81 percent for all community and technical college workforce students. Additional support and case management provided through 5809 through affiliation with WorkSource may contribute to this higher completion rate, as may the shorter duration of training.