

Onondaga Community College Joint Operations for a Better Syracuse TAACCT Final Report

**Report to:
Shaunna Jagneaux, Project Director**

September 28, 2018

Hezel
ASSOCIATES

731 James Street, Suite 410
Syracuse, NY 13203
Tel: 315 422 3512
Fax: 315 422 3513
www.hezel.com

Hezel Associates, LLC, is a custom research, evaluation, and strategic consulting firm specializing in education. Since 1987, Hezel Associates has embraced its mission to serve clients with *intelligence, experience, and insight to enable them to succeed in creating, managing, and improving education initiatives.*

Hezel ASSOCIATES

Patrick Fiorenza, Senior Research Analyst
731 James Street, Suite 410
Syracuse, NY 13203
Tel: 315 422 3512
Fax: 315 422 3513
www.hezel.com
patrick@hezel.com



Hezel Associates, 2018

© by Hezel Associates, LLC. *Onondaga Community College Round 4 TAACCCT Grant Evaluation Final Report* is made available under the Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

This publication was prepared for Onondaga Community College, with funding provided by the U.S. Department of Labor.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Joint Operations for a Better Syracuse Career Pathway Initiative (JOBS) was designed to train historically unemployed, underemployed, new or transitioning workers (including TAA-eligible workers), veterans, and refugees for careers in the Central New York Region. The JOBS initiative developed training that theoretically leads individuals to obtain a living wage job, focusing on non-credit, competency-based programs in the fields of manufacturing, healthcare, and food service management (FSM).

Hezel Associates, LLC, a research, planning, and evaluation firm, was hired to serve as the third-party evaluator for the JOBS program. The evaluation was designed to assess program implementation (quality and timeliness of proposed grant activities) and impact (students' wages and employment outcomes). This Executive Summary provides an overview of the JOBS program, the evaluation design, implementation and outcome study results, and recommendations for both OCC and the workforce development community.

I. Overview of JOBS Program

In September of 2014, Onondaga Community College (OCC) was awarded a Round 4 Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College Career Training (TAACCCT) grant through the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). The grant funded the development of non-credit competency-based programs under the JOBS initiative. Table 1 provides an overview of programs developed by the JOBS initiative.

Table 1. JOBS Programs Overview

Program	Description	Length of time
Medical Assistant	Trains employees to serve in a supportive role in medical offices, assisting with patient care and office management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 32 weeks (900 hours) • 185 hours at an employer site.
Medical Billing	Trains individuals on how to properly submit medical claims to insurance companies and payers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28 weeks (665 hours) • 132 hours at an employer site.
Phlebotomy	Prepares students for a career in drawing and processing blood samples.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8-week course (50 hours) • 100 hours and 100 draws.
Machine Operator	Participants are hired by a sponsoring employee at the beginning of the program and enrolled in a 4-year apprenticeship program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19 weeks (705 hours) • 10 weeks training • 9 weeks at an employer site.
Line Cook	Prepares students for work in fine-dining, fast-food chains, and franchises, hotels, catering, and other food-related establishments. The program created <i>With Love</i> , a teaching and training restaurant.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 32 weeks (818 hours) • 16 weeks training • 16 weeks of practicum.

Note. Programs evolved significantly throughout the grant period. Staff refer to programs with different names. For instance, Line Cook is sometimes referred to as Food Service Management, and Mechanical Operator as the AACT Program. For clarity in this report, we use the titles provided in this table, as they were derived from OCC's website.

JOBS also partnered with Onondaga County Catholic Charities (Catholic Charities) and Work Train, the workforce development branch of the CenterState Corporation for Economic Opportunity (CenterState CEO). The partnership among Catholic Charities, Work Train, and JOBS supported the Culinary Arts for Self Sufficiency (CASS) program, which is administered by Catholic Charities. The CASS program provides soft skill training and technical skill development, thus leading participants into careers in the food services industry. Essentially, the JOBS initiative intended for CASS to serve as a pathway program into Line Cook or other food-related programs at OCC.

Internal JOBS documentation also suggests other programs occurred under this grant. For example, the JOBS website promotes a Warehouse Operator program, although the program had limited enrollment during the grant's performance period. Other examples include a gas technician and pharmacy technician program; however, researchers were unable to obtain additional information about these programs.

Regardless of the specific JOBS program, staff referred to implemented trainings as "necessary and sufficient" for content mastery. Program administrators believe that training should only include elements essential to performance on the job. In their view, training should focus on the most critical skills, and exclude elements that are irrelevant to a students' desired position, which may delay entrance into the workforce. This theory underpins much of the vision behind the JOBS initiative. To create the "necessary and sufficient" curriculum, JOBS staff leveraged a process called Developing A Curriculum (DACUM). The DACUM process is designed to narrow the gap between course work and what workers need to excel on the job. This model enables employers to play an essential role in the development of curriculum. Industry partners are engaged in a systematic process that highlights the knowledge, skills, attributes, and competencies needed for successful employment within their fields, typically surrounding positions at the entry level. After employers' detail necessary programmatic components for cultivating a successful employee, they evaluate the content to assure alignment to their needs.

Once the DACUM processes are completed, JOBS staff believe they had a roadmap to move forward and provide training to set program participants up for success in the workplace. For each program, JOBS administered a series of diagnostic tests, such as s Accuplacer, TABE, and Learning Resources, Inc (LRI). These tests were used to assess adult learner's skill levels and aptitudes regarding reading comprehension and math (Accuplacer) and soft skills, such as teamwork, collaboration, leadership, and customer service (TABE, and LRI). Prospective Mechanical Operator students were required to take the Bennet Mechanical Aptitude test, which assesses an individual's aptitude for understanding and applying mechanical principles. Although placement exams were standard across programs, some programs, such as Mechanical Operator, involved interviews with prospective employers. Other programs required candidates to only complete the placement exam and application (Medical Billing, Medical Assistant, Line Cook, and Phlebotomy).

Early in each program, students had the opportunity to participate in a job shadowing experience and employer-led tours of workplaces. These experiences helped solidify whether the program was along a career path that students wanted to continue to pursue. Each program also culminated with a practicum experience, which encompassed students gaining real world

experience at a worksite while also allowing employers to evaluate whether or not individuals were “work ready.” To graduate, a student must receive an endorsement from the employer at their practicum site. If their employer sponsor deems them “work ready” they have completed the OCC training, and can begin to pursue job opportunities. If the employer suggests that some remedial work is needed, JOBS works with the student to correct any skill (professional or technical) deficiencies, and the student repeats the practicum experience.

The type of credential earned was dependent on what employers and incumbent workers have identified as essential to success in the workplace. For this reason, OCC did not include content in curriculum that was not essential to performing the job; they believe this model “right sizes” programs and learners can exit the program quickly, and become employed. With this model, and based on available data, it is unclear what credentials, certifications, and degrees were awarded from grant activities.

At the core of this program was a desire to match local needs with local skills. Throughout this report, Hezel Associates provides commentary on the degree to which the program achieved intended goals, and alignment with the guiding vision of the JOBS initiative.

II. Summary of Evaluation Design

Hezel Associates conducted a mixed methods study for this evaluation, which entailed two major components—implementation and outcomes. The implementation evaluation contributed to formative feedback throughout the grant period and included analyzing processes applied, assessing operational strengths and weaknesses, and making recommendations regarding how implementation might be improved to increase net impact for participants. The outcomes study of grant-funded activities attempted to apply a quasi-experimental design and develop comparison groups identified through a propensity score adjustment. The purpose of the outcomes study was to assess the educational and employment outcomes of interest. However, Hezel Associates was not provided adequate data to assess program outcomes, which limited our ability to address numerous evaluation questions.

Implementation Study

Implementation was assessed by gathering data through reviews of program documentation and interviews with program staff, faculty, employers and industry stakeholders. In addition, focus groups were conducted with program participants. The implementation study addressed the following questions:

- How was the particular curriculum selected, used, or created?
- How was the program managed or implemented?
 - How were programs and program design improved or expanded using grant funds?
 - What delivery methods were offered?
 - What was the program administrative structure?
 - What support services and other services were offered?
- Did the grantees conduct an in-depth assessment of participants’ abilities, skills, and interests to select participants into the grant program?
 - What assessment tools and process were used?

- Who conducted the assessment?
- How were the assessment results used?
- Were the assessment results useful in determining the appropriate program and course sequence for participants?
- Was career guidance provided and if so, through what methods?
- What contributions did each of the partners (employers, workforce system, other training providers and educators, philanthropic organizations, and others as applicable) make in terms of (a) program design, (b) curriculum development, (c) recruitment, (d) training, (e) placement, (f) program management, (g) leveraging of resources, and (h) commitment to program sustainability?
 - What factors contributed to partners' involvement or lack of involvement in the program?
 - Which contributions from partners were most critical to the success of the grant program?
 - Which contributions from partners had less of an impact?
- What promising practices emerged from the implementation process?
- To what extent has institutional capacity changed?
- To what extent are JOBS programs aligned to market needs?
- To what degree are JOBS participants prepared with the soft-skills necessary for success in the workforce?

Outcomes Study

Hezel Associates intended to implement a quasi-experimental, matched-participant design for the outcomes study. This design would have facilitated understandings of the impact of grant activities, such as program completion, student persistence, employment, and wages, accounting for a lack of a randomly assigned control group.

Although OCC did obtain wage and unemployment insurance data from the New York State Department of Labor (NY DOL), these data were not provided to Hezel Associates. As such, our ability to address many of the outcome evaluation questions was limited. The United States Department of Labor (USDOL) has mandated that evaluators send a report by September 30, 2018, regardless if all data has been received; this report, unfortunately, does not include outcomes results of the JOBS program. Should wage data become available, Hezel Associates will amend this report and conduct appropriate analysis to address the outcomes evaluation questions identified below:

- To what extent did JOBS activities increase student retention rates and the attainment of certifications, certificates, diplomas, or other recognized credentials for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA)-eligible workers and other adults?
 - What factors contributed to the success of JOBS participants in program completion and employment?
- What factors serve as an early warning indicator for student non-completion?
- To what extent did JOBS improve employment outcomes for program participants?
 - To what extent do JOBS students obtain a livable wage after participating in the program?

In addition, Hezel Associates was provided numerous datasets from OCC's Student Information System (SIS), Colleague. These data conflicted with other data sets collected throughout the grant period. For example, JOBS staff used a document called the Quarterly Progress Report (QPR) to track student outcomes and demographic information. The data from the QPR did not align with data in the SIS, particularly in terms of student completion. In addition, students had multiple OCC IDs, making it difficult to match across data sets. However, the major obstacle was that no wage data were received. Wage data were a critical piece to conduct much of the analysis in this report. Absent wage data, there was very little new information evaluators could report on, which had not already been presented to US DOL in their annual APR.

III. Implementation Study Findings

Results from the implementation study are mixed. Although JOBS achieved most of the implementation goals detailed in the grant, the changes to the Statement of Work (SOW) caused delays regarding implementation. After an on-campus cookie manufacturer was not able to build a facility on campus, JOBS was forced to change the scope of the grant. With the absence of a critical partner, OCC was forced to amend the grant project plan. This process took nearly a year and a half and substantially slowed the implementation process.

The grant also faced delays in approval of clock-hour financial aid for competency-based, non-credit courses at OCC. However, JOBS staff was able to obtain full-funding for most students, as they worked to secure financial aid for non-credit, competency-based programs.

JOBS staff were extremely committed to supporting students anyway they could. Throughout the grant performance period, there are countless examples of JOBS helping students obtain bus passes, internet access, clothing, food, and legal support. Overall, the grant implementation produced mixed results. Practices and policies, such as recruitment of students, and in-take procedures, varied across programs.

IV. Participant Impacts & Outcomes Summary

Although OCC has access to wage data, Hezel Associates was not provided these data, and therefore was unable to conduct any rigorous analysis on program outcomes. When appropriate, evaluators reference self-reported data and data collected in JOBS QPR document. However, the findings are limited in terms of participant impacts and outcomes. Hezel Associates understands the importance of this grant, and how these programs impact students and the local economy. Should wage data become available to evaluators, we will amend this report and conduct a more comprehensive review on program impact.

V. Conclusions

OCC JOBS program had mixed results regarding implementation, and the outcomes assessment of the program was not conducted due to the lack of data. Below, evaluators present conclusions from this evaluation and offer recommendations to consider moving forward.

