

**Chicago Cook Workforce Partnership  
Integrating Workforce Data System:  
*Challenges and Lessons from the Field***

*By Marty Miles, Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago, and Chicago Jobs Council  
March 28, 2013*

**Goals**

To support the development of the requirements for the IWIS database, the System Requirements Contractor team (SRC) conducted phone interviews and reviewed relevant literature with these goals in mind:

- To gain useful information, tools and lessons from current and past projects focused on integration of data across multiple funders and systems, alignment of measures and definitions, or related work in another field;
- To understand the general approach that projects had taken for these areas of work, including their:
  - Identification and engagement of funder and provider stakeholders to inform the requirements of the system;
  - Collection of data and measures that are important to track, as well as how those are defined; and
  - Integration of technology to accomplish the goals of the project.
- To gain more clarity about potential challenges to anticipate, lessons learned, and opportunities or accomplishments to build on.

**Process**

The SRC team identified a number of projects—both in Chicago and across the country—that could provide useful insights for the IWIS project. After prioritizing these projects the team conducted 10 interviews with 16 people. Those interviewed, their associated projects or organizations, and titles are identified below, and brief descriptions of the projects are included at the end of this report.

- Chicago-based initiatives
  - Opportunity Chicago Project
    - *Mary Howard, Executive Vice President, Resident Services, Chicago Housing Authority (CHA)*
    - *Lucas Fopma, Director of Contracts, Management & Reporting at CHA*
    - *Leslie Palmer Garcia, Planning Analyst at CHA*
    - *Maria Hibbs, consultant and former Director of the Partnership for New Communities*
  - The 741 Collaborative
    - *Maria Kim, Chief Operating Officer at The Cara Program (a founding partner of the collaborative)*

- Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) – Chicago: Centers for Working Families/Financial Opportunity Centers
  - *Ricki Lowitz, Director, Economic Opportunities*
  - *Jennifer McClain, Senior Program Officer*
- Department of Family and Support Services (DFSS) Cityspan initiative for youth-serving agencies
  - *Jennifer Axelrod, Deputy Commissioner for Youth Services*
- Cross-funder workforce data initiatives in other cities
  - New York City Human Services Data Project (HS Data) – Office of the Deputy Mayor for Health & Human Services
    - *Louisa