Changes to the SOW hindered program implementation

The SOW amendment took a year and a half to complete. During that period, JOBS lost significant time, and lacked direction on how to move the grant forward. Although the team managed to meet most of the deliverables in the grant, JOBS staff were in a constant battle

against time to complete objectives. The multiple models, processes, and strategies for programs may be indicative of the changes to the SOW, and the necessity to build programs and iterate for future cohorts.

Outcomes from grant-funded activities are unknown due to limitations in data

The JOBS program impact on wages and employment opportunities is currently unknown due to limitations in data received. JOBS programs were designed as non-credit and competency based. Limited evidence was provided on who completed the program, as data between Colleague and records kept from JOBS staff conflicted. Evaluators were unable to identify the kinds of certifications or awards provided to students who completed a JOBS program.

JOBS staff were extremely dedicated to the advancement of the students served

Throughout this report, numerous examples were provided of the generosity and commitment to students JOBS staff exhibited. They supported students in a variety of ways, whether that was purchasing boots, clothing, bus tickets, or offering support to work through a complicated personal issue, OCC was genuinely committed to helping students succeed, and put them on a path towards employment.

Strong employer relationships emerged throughout the grant period

JOBS staff developed numerous relationships with employers. Since the JOBS team mostly relocated to Central New York (CNY), they created and built networks from the ground up. These efforts paid dividends, especially in the manufacturing program, which seemed to have the most concrete model and partnerships with local employers.

JOBS contributed to changes in institutional wide practices at OCC

One success was the changes to institutional wide practices at OCC. With the JOBS funding, OCC was able to create non-credit, competency-based education, serving a very particular need within the CNY community. Financial aid is now available for non-credit programs, which is new to OCC. The JOBS team also create several different models of education and learned how to create and manage short-term training for individuals.

Evaluation could not assess Phlebotomy, Medical Assistant, and CASS programs.

Evaluators attempted to gain information from these programs, such as contact lists, faculty information, and outcomes data. However, limited information was received, therefore there were little data to discuss in this report.

VI. Recommendations

Although the JOBS program faced many challenges, such as delays in implementation, there were success throughout the program. Building on this report's findings, evaluators present the following recommendations.

Evaluate future programs for duplication at OCC

JOBS should look critically at whether their programs are duplicating efforts at OCC. Programs may serve different populations and needs, but there may be potential ways to improve collaborations between traditional and competency-based training across the institution. OCC, collectively, may be able to use resources more efficiently by assessing programs and avoiding

duplication. The programs may serve different populations and needs, but streamlining programs should be explored. Programs such as the Line Cook suffered from low enrollment numbers, and OCC offers numerous similar programs. Partnerships may emerge among programs, and OCC can offer a unique experience for the student, capitalizing on the strengths of traditional and competency-based education.

Hire a data analyst for workforce-related programs

According to program documentation, OCC originally intended to hire a Data Analyst to support the JOBS program. This position could have been very beneficial within the grant, as JOBS struggled with data management for program assessment, and ultimately, was unable to provide critical information to evaluators. Moving forward, the analyst can play a critical role in (a) assessing quality of programs, (b) investigating market demand, and (c) exploring existing data at OCC to understand program effectiveness.

Continue to build employer relationships

As some workforce programs are already in place for the fall, JOBS must continue to build relationships and identify opportunities to train individuals. By continuing to grow and nurture relationships, OCC can continue to share their work in the community, and identify new, innovative programs and partnerships.

Conduct annual strategic planning

JOBS programs are rooted in a clear mission of providing necessary and sufficient training that leads directly to a living wage job. However, the programs are often implemented differently. Evaluators propose developing consistency across program implementation, especially regarding processes and procedures, which may help advance the mission of Workforce Development at OCC

Mechanical Operator program evolved throughout the grant period

The Mechanical Operator program model had several iterations in the grant period, with differences in curriculum, recruitment, and employer engagement. JOBS tested different strategies on how to best work with employers. The apprenticeship model, implemented later in the grant, seems to be the direction JOBS will manage in the future.

Students spoke very highly of manufacturing faculty

After the manufacturing pilot, JOBS made substantial changes to the program, one of which was hiring a new instructor. Students and the professor worked well together and developed positive relationships with each other

These recommendations are intended to help guide the next iteration of the JOBS initiative. Throughout the grant period, JOBS made substantial gains on laying a strong foundation for future growth. With many institutional practices now in place, such as clock hour financial aid and with JOBS staff having strong relationships with employers, OCC is primed to build on the successful practices which emerged from the JOBS initiative.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	11
Methods	13
Study Design: Convergent Parallel Design	13
Target Population & Comparison Group.....	13
Phase 1: Design of the qualitative and quantitative strands.....	13
Qualitative Strand	14
Quantitative Strand	15
Phase 2: Independently analyze quantitative and qualitative data.....	16
Qualitative Data Analysis	16
Quantitative Data Analysis	17
Phase 3: Merge qualitative and quantitative findings.....	17
Phase 4: Interpret the merged results	17
Findings	18
Evaluation Question 1.....	18
Evaluation Question 2.....	18
Evaluation Question 3.....	19
Evaluation Question 4.....	20
Evaluation Question 5.....	22
Evaluation Question 6.....	24
Evaluation Question 7.....	24
Evaluation Question 8.....	26
Evaluation Question 9.....	27
Evaluation Question 10.....	28
Evaluation Question 11.....	28
Conclusions	30
Recommendations	31
References	33
Appendix A: Focus Group Protocol	34
Appendix B: Staff Interview Protocol	36
Appendix C: Employer Interview Protocol	41
Appendix D: Participant Questionnaire	45
Appendix E: Document Review Framework	54

INTRODUCTION

In September of 2014, Onondaga Community College (OCC) received a Round 4 Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College Career Training (TAACCCT) grant award through the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). Throughout the grant period, Hezel Associates, a custom research, evaluation, and planning firm, based in Syracuse, New York, has served as the third-party evaluator. This final, summative report provides an overall assessment of the quality of implementation and impact of grant funding. To assess this program, Hezel Associates conducted a quasi-experimental mixed methods study to answer the following research questions regarding impact and outcomes of Joint Operations for a Better Syracuse (JOBS) participants:

1. To what extent did JOBS activities increase student retention rates and the attainment of certifications, certificates, diplomas, or other recognized credentials for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA)-eligible workers and other adults?
2. What factors contributed to the success of JOBS participants in program completion and employment?
 - 2.1. What factors serve as an early warning indicator for student non-completion?
3. To what extent did JOBS improve employment outcomes for program participants?
 - 3.1. To what extent do JOBS students obtain a livable wage after participating in the program?

Further, the evaluation is focused on the following research questions to assess implementation fidelity and quality:

4. How was the particular curriculum selected, used, or created?
5. How was the program managed or implemented?
 - 5.1. How were programs and program design improved or expanded using grant funds?
 - 5.2. What delivery methods were offered?
 - 5.3. What was the program administrative structure?
 - 5.4. What support services and other services were offered?
6. Did the grantees conduct an in-depth assessment of participants' abilities, skills, and interests to select participants into the grant program?
 - 6.1. What assessment tools and process were used?
 - 6.2. Who conducted the assessment?
 - 6.3. How were the assessment results used?
 - 6.4. Were the assessment results useful in determining the appropriate program and course sequence for participants?
 - 6.5. Was career guidance provided and if so, through what methods?
7. What contributions did each of the partners (employers, workforce system, other training providers and educators, philanthropic organizations, and others as applicable) make in terms of (a) program design, (b) curriculum development, (c) recruitment, (d) training, (e) placement, (f) program management, (g) leveraging of resources, and (h) commitment to program sustainability?
 - 7.1. What factors contributed to partners' involvement or lack of involvement in the program?
 - 7.2. Which contributions from partners were most critical to the success of the grant program?
 - 7.3. Which contributions from partners had less of an impact?

8. What promising practices emerged from the implementation process?
9. To what extent has institutional capacity changed?
10. To what extent are JOBS programs aligned to market needs?
11. To what degree are JOBS participants prepared with the soft-skills necessary for success in the workforce?

Evaluators have provided JOBS staff with reports that provide formative feedback regarding implementation quality, designed to support program improvements. This report details the evaluation methods and findings from the grant performance period. The findings in this report serve as the basis for the conclusions and recommendations which evaluators present.

METHODS

Researchers conducted a mixed methods study to assess the quality of implementation and the impact of OCC’s TAACCT Round 4 funding. This section describes this study’s underlying methodological framework, including design components and related evaluative activities.

Study Design: Convergent Parallel Design

To address each evaluation question, Hezel Associates applied a mixed methods approach, collecting, analyzing, and mixing quantitative and qualitative data within a single study (Creswell & Clark, 2011). Researchers selected a mixed methods design knowing that neither qualitative nor quantitative data alone would provide the depth and understanding needed to answer the complexity of each evaluation question. Both qualitative and quantitative data were required to assess the JOBS program implementation (regarding the quality and timeliness of proposed grant activities) and impact (regarding students’ wages and employment outcomes).

Weighing the benefits and limitations of various mixed methods research designs, researchers concluded that the convergent parallel design (convergent design) was the most appropriate option for this study. The convergent design requires researchers to collect and analyze independent strands of qualitative and quantitative data in one phase, followed by merging the results of the two strands—looking for convergence, divergence, contradictions, or relationships between the qualitative and quantitative data. This approach allowed researchers to establish valid, and well-substantiated conclusions about the implementation and impact of the JOBS program (Creswell & Clark, 2011).

Target Population & Comparison Group

To be eligible to participate in this study, an individual must have been involved in the JOBS program as a student or key stakeholder (e.g., faculty, staff, or employer). OCC provided Hezel Associates with email contacts for those eligible to participate in the study. However, contact information for both students and employers was incomplete. Table 2 below provides additional details on the total population for this study.

Table 2. Study Population

Stakeholder	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
Students	-	70	198	74	342
Staff	5	8	8	10	10
Employer Partners	-	37	41	39	78
Total	5	115	247	123	430

Note. Year one of the program did not involve any students or employer partners. The total column includes only unique participants. Number of eligible students differs from total enrolled, this is due to evaluators not being provided contact information for all enrolled students. Number of employer partners may be higher than numbers reflected in the table, since evaluators did not receive all contact information. Table 2 represents only contact information that was made available to evaluators.

Phase 1: Design of the qualitative and quantitative strands

During Phase 1 of the convergent design, Hezel Associates developed instrumentation for the qualitative and quantitative components of the study. Within this phase, evaluators collected data

in preparation for the second phase of the study, in which qualitative and quantitative data were independently analyzed.

Qualitative Strand

Qualitative data were collected through student/participant focus groups (Appendix A), and interviews with JOBS staff (Appendix B) and industry employers (Appendix C).

Participant Focus Group

Hezel Associates conducted five focus groups with participants during the grant period. The Focus Group Protocol (Appendix A) used was semi-structured and collected information regarding student perceptions of their experiences in the JOBS program. Students were provided with an Informed Consent Document, which explained the study, focus group processes and procedures, and all associated benefits and risks. The form was reviewed with the evaluator and participants were asked to sign the form to provide consent if they agreed to participate, or they could decline participation. Focus groups were recorded with participants’ permission and later transcribed into a word document for analysis.

Focus groups were conducted with manufacturing students in December 2015, February 2017, and August 2018. Evaluators facilitated a focus group with Line Cook students in February 2017. An additional focus group was conducted in February 2017 with Medical Billing students. Evaluators were unable to arrange focus groups with other programs, as faculty or staff were non-responsive on coordination efforts.

Program Staff Interviews

Hezel Associates administered interviews with program staff during each year of the grant. A 13-question protocol was created to guide interviews with program staff. OCC staff coordinated interview times with seven program staff members. Interviewed staff were knowledgeable about implementation practices related to grant funded activities. The interviews were semi-structured, allowing the evaluator to take unplanned tangents as warranted, designed to maximize the data collection process. The in-person interviews occurred in February 2018, 2017, and 2016, and November 2015. A document with consent language, explaining the risks and benefits of the study, was provided to each interviewee prior to starting the interview. Each interviewee provided consent to be recorded and the interview was transcribed into a word document for analysis. JOBS staff were provided a data summary shortly after the interviews were completed.

Table 3. Jobs Staff Interview Response Rate

Grant Year	n	Response Rate (%)
Year 1	5	62.5
Year 2	8	100.0
Year 3	10	100.0
Year 4	12	100.0

Note. The sample size differed across years due to changes in hiring.

Employer Interviews

An 8-question protocol was created to guide interviews with employers. OCC was asked to provide contact information for employers who have been engaged with the program, either by

hosting a practicum, participating in a DACUM panel, or hiring a student. The majority of contact information received was by individuals who participated in a DACUM panel. Evaluators obtained limited contact information of JOBS trainees’ supervisors. A document with consent language explaining the risks and benefits of the study was provided to each interviewee by email prior to starting the phone interview. The interviews occurred in June of 2016, September of 2017, and July of 2018. Each interviewee provided consent to be recorded and the interview was transcribed into a word document for analysis.

Table 4. Employer Interview Response Rate

Year	n	%
Year 1	0	-
Year 2	11	29.7
Year 3	7	17.1
Year 4	8	20.5

Note. The sample size differed across years. Year 1 (n = 0), Year 2 (n = 37), Year 3 (n = 41), Year 4 (n = 39).

Document Review Framework

Hezel Associates developed a Document Review Framework (Appendix E) using the work plan designed by OCC. Hezel Associate’s original Document Review Framework was based on the work plan in the Technical Proposal, but was amended once the new SOW was approved. The protocol was reviewed with OCC during the summer of 2016. The matrix creates an outline of milestones and deliverables for OCC project staff and Hezel Associates to follow in identifying appropriate documents for review.

Quantitative Strand

The quantitative strand included a participant questionnaire (Appendix D). In addition, evaluators were presented with extant data related to JOBS programming.

Participant Questionnaire

Hezel Associates administered a participant questionnaire annually. The online questionnaire was intended for individuals who were current or former participants of a JOBS program of study or general project activity. The questionnaire consists of 24 questions exploring (a) demographic and respondent characteristics, (b) program and support services perceptions, (c) credit for prior learning, (d) employment status and outcomes, and (e) how they heard about their program. JOBS staff were provided the opportunity to review the survey during development, but no input was received.

Evaluators obtained student email addresses by accessing a shared Google Document hosted by program staff. Originally, a JOBS staff member was going to send out the survey link from in an attempt to increase student participation rate. Instead, Hezel Associates distributed the survey. The contact spreadsheet did not include information for all students and evaluators could not obtain missing information, therefore not all students were provided the opportunity to participate in the survey. Table 5 details the response rates for each year of the grant.

Table 5. Student questionnaire participation rate

Year	n	Response Rate (%)
Year 2	7	10.0
Year 3	37	32.4
Year 4	14	18.9
Total	58	17.1

Note. The sample size differed across years. Year 2 (n = 70), Year 3 (n = 114), Year 4 (n = 74). Evaluators accessed email addresses that were logged in a Google Spreadsheet by program staff. Some contact information was missing for students, leading to the discrepancies in sample size and inability to contact all students in the program. Students had not started the program in Year 1 (n = 0).

Student Extant Data

Hezel Associates requested student data to address evaluation questions related to program outcomes. Extant data were shared using Google Spreadsheets. Hezel Associates requested that OCC provide data regarding NY US Wage and Unemployment Insurance data and comparison cohort data from similar programs at OCC. This included demographic and wage data information from the Advanced Machining Certification, Apprentice Training: Building Trades (A.A.S), Apprentice Training: Electrical (A.A.S), Nursing (A.A.S.), Health Information Technology / Medical Records (A.A.S), Professional Cooking (CERT) and Hospitality Management (A.A.S) programs since 2014. Additional data requested included scores of Accuplacer and entrance exams, for both comparison and JOBS program students.

Evaluators were not provided access to many of the data requested, which limited our ability to report on findings, particularly regarding outcomes of the program. In some cases, data received were not able to be analyzed. Regarding program information, there was no way for researchers to assess if a TAACCCT funded student completed a program. Data only included program start and end date. Information about credential or certificate attainment was not included in the data file. Some extant was available in the QPR document, which JOBS staff used to track student performance. However, much of the data in this file was missing (placement exams) or conflicting (e.g., student IDs, program completion).

Phase 2: Independently analyze quantitative and qualitative data

During Phase 2 of the convergent design, evaluators independently analyzed qualitative and quantitative data.

Qualitative Data Analysis

To analyze qualitative data collected from interviews and focus groups, researchers disaggregated data by individuals' role in the grant (student, staff, employer), to reflect different contributions and experiences regarding grant activities. The qualitative analysis included (a) transcribing audio files, (b) reading through transcripts to fully immerse the researcher in the data (Patton, 2015), (c) creating brief memos on each transcript, (d) developing a preordinate coding structure based on the program logic model (Patton, 2015), (e) coding each transcript using the resulting codebook, (f) aggregating information based on research questions and codes, (g) identifying any unexpected findings, and (h) writing rich and thick descriptive narratives of interviews to address research questions (Patton, 2015). NVivo 7 was used to code and manage the qualitative data.

Several means were applied to maximize the credibility of the qualitative findings (Creswell & Clark, 2011). By describing experiences in detail, researchers could evaluate each research question and draw conclusions with greater confidence in the results (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Additionally, researchers reviewed and resolved disconfirming evidence to help verify the authenticity of patterns and themes developed from the data (Creswell & Clark 2011).

Document Review Framework

Hezel Associates collected documents and compared them to the project work plan. For available documentation, each artifact was examined, and its alignment with a strategy/activity was noted. Once all documentation was reviewed, researchers made judgments for each strategy and activity, noting if enough documentary evidence was available to indicate if the strategy was in alignment with the JOBS work plan.

Quantitative Data Analysis

Participant questionnaire data were assessed by calculating descriptive statistics for all items. Data were disaggregated by grant year and program. However, due to the small sample sizes, these data were rarely integrated into this report. Each year, data summaries were provided to OCC detailing findings from the student questionnaire.

Regarding student impact data, to consolidate Excel files, evaluators used the Student ID variable to match data across sets. Once all appropriate data were matched, researchers intended to use STATA to conduct statistical analysis. Since no outcomes data were provided, no analysis on these data occurred.

Phase 3: Merge qualitative and quantitative findings

After the qualitative and quantitative data strands were analyzed independently, researchers conducted side-by-side comparisons for merged data analysis. Data were compared, contrasted, and synthesized based on each research question (Creswell, 2014). These results are presented in the Findings section of this report.

Phase 4: Interpret the merged results

To interpret the merged results of the data, researchers examined the extent to which the data converged or diverged, and then developed recommendations based on a complete understanding of the data (Creswell, 2014). These insights are provided in the Conclusions and Recommendations section of this report.

FINDINGS

These findings include analysis and synthesis from all data collection activities conducted during the grant period.

Evaluation Question 1

To what extent did JOBS activities increase student retention rates and the attainment of certifications, certificates, diplomas, or other recognized credentials for Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA)-eligible workers and other adults?

Evaluators are unable to address this research question. For the 468 unique participants served, no certifications, certificates, diplomas, or other recognized credentials were awarded. However, evaluators cannot assess the accuracy of Colleague data.

Shortly into the program, JOBS staff decided to focus on the needs of employers, and many employers they spoke with did not believe that a certificate provides students with an employment advantage (regarding being a competitive applicant or higher earnings). The non-credit programs were designed to quickly train individuals to make them employable in the job market. With this short-term, non-credit focus, JOBS did not emphasize receiving a credential at the end of the program.

As program completion was described as being “workforce ready,” there are still unknowns of what was awarded to students upon completion. Conflicting evidence exists. In the medical billing course, students commented that “we get just a certificate of completion,” and one student said, “that is just a piece of paper saying we did this program,” suggesting the certification does not align with particular standards or a common credential in the field. Further, staff did refer to Line Cook and CASS participants receiving a SERV Safe credential, but no additional evidence could be found in extant student data. Although some credentials may have been awarded, there is no evidence to speak with confidence of the types and quantity, and how the credentials may have impacted job outcomes.

Evaluation Question 2

What factors contributed to the success of JOBS participants in program completion and employment? What factors serve as an early warning indicator for student non-completion?

Due to limitations in the data received, Hezel Associates is only able to answer this evaluation question partially. Unfortunately, the coding used for grant participants in Colleague does not make it clear which individuals completed the program. Evaluators contacted JOBS for clarification, but JOBS was unresponsive to requests. This uncertainty limits our understandings of factors that contributed to completion. Program start and end dates are complete for all individuals, and Program Status is also coded in a way that indicates 100% program completion.

These data conflict with data within the QPR, in which JOBS indicated some students dropped out of a program, found employment before completion, or decided the program was not the right fit. Evaluators also do not have access to any employment data, restricting evaluators’ ability to understand contributions to successful employment. Evaluators’ cannot assess quantitatively the factors that serve as an early warning indicator for non-completion.

However, throughout the grant period, evaluators gathered qualitative evidence that may provide some insights as to why a student may fail to complete a program. Students tended to speak about common challenges they face, which included reliable transportation, affordable child care, access to the internet, and financial support. JOBS staff made a good-faith effort to help students overcome barriers and help move them toward obtaining a living wage job. To JOBS' credit, they were extremely hands-on with their wrap-around services. Each year, evaluators identified numerous examples of JOBS staff working diligently to help individuals overcome obstacles to set them off into a career path. Some examples include providing students with Chromebooks and instructions on how to access the internet, either at their local library or free Wi-Fi locations. For one individual, OCC was even able to provide internet access within their home. Other cases of JOBS staff going the extra mile included going to a courthouse to provide and assist with obtaining legal services, assisting with finding an apartment, turning the heat back on in an apartment, and arranging transportation support (either by giving rides or providing bus passes).

JOBS staff worked very hard to support their students in a variety of ways, and was eager to help transform lives, doing whatever necessary to keep individuals on the right path. These examples are indicative of some of the findings of this report. Although data presented numerous limitations on assessing outcomes, numerous examples emerged that highlight the commitment that JOBS staff had to their students, and commitment to fulfilling the vision of the grant.

Evaluation Question 3

To what extent did JOBS improve employment outcomes for program participants? To what extent did JOBS students obtain a livable wage after participating in the program?

With no access to NYS Wage and Unemployment Insurance data, Hezel Associates is unable to address this question. OCC did attempt to collect self-reported wage data from participants. Available data was provided in a shared Google Spreadsheet. However, there was too much missing data for any analysis to take place. Data were collected as hourly wages and salary, potentially indicative of different employment status (part-time versus full-time). These distinctions can be explored further once wage data are received.

The sample of individuals providing wage data on the Participant Questionnaire across the grant was fairly small; however, there is still value in examining these wage outcomes. Further, though these findings might not generalize to JOBS more generally, they do provide a brief illustration of programmatic impact on a subsample of the student population. As such, outcomes will be described.

In Year 3 of the grant, of the twenty students that provided wage information, 50.0% indicated that their wages had stayed the same, most of which were students from the phlebotomy program (n = 7). In addition, 45.0% of students reported that their wages increased (n = 9), with most again representing students within the phlebotomy program (n = 5). There was only one student whose wages decreased post program participation. In the final year of the grant, some students reported wage increases while others reported not experiencing changes in their wages (43% for both), with only one person indicating a wage decrease.

In one cohort of the Medical Billing program, students were agitated that they might complete the program, and not have a practicum experience. They felt that the program “promised” a job at the end, and halfway through the program, the positions were no longer available. Students seemed to enjoy the field but felt that if JOBS did not produce an employment opportunity, they were unsure what their prospects looked like in the market.

On the other hand, in the mechanical operator program, especially in the apprenticeship cohorts, students were incredibly energetic about their employment prospects. This program model differed from medical billing, as students were assigned an employer from the beginning, and for many, were paid for the 10-week boot camp component of the course. These students knew their job prospects had improved and were confident that it would translate into a position. During the later cohorts of the apprenticeship program, students were guaranteed a position after their 10-week boot camp. Part of the enrollment process included an interview with employers, who selected a student for the practicum, and agreed to hire the student. Students expressed delight, knowing that they were assured a position after completing the 10-week boot camp, and many expressed that without the job guarantee, they were not sure they could participate in the program.

Evaluation Question 4

How was the particular curriculum selected, used, or created?

Throughout the grant period, OCC used various methods to select, use, and create curriculum. The process differed widely among each program. Evidence of curriculum being used was not received. The following presents a review of each program, based on available data.

Machine Operator

The Machine Operator program was implemented in multiple ways through the grant period. The program started with a pilot program, in which individuals were trained on basic mechanical techniques and skills. Multiple staff referred to this project as “not our typical model,” and the program was running as JOBS was working to re-scope the entire grant. Staff considered this pilot program a learning experience, as students in this cohort struggled to obtain employment. Employers commented that they felt these students signed up for the program for “the wrong reasons,” and were never interested in the manufacturing field. During practicum many students exhibited behaviors (tardiness, lack of motivation) that indicated a lack of interest in a manufacturing career.

Some consistency emerged in the Machine Operator program when a new faculty member was hired to revamp the manufacturing programs. This faculty member had dozens of years working in the manufacturing sector and also started his career in an apprenticeship program. His vision of classroom functioning like a manufacturing shop floor set the stage for significant changes to the curriculum. OCC still conducted the DACUM process to understand the needs of employers, and the faculty member worked diligently to incorporate those skills into the classroom. These skills were divided into professional (e.g., being on time, teamwork, taking the initiative, communication) and technical skills (e.g., cleaning a machine, setting up a machine, troubleshooting).

Within the classroom, the vision was to run the classroom like a “shop floor.” The teacher would develop assignments and projects to mimic what a student might experience at an employer site. Students said that the professor would often incorporate “controlled failure,” where he would intentionally change a directive or make a mistake, with the idea being that the students needed to learn how to react constructively to failure, and manage unclear directives. Students tended to enjoy these experiences and commented that they felt as though it instilled them with a sense of confidence on the job site. Also, the faculty member leveraged resources from ToolingU to provide online modules for students to complete as homework. The faculty member commented that the modules were not always phrased or written correctly, and they easily confused the students. In these cases, he used them as learning experiences in the classroom.

This curriculum process was exposed very openly to evaluators, and the faculty member welcomed the evaluation team to view his model. Students enjoyed working with this professor. Moreover, the professor often commented on how much he learned from students. The 10-week component created a strong sense of purpose and camaraderie among participants. Faculty considered themselves “privileged” and “honored” to work with the students, and felt a strong commitment to their continued success during the practicum component of the program.

Line Cook

One of the more innovative programs in this grant was the development of the teaching restaurant, With Love. Individuals learn how to not only cook and manage a kitchen, but also run a restaurant. The restaurant was managed and run by a seasoned chef and culinary expert, who often would impart wisdom on trainees and share experiences. Industry experts vetted the curriculum, but faculty admitted that due to how fluid their profession is, nothing replaces real-world experiences. The course ultimately was a blended model where students would sit and learn about techniques and strategies, and then work to exhibit those skills in the kitchen.

The Line Cook programs seemed to present an innovative way to teach and train those in the culinary industry. However, the program suffered from very low enrollment, and many of the necessary skills to be successful could not be trained. For example, one member of the JOBS team expressed concerns that with such low enrollment numbers, it was nearly impossible to give real-world experiences on delegating and supervising tasks in the kitchen. Often, faculty and staff were working side-by-side to cook dishes, wash plates, take orders, check-out customers, and prep food. This experience provides value to a student, as they learn a multitude of skills, but faculty worried that it distracted them from the educational component of the course. In such a fast-moving environment, faculty desired for students to have time to reflect on tasks and learn, and not feel overwhelmed by the pressures of managing a restaurant.

At one point during the grant, a consultant from Le Moyne was hired to help support the curriculum development process for the Line Cook program. However, no additional details were obtained on the curriculum process, or the role of the consultant.

Medical Billing

Evaluators were provided information indicating that DACUM panels were conducted with employers to help design the curriculum for Medical Billing. Medical Billing employers were

satisfied with DACUM panel results. JOBS shared outcomes of the DACUM panels with employers, and asked if they believed that the skills which emerged aligned with their needs.

One employer spoke critically about the curriculum, saying that students in their practicum were not ready. This employer commented that during one of the early cohorts, students did not have access to software to practice entries for medical billing. The employer considered this to be a baseline skill expected of employees upon hiring. “We learned the hard way that computer skills are a necessity in these positions, so not exposing students to computers was not necessarily advantageous to anybody,” they shared. In the future, the Medical Billing program adapted, and students were provided access to medical billing software to learn how to do entries, and trial runs of issues they would face in the real world.

In later cohorts, students had mixed feelings about the quality of the curriculum. They felt as though the class was too slow for some, and too fast for others. They said that their computer work was difficult because the teacher would have to spend 10 minutes with some students, while others had completed an assignment. They also desired to have access to more materials to practice at home.

For Medical Assistant, Phlebotomy, and CASS programs, evaluators were unable to obtain any information regarding curriculum. Across all programs, there seems to be a disconnect between the DACUM process and conversion into instructional materials. Faculty, who for some it was their first time teaching, did not seem to use the DACUM materials in a way that helped them develop content.

Evaluation Question 5

How was the program managed and implemented?

Throughout the grant period, the organizational structure of the grant changed. Early in the grant, there was some confusion by the staff on roles and responsibilities. The team commented that there was a lack of alignment of responsibilities. There was also concern that responsibilities were not being met, and the team could improve. As a result, JOBS staff was divided into “sub-teams,” where they could work more closely with peers and overcome some of the organizational challenges faced. The sub-teams began to meet weekly, and staff met as a full team bi-weekly to share updates across the team. This change was seen as a positive, as the staff commented that these changes helped to support improvements. One staff member shared that the programs run by JOBS require everyone to be “all hands-on-deck,” and to know what is going on within each program and student.

Staff reported they were “very happy” with the adjustments. Prior to the changes, staff felt as though they did not meet often enough to discuss the needs and collaborate across teams. One individual shared, “I like the team stuff,” and appreciated the opportunities to clarify roles and responsibilities. However, some program staff believe the grant is understaffed. As a solution, the JOBS team has hired temporary workers to help conduct more administrative tasks such as entering data, answering phone calls, and responding to emails.

For most programs developed, evaluators were unable to collect information to show how the program evolved over the grant period. One exception is the Mechanical Operator program, described below, and serves as a success of program implementation.

Mechanical Operator Program

Although the models changed throughout the grant, employees generally saw improvements from the first pilot to the cohort that completed in Spring 2018 for the Mechanical Operator program. The first cohort was described as a pilot program, as the staff were still getting acclimated to Central New York, and working to understand market needs. The pilot program was designed using the DACUM model, where employers gathered to discuss what necessary skills should emerge from the program. In addition, criteria for acceptance into the pilot program was not as rigorous as later cohorts of the Mechanical Operator program. Staff commented they felt pressured to start a program and try to get a “quick win” to move the JOBS initiative forward. They rushed recruitment process led to some individuals being in the program when JOBS staff did not think they were ultimately qualified. However, students in this cohort spoke highly of the program and enjoyed the lessons with professors.

During the practicum phase, employers met with individuals to hire them to meet the 100-hour practicum requirement of the course. One employer mentioned that he met with three students, and would not hire two of them. For the third, he “was willing to give them a shot.” The employer mentioned that overall, he did not have issues with the program and curriculum but felt as though people in the course did not want to have a career in manufacturing. Students struggled to find placements, according to staff. The staff used this as a lesson learned. Future cohorts operated and were managed much differently.

Ultimately JOBS staff moved towards a different model, where employers were critical to the recruitment and selection of students. JOBS decided to hold a job fair, which all interested students could attend to learn about the program and meet with the potential employers. Students met with employers, and were then offered to interview with prospective companies. The partnering companies would then hire the students, and sponsor them throughout the entire 10-week bootcamp, and then also provide employment for them as an apprentice at their company.

JOBS partnered with MACNY (Manufacturers Alliance of Central New York) and also with for-credit courses at OCC which are required for an apprenticeship program. This model was a shift from that with which was used on the first cohort, as employers were engaged more upfront and hired students as a core program component.

In the Fall of 2018, JOBS will once again reform the program. This time, instead of having multiple employers, there is only one. In the Summer of 2018, a local manufacturer started talking with OCC about developing a welding program. They needed to hire 12-15 individuals in the fall and wanted a customized training for new employees. OCC designed the program alongside the company and will offer the course in the Fall, post grant funding. This partnership shows some sustainability efforts are in place to continue workforce development programs, and the programs continue to evolve based on the needs of local employers.

Evaluation Question 6

Did the grantees conduct an in-depth assessment of participants' abilities, skills, and interests to select participants into the grant program?

For all programs, trainees were assessed using multiple types of placement exams. OCC conducted placement exams such as Accuplacer, LRI, and TABE. For Manufacturing, students were also assessed using the Bennet Mechanical Aptitude Test. Although there is evidence that these placement exams were provided, data are missing preventing evaluators from analyzing scores. Data regarding program completers are necessary to understand how predictive scores may be of completing a JOBS program. Many of these tests were administered at the OCC Testing Center. The tests were used as one factor of entry into the program. If a student scored too low on an assessment, OCC offered remedial work for the student. Participants also took these exams post-program, in hopes of seeing improvements in their test scores.

Evaluation Question 7

What contributions did each of the partners (employers, workforce system, other training providers and educators, philanthropic organizations, and others as applicable) make in terms of (a) program design, (b) curriculum development, (c) recruitment, (d) training, (e) placement, (f) program management, (g) leveraging of resources, and (h) commitment to program sustainability?

Throughout the grant period, partners played a critical role in creating JOBS programs. For the majority of JOBS programs, organizations participated in DACUM panels, curriculum development, practicums, facility tours, recruitment, and job placement.

Partners also played a critical role in the administration of the program. One partner, CNY Works, whose mission is to provide a single point of entry to the workforce system, offered to pay for an Office Assistant for the JOBS program. This role helped alleviate some of the administrative duties that had fallen to multiple members of the team. Also, the OCC Foundation provided hundreds of dollars worth of bus passes to students. Knowing that many students did not have cars or access to reliable transportation, the bus passes were a way to help individuals' persistence in the program and have one less obstacle preventing program completion. There were other examples as well, such as OnPoint for College providing a prepaid cell phone to a student to make calls for interviews, and the Near West Side Initiative donating supplies to the program.

Employers were very active in the development of most JOBS programs. For many programs, evaluators were able to identify how they participated, detailed below. Common trends across all programs included that OCC was able to provide various ways to fund students. Companies like CenterState CEO provided stipends and tuition coverage for students. Also, many employers were critical in the practicum experience. Staff frequently commented that it was the partners were what made the program, and they valued the commitments.

Mechanical Operator Programs

Local manufacturers played a critical role in the JOBS program. Companies such as Dannon Tool, Darco, Cryomech, Production Products Company (PPC), Evergreen, Manth Brownell,

Syracuse Label, Hutamaki, Novelis, Anheuser-Busch, Berry Plastics, Nucor Steel, United Radio, Tessy Plastics, and Schneider Packaging all contributed to the program. These companies provided students with positions for practicums, employment, and facility tours. They also contributed to the DACUM process and curriculum development.

Other partners, such as CenterState CEO and MACNY all supported students financially during the program. In addition, the Community Foundation (CFA) paid fees for 5 students (valued at \$7,875), and an additional OCC Scholarship paid tuition for 10 students (\$41,400). Also, in the fifth cohort of Manufacturing, eight students were partially funded by CFA grant, and 11 students partially funded by funds from MACNY Apprenticeship Expansion Grant (AEG) grant. Further, numerous students received food from OCC's food pantry.

Regarding program sustainability, some manufacturers have decided that they would like more customized training developed. Many cohorts included multiple employer partners, but OCC has also trialed programs with just one partner. There are advantages to both. Multiple partners may enrich the educational experience, as students in the 10-week bootcamp are exposed to different employment opportunities, careers, and tasks. However, one employer also provides a very targeted experience, and students can have a very clear understanding of the workplace climate and career path, prior to full employment post bootcamp.

Line Cook

The Line Cook programs were also provided substantial support from the employer and community partners. Before the restaurant was built, Onondaga County Office of Economic Development (OCDC) and Syracuse Land Bank provided the primary training center for Line Cook programs. Also, many students were provided tuition assistance from an OCC Scholarship and stipend from CenterState CEO. In addition, one student was provided financial support to pay their gas and electric utility bill, as they were at risk of being evicted if their heat and electricity were turned off.

CenterState CEO was also instrumental in creating the Entrepreneur in Residence (EIR). The EIR was an individual in the Line Cook program selected by CenterState CEO and JOBS. The student selected was someone who had a desire to start their own restaurant, and they were provided with real work experience by managing the With Love Restaurant. The EIR worked with JOBS to select the menu, manage the facility, and be the face of the restaurant. This position lasted 6 months, and then the cuisine of the restaurant would change, along with the EIR.

One staff member elaborated on the partnership with CenterState, noting that "CenterState has been really good about being involved with wrap around services we can't really deliver here." These services include providing the student with mentorship and training related to marketing, QuickBooks, real-estate, and strategies to start a business. CenterState CEO also provided a monthly stipend of \$1,300 to support the EIR at With Love Restaurant, and they covered tuition and fees for the individual (\$5,815).

CNY Works also partnered with the restaurant as a worksite for their youth programs and paid their participants 20 hours per week over 6 months. The Center for Community Alternatives

(CCA) provided a student in the program with a new shirt, a pair of pants, and boots, valued at \$155. JobsPlus! Students in Line Cook programs also received 30-day bus passes, valued at \$108. Finally, Catholic Charities also rented the space to use as a test kitchen.

Several local restaurants, such as Alto Cinco, The Inn Between, Empire Brewing Company, Moe's BBQ, along with national chains, Panera and Chipotle, all participated in DACUM panels. For the FSM program, Chipotle has offered support by granting a Lead Crew member to donate three hours per week for two months to share their workflow and hiring protocols, all to assist with curriculum development. The Falk School at Syracuse University also sponsored 3 interns for the FSM program.

Medical Billing

Like the other JOBS initiatives, the Medical Billing program had extensive participation from local employers. Representatives from MedBest Medical Management, Practices Resources LLC, St. Joseph's, and Medical Management Resources, Inc., all participated in the DACUM Process. A CFA grant funded several students. Also, 13 students were provided individual sessions with OCC's operator of Single Stop system of benefits.

Medical Assistant

Very little data were available regarding partnerships with the Medical Assistant program. JOBSPlus! donated a computer skills instructor to teach the MA program for six weeks at no cost.

Phlebotomy

Employers also provided support for the Phlebotomy program student clinical component. These employers included Upstate Medical, Community General and Downtown, Oswego Hospital, Crouse Hospital, Lab Alliance, St. Joseph's Hospital, and Quest Diagnostics.

For the remaining programs, very little is known about the engagement of employers. It is unknown if employers participated in the DACUM process, and to what degree they supported students with job shadowing and practicum experiences, or if these experiences occurred within this program.

Evaluation Question 8

What promising practices emerged from the implementation process?

Although the program implementation suffered from delays and was mixed regarding fidelity to model and timeliness, several promising practices emerged. One promising practice is the emphasis that JOBS staff made to get to know students, and understand any barriers they might have for program completion.

Some individuals had experience in social work, and leveraged those skills to talk with individuals about barriers and help them often navigate complex regulations and rules for accessing benefits (such as SNAP). They also were able to point them to community resources, using the Compendium of Services, which detailed different service providers and non-profits that offer support to individuals in need in CNY. From the onset, OCC made it mission critical to

give each student a person to talk to whom they felt comfortable sharing with, and throughout the program, they remained their champion and voice to help assure they stay on the right path.

Also, JOBS staff worked very hard to build relationships with individuals in CNY. Most of the grant staff were not from CNY. As such, JOBS staff were tasked with a challenge of networking and building relationships from the ground up and identifying appropriate partnerships to advance their programs. Overall, JOBS staff enjoyed this process, often commenting that CNY “is more collaborative than anywhere we have worked.”

Another promising practice that emerged was the ability to provide funding to students, absent the ability to provide financial aid. For nearly the first three years of the grant, no financial aid was available to students in competency-based, non-credit courses. To help alleviate financial pressures, JOBS staff worked with partnering agencies, such as OCDC and CenterState CEO, to assemble scholarships for students. Many students received much-needed support, without the aid, many would not be able to attend.

Evaluation Question 9

To what extent has institutional capacity changed?

The grant led to some positive institutional changes at OCC. For example, before the JOBS program, OCC offered very few non-credit, competency-based trainings. The programs that were designed by JOBS staff were transformative, and a new model for OCC. As these programs were new, JOBS staff often had to balance sensitive cultural and political issues on campus to forward their programs. They faced severe challenges regarding data collection and administration. For example, the non-credit data was not part of Colleague, OCC’s student information system (SIS). For the majority of the grant, JOBS staff were tracking student data in Google Spreadsheets, mirroring data collected in Colleague. This data collection process served to be a substantial administrative burden on the grant. Ultimately, JOBS was able to transfer their records into Colleague, yet issues still emerged regarding data quality and implementation. However, the fact that OCC now has an official record of non-credit students is certainly a positive change in institutional capacity.

Another substantial gain was the ability of OCC to offer financial aid to non-credit students. As one of the key deliverables of the grant, JOBS staff was faced with many issues to have financial aid provided. For most of the grant, funding to students was provided, through creative work by the JOBS team and OCC. OCDC awarded several scholarships, and CenterState, Community Foundation, and OCC foundation, all served as a means to help individuals who could not afford the program. Further, within the program, OCC found ways to support students with supplies. Some students were bought boots for the practicum, or new clothing to look professional at the workplace.

Another way that institutional capacity has changed is the reduction of silos among non-credit and for-credit courses. JOBS staff worked hard over the grant period to describe their programs as not competing, but serving a different purpose for a different student. JOBS staff attended various leadership meetings and invited faculty to learn more about their programs, to help

increase collaborations. Also, JOBS worked with OCC's Community Care Hub, to help students learn about the resources available to them.

Other areas of capacity building included various trainings that JOBS staff attended. Staff attended training related to DACUM and competency-based training. Additionally, JOBS leadership built in redundancy into individuals work, so several team members could conduct other individuals' responsibilities as needed. For example, several staff members were trained in the DACUM process, and all were briefed on the logistics on how to run an event.

A final area is in regard to data collection in Colleague. Prior to JOBS, non-credit, competency programs were not tracked in Colleague. JOBS staff worked in partnership with OCC's Institutional Research Office to make the necessary changes to the SIS system, and add available data into the system. Although the data was missing, or the coding was not clearly prescribed, it was certainly an advancement for the institution.

Overall, the grant did make substantial gains regarding institutional capacity and positions the program well for expansion and sustainability post-grant.

Evaluation Question 10

To what extent does the program align with market needs?

JOBS shared evidence of using EMSI and Burning Glass to research community needs and program areas. Once industries areas were identified, JOBS began to have conversations with employers to refine topic areas further and what hiring availability looks like. In their petition to re-scope their work, alignment towards market needs was a primary argument for the change. JOBS provide evidence of job opportunities in the targeted industries in CNY. The vision was that the EMSI and Burning Glass data would identify the training program to prepare the workers for careers in sectors needed the most by the community. JOBS intended to identify areas that supported individual advancement, and regional growth to best serve employers. JOBS staff conducted research to select the markets of healthcare, manufacturing, and food industry occupations, including processing, manufacturing, quality assurance, packaging, distribution, and service, as well as for supervisory positions and small business ownership.

Evaluation Question 11

To what degree are JOBS participants prepared with the soft-skills necessary for success in the workforce?

Hezel Associates only obtained limited contact information for employers. Although LRI data was provided pre-and post-, the limited data made it challenging to analyze if LRI was predictive of soft skills, and how students turned classroom experiences into real-world lessons.

Some employers did offer their perceptions of soft skills. These employers represent individuals from the Medical Billing program, and their practicum experience. Most individuals commented that the experience has "gone very well," and referred to students as being "exceptional," and they "stand-out." They were pleased with their progress and thought they were well prepared for the position. However, some employers provided a different perspective. "The students were

great—but to be honest—they were not prepared for being out in the workplace yet—and we have been very honest with them about that,” shared one employer.

Although Hezel Associates was unable to contact many of the student’s current employers or practicum sponsors, DACUM panelist contact information was provided to discuss their role in the grant. Many employers discussed the traits they are looking for in employees. These characteristics were consistent across fields. Interestingly, the majority of employers discussed the importance of soft skills. One individual commented, “They do not have any skills, they are just graduating from a program, so they have no experience, but myself personally, I am looking for work ethic, I am looking for customer service, because it is so much of what we do.”

Another characteristic that employers were looking for is a being a self-starter and taking the initiative. “I do not need employees who are going to come here and say, I can do only do exactly what you are telling me,” commented one employer. “I have limited opportunities for people like that. I got to have opportunities for people who can be knowledgeable about the processes and continue to improve skill sets and solving challenges,” They elaborated. “I think being like sort of a self-starter or having the initiative to kind of look for things,” another shared. Employer comments offer some insights into the kinds of skills they look for in an applicant. Many of the employers emphasized soft skills over technical, believing they could provide on the job-the-training for technical aspects of an employee’s work.

Finally, one employer commented that they believed the students need to show an aptitude and interest in the program areas. They felt like the students they worked with did not really have an interest in the field, and this misalignment prevented them from growing in their position. “I think the most significant shortfall with candidates when they come through is they didn’t show the aptitude to be more than a machine tender,” they shared.

These findings represent Hezel Associates’ current knowledge of the program based on available data. The findings are the basis for the conclusions and recommendations, provided in the following section.

CONCLUSIONS

OCC JOBS program had mixed results regarding implementation, and the outcomes assessment of the program was not conducted due to the lack of data. Below, evaluators present conclusions from this evaluation and offer recommendations to consider moving forward.

Changes to the SOW hindered program implementation

The SOW amendment took a year and a half to complete. During that period, JOBS lost significant time, and lacked direction on how to move the grant forward. Although the team managed to meet most of the deliverables in the grant, JOBS staff were in a constant battle against time to complete objectives. The multiple models, processes, and strategies for programs may be indicative of the changes to the SOW, and the necessity to build programs and iterate for future cohorts.

Outcomes from grant-funded activities are unknown due to limitations in data

The JOBS program impact on wages and employment opportunities is currently unknown due to limitations in data received. JOBS programs were designed as non-credit and competency based. Limited evidence was provided on who completed the program, as data between Colleague and records kept from JOBS staff conflicted. Evaluators were unable to identify the kinds of certifications or awards provided to students who completed a JOBS program.

JOBS staff were extremely dedicated to the advancement of the students served

Throughout this report, numerous examples were provided of the generosity and commitment to students JOBS staff exhibited. They supported students in a variety of ways, whether that was purchasing boots, clothing, bus tickets, or offering support to work through a complicated personal issue, OCC was genuinely committed to helping students succeed, and put them on a path towards employment.

Strong employer relationships emerged throughout the grant period

JOBS staff developed numerous relationships with employers. Since the JOBS team mostly relocated to Central New York (CNY), they created and built networks from the ground up. These efforts paid dividends, especially in the manufacturing program, which seemed to have the most concrete model and partnerships with local employers.

JOBS contributed to changes in institutional wide practices at OCC

One success was the changes to institutional wide practices at OCC. With the JOBS funding, OCC was able to create non-credit, competency-based education, serving a very particular need within the CNY community. Financial aid is now available for non-credit programs, which is new to OCC. The JOBS team also create several different models of education and learned how to create and manage short-term training for individuals.

Evaluation could not assess Phlebotomy, Medical Assistant, and CASS programs.

Evaluators attempted to gain information from these programs, such as contact lists, faculty information, and outcomes data. However, limited information was received, therefore there were little data to discuss in this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the JOBS program faced many challenges, such as delays in implementation, there were success throughout the program. Building on this report's findings, evaluators present the following recommendations.

Evaluate future programs for duplication at OCC

JOBS should look critically at whether their programs are duplicating efforts at OCC. Programs may serve different populations and needs, but there may be potential ways to improve collaborations between traditional and competency-based training across the institution. OCC, collectively, may be able to use resources more efficiently by assessing programs and avoiding duplication. The programs may serve different populations and needs, but streamlining programs should be explored. Programs such as the Line Cook suffered from low enrollment numbers, and OCC offers numerous similar programs. Partnerships may emerge among programs, and OCC can offer a unique experience for the student, capitalizing on the strengths of traditional and competency-based education.

Hire a data analyst for workforce-related programs

According to program documentation, OCC original intended to hire a Data Analyst to support the JOBS program. This position could have been very beneficial within the grant, as JOBS struggled with data management for program assessment, and ultimately, was unable to provide critical information to evaluators. Moving forward, the analyst can play a critical role in (a) assessing quality of programs, (b) investigating market demand, and (c) exploring existing data at OCC to understand program effectiveness.

Continue to build employer relationships

As some workforce programs are already in place for the fall, JOBS must continue to build relationships and identify opportunities to train individuals. By continuing to grow and nurture relationships, OCC can continue to share their work in the community, and identify new, innovative programs and partnerships.

Conduct annual strategic planning

JOBS programs are rooted in a clear mission of providing necessary and sufficient training that leads directly to a living wage job. However, the programs are often implemented differently. Evaluators propose developing consistency across program implementation, especially regarding processes and procedures, which may help advance the mission of Workforce Development at OCC

Mechanical Operator program evolved throughout the grant period

The Mechanical Operator program model had several iterations in the grant period, with differences in curriculum, recruitment, and employer engagement. JOBS tested different strategies on how to best work with employers. The apprenticeship model, implemented later in the grant, seems to be the direction JOBS will manage in the future.

Students spoke very highly of manufacturing faculty

After the manufacturing pilot, JOBS made substantial changes to the program, one of which was hiring a new instructor. Students and the professor worked well together and developed positive relationships with each other

These recommendations are intended to help guide the next iteration of the JOBS initiative. Throughout the grant period, JOBS made substantial gains on laying a strong foundation for future growth. With many institutional practices now in place, such as clock hour financial aid and with JOBS staff having strong relationships with employers, OCC is primed to build on the successful practices which emerged from the JOBS initiative.

REFERENCES

Creswell, J. W., & Clark., V.P. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G., (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

APPENDIX A: FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL

OCC TAACCT Evaluation Focus Group Protocol

Format	Qualitative research to assess program implementation and perceptions of impact.
Research Questions	Interview questions will address Research Questions 1,2,3,4,5,10,11.
Timeline	Data collection and analysis will be conducted in the spring of 2016.
Process	<p>Student participants of the focus group will be determined by an initial document review and advisement from OCC. Each focus group will consist of 5-7 individuals and will be moderated by a Hezel Associates researcher. Consent forms will be provided to all members of the focus group prior to the beginning of the focus group. The session will be recorded, and those wishing not to be recorded will be asked not to participate.</p> <p>Participants will be asked to sit in a circle, whenever possible, with the facilitator included in the circle. A notetaker, if present, will sit outside the circle. The recording device should be placed in the center of the circle. The focus group facilitator should use this protocol as a guide, while following up on individuals' responses. The facilitator should not take notes.</p>
Instructions	We are conducting focus groups with participants of the OCC TAACCT program in order to gain further insights on the impact of the program to develop the necessary skills for the workforce. The information will be used to inform improvements to the current strategy and as part of the formal review process of OCC's TAACCCT grant. Responses will not be attributed to any individual, and we encourage to provide honest responses to all questions.

Focus Groups with OCC TAACCT participants

1. Which program did you or are you participating in at OCC? ^{2,2.1, 4.5,5.1}
 - a. Why did you decide to participate in the program?
 - b. What did you enjoy most about the program? Dislike?
 - c. Where there any challenges to participating in the program?
2. What kind of credential/diploma or degree will you receive after completion?^{1,3}
 - a. Why is this credential/diploma beneficial to your job search?
 - b. How will/did this credential/diploma impact your wages? (*Probe: find out why/how impacts job wages*).
 - c. How did/will this credential make you more competitive in the job market?
3. What kind of support did OCC provide to you while in the program? Anything job search related or career advisement? ^{3, 3.1,5,5.1,5.2,,5.3, 5.4}
 - a. What kind of career counseling did you receive during the program?
 - i. If yes: How so?
 - ii. If no: What would have been beneficial to you?
 - b. What kinds of other support services were available to you?
4. What skills have you obtained through the program? ^{10,11}
 - a. Do you believe these skills are transferable to the workforce? (*Probe for soft skills versus technical skills*)
5. What else would you like to share about the program that maybe we haven't talked about today?

APPENDIX B: STAFF INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

OCC TAACCCT Round 4 Staff Interview Protocol

Format	<p>Qualitative research to collect opinions, and will span a broad range of issues regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Organizational Structure/Governance• Curriculum Development• Program Design• Partner Support• Broader View/Future <p>Semi-structured interview protocol outlines pre-determined questions, and allows the interview to probe and pursue unplanned tangents as conversations warrant.</p> <p>Respondents will be recruited via email.</p>
Targets	<p>Respondents will be faculty and staff members involved in program development.</p>
Research Questions	<p>Interview questions will address Research Questions 4,5,6,7,8,9,10.</p>
Timeline	<p>Interviews will take approximately 45-60 minutes and will be conducted by telephone July 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018.</p>

Initial Recruiting Email

Onondaga Community College (OCC) has partnered with Hezel Associates, a research firm in Syracuse, NY, to conduct the independent evaluation of the USDOL TAACCCT Round 4 grant awarded to OCC.

As a part of our responsibilities, we will be conducting phone interviews with representatives from the TAACCCT programs to better understand the grant activities. You have been selected as a potential participant due to your involvement in the grant activities. The purpose of our study is to provide feedback to the Project Director and to help improve grant funded activities.

Telephone interviews will require 45-60 minutes. We are scheduling interviews between [specify date range]. Please respond to this email with times and dates if you are available to participate in an interview during this timeframe. We will send you a return email confirming your scheduled interview.

This study is being coordinated with Shaunna Jagneaux, TAACCCT Project Manager, OCC. If you have any questions about the evaluation or interviews, she can be reached by email at s.l.jagneaux@sunyocc.edu. You are also welcome to contact me if you need more specific information regarding details of the evaluation study.

Thank you in advance for your support.

Sincerely,

[SIGNATURE OF SENDER]

Pre-Interview Confirmation (via email), with Informed Consent Attachment

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the TAACCCT grant evaluation process.

As part of the TAACCCT project evaluation, Hezel Associates will be interviewing program staff to explore the grant's development and implementation.

Your interview has been scheduled for:

[INSERT DATE / TIME]

We will call you at [INSERT PHONE #]. We expect the interview will last 45 minutes to 1 hour.

Your individual responses will be kept confidential and aggregated for the report. No personally identifying information will be reported, and we will make every effort to protect your identity when we present our findings. Please review the Informed Consent document attached to this email prior to the interview.

If you have any questions about the evaluation or your participation feel free to contact myself, Shaunna Jagneaux, or you may email Solutions IRB (our external review board charged with ensuring we treat evaluation study participants ethically) at participants@solutionsirb.com.

Thank you for your participation,

[SIGNATURE OF SENDER]

Interviewer Instructions

ITEMS IN ITALICS SHOULD NOT BE READ TO INTERVIEWEE

Phone Interview Introduction

Hello, this is _____ from Hezel Associates. I'm calling about the interview we have scheduled to discuss your involvement in the TAACCCT project.

Is now still a convenient time to talk?

As a reminder, your responses will be kept confidential and aggregated for the report. No personally identifying information will be reported, and we make every effort to protect your identity when we present our findings. You can stop the interview at any time and skip any questions you are not comfortable answering. You can also choose to withdraw your responses.

Have you read the informed consent document that was emailed to you?

IF NOT, GO OVER THE MAJOR SECTIONS WITH THEM, ESPECIALLY BENEFITS AND RISKS.

Do you have any questions about the consent form or the study?

Do you agree to participate in the interview?

I would like to record our interview to support my note-taking. The recording will not be used for any other purpose. May I have your permission to record our conversation?

IF PARTICIPANT DECLINES RECORDING, RESEARCHER WILL TAKE NOTES.

Questions

Organizational Structure/Governance

To start off, I'd like to talk about the organizational structure and governance of the grant...

1. Please describe your role in the JOBS program.^{4,5,9}
 - a. How did you get involved?
2. Can you explain the organizational structure of the TAACCCT grant?⁵
 - a. Can you speak about implementation strategies? What is the administrative structure? (*Probe: implementation of strategies, leadership, administrative structure*)^{5, 5.3}
 - b. What are your perceptions of the project organization and/or management?⁵

Curriculum Development

Next, I'd like to know more about curriculum development...

3. Please describe your role in curriculum development.⁴
(*If not involved in curriculum development, skip to Program Design section*)
4. Could you walk me through the curriculum development process?⁴
 - a. How was the program curriculum designed?
(*Probe: how it was/will be selected/created/used, communication methods, plan for industry alignment, challenges, success, DACUM process*)⁴
5. (*If curriculum development not started yet*) What is your plan for curriculum development?
(*Probe: how it will be selected/created/used, communication methods, plan for industry alignment*)⁴

Program Design

Shifting now to the program design...

6. Could you describe the program(s) you are involved in?^{4,5,9}
 - b. Where there any program changes made that you were aware of?
(*Probe: existing program changes, improvement, expansion, delivery method, administrative structure, student intake, prior learning*)^{5.1, 5.2, 5.3,5.4, 6, 7}
7. What services for students are offered or will be offered as a result of the TAACCCT project?^{5.4}
8. Are there any existing challenges to the program? Did you foresee any on the horizon?^{8,9}
9. Do you believe that the program aligns with market needs?¹⁰

Partner Support

I'd like to know more about partner support...

10. Can you tell me about the contributions that partners have made or are planning to make to the program? ^{7,7.1,7.2}

(Examples—employers, workforce agencies, external education providers with program design, curriculum, recruitment, training, resources, or commitment to sustainability)

(Probe: factors impacting involvement, most and least critical contributions, challenges, successes)

Conclusion

11. Describe any capacity building within your department that you expect to see as a result of this project.⁹

a. What about at OCC?

(Probe: programmatic, procedural, cultural) ⁹

12. What is your overall opinion of the TAACCCT project? Do you have any suggestions for improving the project?^{5,9}

(Draw from any negative answers to previous question)

Thank you, that's it for my questions:

13. Is there anything else you'd like to say about the grant or the programs in general?

APPENDIX C: EMPLOYER INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

OCC TAACCCT Round 4 Employer/Industry Stakeholder Interview Protocol

Format	<p>Qualitative research to collect opinions, and will span a broad range of issues regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Involvement in the JOBS program• Alignment with industry needs• Contributions to program design• Partner Support• Broader View/Future <p>Semi-structured interview protocol outlines pre-determined questions, and allows the interviewer to probe and pursue unplanned tangents as conversations warrant.</p> <p>Respondents will be recruited via email.</p>
Targets	<p>Respondents will be employer and industry stakeholders involved in program development.</p>
Research Questions	<p>Interview questions will address Research Questions 3, 7, 8, 10, 11.</p>
Timeline	<p>Interviews will take approximately 20-30 minutes and will be conducted by telephone March 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018.</p>

Initial Recruiting Email

Onondaga Community College (OCC) has partnered with Hezel Associates, a research firm in Syracuse, NY, to conduct the independent evaluation of the USDOL TAACCCT Round 4 grant awarded to OCC.

As a part of our responsibilities, we will be conducting phone interviews with employers and other stakeholders from the TAACCCT programs to better understand how grant activities align with industry needs. You have been selected as a potential participant due to your involvement in the grant activities. The purpose of our study is to provide feedback to the Project Director and to help improve grant-funded activities.

Telephone interviews will require 20-30 minutes. We are scheduling interviews between [specify date range]. Please respond to this email with times and dates if you are available to participate in an interview during this timeframe. We will send you a return email confirming your scheduled interview.

This study is being coordinated with Shaunna Jagneaux, TAACCCT Project Manager, OCC. If you have any questions about the evaluation or interviews, she can be reached by email at s.l.jagneaux@sunyocc.edu. You are also welcome to contact me if you need more specific information regarding details of the evaluation study.

Thank you in advance for your support as we move forward with this important study.

Sincerely,

[SIGNATURE OF SENDER]

Pre-Interview Confirmation (via email), with Informed Consent Attachment

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the TAACCCT grant evaluation process.

Your interview has been scheduled for: [INSERT DATE / TIME]

We will call you at [INSERT PHONE #]. We expect the interview will last 20 to 30 minutes.

Your individual responses will be kept confidential and aggregated for the report. No personally identifying information will be reported, and we will make every effort to protect your identity when we present our findings. Please review the Informed Consent document attached to this email prior to the interview.

If you have any questions about the evaluation or your participation feel free to contact me, Shaunna Jagneaux, or you may email Solutions IRB (our external review board charged with ensuring we treat evaluation study participants ethically) at participants@solutionsirb.com.

Thank you for your participation,

[SIGNATURE OF SENDER]

Interview Instructions

ITEMS IN ITALICS SHOULD NOT BE READ TO INTERVIEWEE

Phone Interview Introduction

Hello, this is _____ from Hezel Associates. I'm calling about the interview we have scheduled to discuss your involvement in the TAACCCT project.

Is now still a convenient time to talk?

As a reminder, your responses will be kept confidential and aggregated for the report. No personally identifying information will be reported, and we will make every effort to protect your identity when we present our findings. You can stop the interview at any time and skip any questions you are not comfortable answering. You can also choose to withdraw your responses.

Have you read the informed consent document that was emailed to you?

IF NOT, GO OVER THE MAJOR SECTIONS WITH THEM, ESPECIALLY BENEFITS AND RISKS.

Do you have any questions concerning the consent form or the study?

Do you agree to participate in the interview?

I would like to record our interview to support my note-taking. The recording will not be used for any other purpose. May I have your permission to record our conversation?

IF PARTICIPANT DECLINES RECORDING, RESEARCHER WILL TAKE NOTES.

Questions

Involvement in the TAACCCT Project.

2. To begin, tell me a little about your company/organization.
3. Can you please describe your involvement in the JOBS program at OCC? ^{7,7.1,7.2,7.3}
 - a. How did you get involved?
 - b. What were you asked to do?
 - c. How have you contributed to JOBS?

(Probe: new relationship or existing, curriculum development, factors impacting involvement, most and least critical contributions, challenges, successes)

Alignment with Industry Needs

4. How will the program affect your company? ^{7,7.1,7.2,7.3,8,10}
 - a. Has your company hired any individuals who have completed the JOBS program?
 - i. Yes: What made that individual a good candidate? ^{3,3.1}
 1. What can you say about their performance on the job? (probe soft skills, communication, and technical skills). ¹¹
 2. Do you know what the average salary was of those you employed from the JOBS program? ^{3,3.1}
 - ii. No: Why not?
5. How do you envision JOBS fitting into the future labor market in your region? ^{7,7.1,7.2,7.3, 10}
6. How do the skills taught in the program align with the skills you are looking for in your workers? *(Probe: missing skills, additional job training required, what other employers are looking for)* ^{7,7.1,7.2,7.3, 10}

Conclusion

5. What is your overall opinion of the JOBS program? ⁷
 - a. What about the curriculum specifically?
6. Do you have any suggestions for improving the project? ⁸
(Draw from any negative answers to previous question)
7. Do you believe the program aligns with market needs? ¹⁰
8. Is there anything else you'd like to say about the TAACCCT grant or the JOBS program specifically?

APPENDIX D: PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

OCC TAACCCT Round 4 Participant Questionnaire

Student Questionnaire Initial Email

Subject: OCC Program Participation Questionnaire

Hello,

Since you are a current or former student in workforce program at OCC, I'd like to invite you to complete a brief questionnaire.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to help us understand your program of study at OCC. Your feedback is important and will potentially help improve these programs.

Please answer the following questions as honestly as possible. The online form should take about 10-15 minutes to complete. After you have reviewed the Informed Consent information below, you may click this link to begin:

<Questionnaire link>

Thank you for your participation!

Sender's name, Hezel Associates

Informed Consent

Completing this questionnaire is not anticipated to pose any risk to you. Your participation is strictly voluntary and you may withdraw your participation at any time without penalty.

All information collected will be used only for research purposes. Because this questionnaire is anonymous, there will be no connection to you specifically in the results or in future publication of the results. If you have any questions please ask or contact the TAACCCT grant manager, Shaunna Jagneaux, she can be reached by email at s.l.jagneaux@sunyocc.edu.

Additionally, if you have any concerns about your treatment as a participant in this study, please contact Solutions IRB at participants@solutionsirb.com or 1.855.226.4472.

By clicking the questionnaire link, you are verifying that you have read the explanation of the study, and that you agree to participate. You also understand that your participation in this study is strictly voluntary.

[full signature block]

Participant Questionnaire

Thank you for participating in this survey! Hezel Associates is looking for feedback on your program. Your feedback will potentially help improve the JOBS programs under the federally funded TAACCCT grant.

This survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes. Be assured that your individual responses are confidential and will be reported only as part of group feedback.

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Patrick Fiorenza at Hezel Associates (patrick@hezel.com).

Page 2

1. Are you 18 years of age or older?

- Yes
- No [*Go to Termination Page*]

[Required question]

Page 3

2. Please indicate your program at OCC:

- a. Phlebotomy
- b. Medical Billing Specialist
- c. Manufacturing Boot Camp
- d. Medical Assistant
- e. Line Cook
- f. Culinary Arts for Self Sufficiency (CASS)
- g. Other: [Please describe]

3. Why did you enroll in your program? *Mark all that apply.*

- Interest in the field
- To gain new skills
- To pursue a new career
- To receive a promotion at my current place of employment
- To receive higher wages
- Other_____

4. How did you learn about the OCC JOBS program you enrolled in?

- Brochures/flyers
- OCC alumni
- OCC faculty and/or staff
- OCC open house

- OCC website
- Email from OCC
- Family/friends
- My employer
- Newspaper
- Radio ads
- Social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn)
- TV ads
- Veteran services organization
- Workforce or unemployment agency
- Other _____

Page 4

5. Which best describes your work experience before you began your program?

- I did not have any prior work experience.
- I had experience in a field similar to my program.
- I had experience in an unrelated field.

6. Before enrolling in your program, what was the highest level of education you completed?

- Completed some high school
- High school diploma or equivalent
- Some college
- Earned a one-year (or less) certificate
- Associate's (2-year) degree
- Bachelor's (4-year) degree
- Master's degree
- Doctoral degree
- Other _____

Assessment tools

7. Did you apply for credits for prior learning?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

8. Did you receive credits for prior learning?

- Yes
- No
- Decision pending
- Unsure

Page 5

9. Did you...

- Complete the program (earn a certificate or associate's degree)?
- Withdraw from the program without completing a certificate or associate's degree?
- Other _____

[If "Complete the program" or "Other," go to Q11]

[Required question]

10. Are you still enrolled in your program?

- Yes *[Go to Q11]*
- No
- Unsure

[Required question]

Page 6

11. Why did you withdraw from the program? Mark all that apply.

- Completed what I intended to
- Decided program was not what I wanted
- Difficulty with program requirements
- Family or other external obligations
- Financial difficulties
- Found a job
- Medical issues
- Program was different than expected
- Transferred to another college
- Transferred to another program at the college
- Prefer not to answer
- Other _____

12. Choose which best describes your employment status since completing your program.

- I am working at the same company I was at before I started the program.
- I am working at a different company than I was working at before I started the program.
[Go to Q14]

- I am not employed. *[Go to Q18]*

[Required question]

Page 7

13. After completing the program, which best describes your status with your company.

- I have the same job I had before I started the program.
- I was promoted.
- I was laterally transferred.
- I was demoted.
- Unsure

Page 8

14. Is your current job related to the program you completed?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

[If Q11 = "I am working at the same company...", go to Q19]

15. Which of the following, if any, helped you get this job? Mark all that apply.

- An instructor helped me make a connection with the company
- Practicum, apprenticeship or internship experience
- College-organized tour of employer facility
- College provided career advisor
- Made a connection with the employer when they visited my college
- Other _____

16. Does the education you received in your program satisfy at least the minimum requirements for your current job?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

17. How would you describe the changes, if any, to your wages from before your enrollment to after you left the program?

- My wages increased
- My wages stayed about the same
- My wages decreased

Page 9

18. How would you describe the changes, if any, to your employment options (e.g., number of jobs you qualified for) from before your enrollment to after you left the program?

- My employment options stayed the same
- I had more options for employment than before
- I had less options for employment than before
- Unsure

[If Q11 = "I am not employed" go to Q20]

19. Thinking about your current employment, please rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:

My program prepared me with the ability to do the following in a work setting...

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Not applicable
a. Apply math skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Apply quality control knowledge	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Apply technical skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Apply writing skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Effectively communicate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Lead groups of people	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Manage my time	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. Operate equipment used in the industry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. Prioritize tasks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. Trouble-shoot technical problems	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. Use required computer software	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l. Work as a member of a team	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Support services

The following are meant to understand your use of any support services while at [college].

20. Have you used any of the following at OCC? How satisfied were you with the service?

	Did you use...				If yes, how satisfied were you with the service?						
	Yes	No	Unsure	Prefer not to answer	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied
Academic advising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Career services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Counseling	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Financial aid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In-person tutoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Transportation Services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Career Guidance

21. Please indicate whether you were aware of the following activities/services within the program and whether or not you participated.

	Not aware	Aware	If you marked aware, mark if you have ever participated in this activity/service
Interview guidance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Job fairs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Job shadowing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
One-on-one career advising	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Practicum experience	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Resume writing assistance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

22. What kind of credential, diploma, or certification did you receive from your participation in the program?

23. What barriers did you face while participating in this program?

24. How could the program improve?

25. Would you consider taking part in a follow-up interview?

- a. Yes
- b. No

26. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to answer

27. Which of the following best describes you?

- American Indian/Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black/African American
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Prefer not to answer
- Other _____

28. Do any of the following apply to you?

	Yes	No	Unsure	Prefer not to answer
Veteran or Spouse eligible for Priority of Service	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student with a disability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pell Grant recipient	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA)-eligible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

29. What is your age? *Numeric responses only.*

30. Please share any additional comments you may have about your experience with your program:

Completion Page

Thank you for completing the questionnaire!

Termination Page

Unfortunately, your responses do not meet the criteria for this questionnaire. Thank you for participating!

APPENDIX E: DOCUMENT REVIEW FRAMEWORK

Format	Qualitative research to assess fidelity with which program activities were implemented and in compliance with the timeline.
Timeline	Data collection and analysis will be conducted annually in August, and during monthly meetings with the OCC Project Director.
Process	<p>Documents will be collected through the Project Director and other OCC staff. Documentation will be provided to Hezel Associates via email or secure file transfer protocol (SFTP). The Hezel Associates' internal server may be used dependent upon the sensitivity of the documentation and the availability of a secure file transfer program through OCC's internal servers.</p> <p>The activities in the work plan will guide the identification of documentation to use as evidence.</p> <p>Once documents have been collected and sorted, content in each document will be examined and entered in the following matrix aligned with the appropriate milestones. Hezel Associates will list each document and what OCC has done to justify fulfilling that milestone under Date Received/ Status. The date that that dimension was fulfilled will be listed under the same box. Status for meeting the listed milestones will be marked met through self-reporting, met through documentary evidence, met outside the timeframe, met with no reference to the timeframe, not addressed by the documentation, or in progress.</p>
Instructions	Provide documentation supporting milestones, activities, and deliverables listed in the following matrix. Include any evidence of program implementation and compliance with timeline. Documents can be submitted as attachments via email, using Hezel Associates' internal server via SFTP, or OCC's internal servers if documents contain sensitive information. All document names and a description of each document should be included in the table of the first page. Hezel Associates will fill in Date, Status, and Evidence boxes during analysis.
Definitions	<p>Timeline: Proposed completion date of milestones listed in the work plan.</p> <p>Evidence Received: Examples of materials to be sent to evaluator</p> <p>Date Received / Status: Date the milestone was met (should the documents include a timeframe). Status for meeting milestones: met through self-reporting, met through documentary evidence, met outside the timeframe, met with no reference to the timeframe, not addressed by the documentation, or in progress.</p>

Table 6. Priority 1: Strategy 1.1 Implementation Data

Priority 1: Develop industry-driven, competency-based, stackable & latticed credential and degree pathways in targeted industries designed to meet the needs of new or transitioning workers and the businesses who need them, or those seeking self-employment.				Evidence Tracking	
	Timeline		Deliverables/Activities	Evidence Received	Status
Strategy 1.1	Start Date	Q 3&4	Ensure industry sectors identified lead to good jobs [A1] (Activity)	Market research, LMI data, glass	Late
	1/15/2015	Ongoing	Identify new employer partners each quarter [EEM-A3] (Activity)	DACUM attendance sheets, QPR, Google spreadsheet all provide evidence	Ongoing activity, occurring
	End Date	Q 2-6	Identify typical career paths for validation (Activity)	DACUM evidence and findings	Late
	10/16/2015	Q 2	Secure Burning Glass & LMI Tools (Activity)	Burning glass report	Late
		Q 4	Secure UI Wage Data Access (Activity)	No evidence provided	Complete

Table 7. Priority 1: Strategy 1.2 Implementation Data

Priority 1: Develop industry-driven, competency-based, stackable & latticed credential and degree pathways in targeted industries designed to meet the needs of new or transitioning workers and the businesses who need them, or those seeking self-employment.				Evidence Tracking	
Strategy 1.2	Start Date	Q 5,9,13	Employability & DACUM FSM profiles complete. Updated annually, published as OER	OER links, DACUM panels, DACUM agendas, participant lists	Complete
	10/14/2015	Q 4,8,12	Employability & DACUM manufacturing profiles complete. Updated annually published as OER	OER links, DACUM panels, DACUM agendas, participant lists	Complete
	End Date	Q 6,10,14	Employability & DACUM healthcare profiles complete. Updated annually published as OER	OER links, DACUM panels, DACUM agendas, participant lists	Complete
	9/17/2015	Q 5,9,13	Employability & DACUM Logistics Program profiles complete. Updated annually published as OER	OER links, DACUM panels, DACUM agendas, participant lists	Complete
		Q 5,9,13	DACUM profiles for FS Entrepreneurs complete. Updated annually published as OER.	OER links, DACUM panels, DACUM agendas, participant lists	Complete

Table 8. Strategy 1.3 Priority 1 Implementation Data

Priority 1: Develop industry-driven, competency-based, stackable & latticed credential and degree pathways in targeted industries designed to meet the needs of new or transitioning workers and the businesses who need them, or those seeking self-employment.				Evidence Tracking	
Strategy 1.3	Start Date	Q 6,10,14	Modules & policies for food service management complete (IBEST implemented +2 quarters).	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	9/15/2015	Q 5,9,13	Modules & policies for manufacturing pathway complete (IBEST implemented +2 quarters)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	End Date	Q 7,11,15	Modules & policies for healthcare pathway complete (IBEST implemented +2 quarters)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	9/18/2015	Q 8,12,16	Modules & policies for logistics pathway complete (IBEST implemented +2 quarters)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
		Q 6,10,14	Modules & policies for entrepreneur pathway complete (IBEST implemented +2 quarters)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
		Q 6	Launch Food Innovation Center: provide resources for entrepreneurs combining WT employee model, FSM training & pathway jobs. (Activity)	Web links, course brochure	<i>Complete</i>

Table 9. Strategy 1.4 Priority 1 Implementation Data

Priority 1: Develop industry-driven, competency-based, stackable & latticed credential and degree pathways in targeted industries designed to meet the needs of new or transitioning workers and the businesses who need them, or those seeking self-employment.				Evidence Tracking	
Strategy 1.4	Start Date	Q 5	Career Pathway documented for FSM/Entrepreneur, including CASS, published as OER	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	2/15/2015	Q 4	Career Pathway documented for manufacturing programs, published as OER,	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	End Date	Q 6	Career pathway documented for healthcare program, published as OER, published as OER	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	9/18/2015	Q 5	Career pathway documented for logistics, published as OER, published as OER	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
		Ongoing	Programs are reviewed each cycle, updating quarterly improvement plan to maximize this strategy. (Activity)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>

Table 10. Strategy 1.5 Priority 1 Implementation Data

Priority 1: Develop industry-driven, competency-based, stackable & latticed credential and degree pathways in targeted industries designed to meet the needs of new or transitioning workers and the businesses who need them, or those seeking self-employment.				Evidence Tracking	
Strategy 1.5	Start Date	Q 5	DACUM Toolkit published as OER	None	<i>Not Received</i>
	10/15/2015	Q 6, 8	Programs are reviewed each cycle to minimize time & cost, implementing quarterly improvement actions (program). (Activity)	Evidence obtained through staff interviews.	<i>Yes</i>
	End Date	Q 5-16	Programs are reviewed each cycle to maximize students in good jobs, implementing quarterly improvement actions. (Activity)	Evidence obtained through staff interviews.	<i>Ongoing</i>
	9/18/2015	Q 5-16	Programs are reviewed regularly by employers for content alignment w/response plan w/in 2 qtr. (Activity)	Evidence obtained through staff interviews.	<i>Ongoing</i>
		Ongoing	Implement quarterly improvements: Employer Engagement. (Activity)	Evidence obtained through staff interviews.	<i>Ongoing</i>

Table 11. Strategy 2.1 Priority 2 Implementation Data

Priority 2: Develop sector-based dual client career pathway system that seamlessly integrates JOBS partners, including college staff, nonprofits, and OneStop in recruitment, retention, career coaching & job placement that serve participants, employers & partners.				Evidence Tracking	
	Timeline		Deliverables/Activities	Evidence Received	Status
Strategy 2.1	Start Date	Q 5	Current Partnership roster, to include roles, responsibilities, list of initiatives each is pursuing, and achievements.	Internal document shared with researchers	<i>Complete</i>
	1/15/2015	Ongoing	Agency partners can view the progress of learners along the pathway, and see the interventions & outcomes of those partners. (Activity)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	End Date	Q 4	JOBS team (OCC & Agency Partners) using common measures & systems for progress tracking, updated at least monthly. (Activity - measures incorporated in cycles)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
		Q 4-16	Align intake practices to maximize recruitment & enrollment (e.g. report participants in intake activities & conversions). (Activity)	No evidence of in-take process	<i>Not Received</i>
		Q 4-16	Align practices to maximize completion, job placement, & job retention. (Activity)	Ongoing activity, evidence has emerged in interviews.	<i>Not Received</i>

Table 12. Strategy 2.2 Priority 2 Implementation Data

Priority 2: Develop sector-based dual client career pathway system that seamlessly integrates JOBS partners, including college staff, nonprofits, and OneStop in recruitment, retention, career coaching & job placement that serve participants, employers & partners.				Evidence Tracking	
Strategy 2.2	Start Date	Q 3	OCIDA Scholarships for workforce, 40K for students	Documentation of award	<i>Complete</i>
	1/15/2015	Q 6-16	CCEO sponsorship of Entreplooyee student each cycle	Documentation of award	<i>Complete</i>
	End Date	Q 6-16	IBEST delivered in partnership with SEOC. Program costs supported by JP Morgan Chase.	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	9/18/2015	Ongoing	Maximize the impact of scholarships & awards	Ongoing activity – evidence emerged in staff interviews	<i>Complete</i>
		Q 8,10, 12,14,16	Inventory services & supports routinely to update compendium of services.	No evidence of Compendium of Services or updates.	<i>Not Received</i>

Table 13. Strategy 2.3 Priority 2 Implementation Data

Priority 2: Develop sector-based dual client career pathway system that seamlessly integrates JOBS partners, including college staff, nonprofits, and OneStop in recruitment, retention, career coaching & job placement that serve participants, employers & partners.				Evidence Tracking	
Strategy 2.3	Start Date	Q 6	Publish compendium of services, making available to public	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	4/15/2015	Q 5	Grant funded Career Coach to service each partner agency & ensure good fit for prospective students, LRI adopted.	Evidence provided through interviews	<i>Complete</i>
	End Date	Q 7	Leverage resources for Manufacturing	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	9/18/2015	Q 8	Leverage resources for FSM/Entrepreneur	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
		Q 6	Leverage resources for Logistics	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
		Q 3	Leverage resources for Healthcare	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>

Table 14. Strategy 2.4 Priority 2 Implementation Data

Priority 2: Develop sector-based dual client career pathway system that seamlessly integrates JOBS partners, including college staff, nonprofits, and OneStop in recruitment, retention, career coaching & job placement that serve participants, employers & partners.				Evidence Tracking	
Strategy 2.4	Start Date	Q 5	Publish Partnership Toolkit as OER.	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	9/15/2015	Q 4	Publish JOBS Partnership Metrics Annually.	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	End Date	Q 6	Publish Data Sharing agreement template as OER.	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	9/18/2015	Q 5	Evaluate partnership efforts to maximize results, implement improvements. (Activity)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
		Ongoing	Provide JOBS team with tools & training aimed at establishing a continuous improvement culture. (Activity)	Evidence emerged in staff interviews	<i>Ongoing</i>

Table 15. Strategy 3.1 Priority 3

Priority 3: Strengthen internal support systems to increase student enrollment, completion, success, and job attainment or continued educational attainment, based on Career Pathway Model characteristics.					
				Evidence Tracking	
	Timeline		Deliverables/Activities	Evidence Received	Status
Strategy 3.1	Start Date	Q 4,5,6,7	Establish tools & resources for tracking project performance & outcomes (e.g. project-based accounting, etc.) [Activity]	Project manager has shared a Google Spreadsheet.	<i>Ongoing</i>
	1/15/2015	Q4-6	Realign campus policies & procedures to align with UG.	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	End Date	Q5-12	Formalize PLA practices to ensure credit is awarded for work deserving of credit, incorporate JOBS programs into pathways to credit programs where applicable.	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	9/18/2015	Q5-12	Leverage internal jobs placement programs for pathway jobs & program intake. (Activity)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
		Q2-16	Create cross-campus support of workforce programs & processes. (report tracking, policy, credit, and jobs in prev. activities).	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>

Table 16. Strategy 3.2 Priority 3

Priority 3: Strengthen internal support systems to increase student enrollment, completion, success, and job attainment or continued educational attainment, based on Career Pathway Model characteristics.				Evidence Tracking	
Strategy 3.2	Start Date	Q5	Produce disclosure reports for Warehouse Worker & Machine Operator.	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	1/15/2015	Q6,7	Publish disclosure reports for FSM & Healthcare programs.	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	End Date	Q3-12	Maximize the impact of scholarships & awards (internal). (Activity)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	9/18/2015	Q6	Enable clock hour financial aid for eligible training programs. (Activity)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
		Q12	Enable competency based financial aid for eligible training programs. (Activity)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>

Table 17. Strategy 3.3 Priority 3

Priority 3: Strengthen internal support systems to increase student enrollment, completion, success, and job attainment or continued educational attainment, based on Career Pathway Model characteristics.				Evidence Tracking	
Strategy 3.3	Start Date	Q4	Calendar programs in flexible, non-semester based, accelerated scheduling. (Activity)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	4/15/2015	Q4-12	Offer courses at locations most accessible by targeted populations. (Activity)	Emerged through staff interviews	<i>Complete</i>
	End Date	Ongoing	Incorporate pathway jobs where they prove to be beneficial to participants. (Activity)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	9/18/2015	Ongoing	Eliminate any other unnecessary hurdles to enrollment, completion, placement, and job retention. (Activity)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
		Q5-16	Actively re-engage students who have stopped-out of JOBS programs quarterly. (Activity)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
		Q5-16	Implement quarterly improvements: retention.	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>

Table 18. Strategy 3.4 Priority 3

Priority 3: Strengthen internal support systems to increase student enrollment, completion, success, and job attainment or continued educational attainment, based on Career Pathway Model characteristics.				Evidence Tracking	
Strategy 3.4	Start Date	Q5-16	Ensure that programs are achieving at least 90% completion.	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	9/15/2015	Q6-16	Ensure that programs have 90% job placement in Q1 post-graduation.	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	End Date	Q7-16	Ensure that programs have 90% job retention in Q2 & Q3 post-graduation, and at least 80% in Q4 & Q8.	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
	9/18/2015	Q6-16	Ensure programs operating capacity does not exceed job opportunity, and that they are operating at that threshold. (Activity)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>
		Q6-16	Minimize the time it takes to achieve livable wage, not to exceed Q3 (measured in Q3, 4, 8). (Activity)	No evidence provided	<i>Not Received</i>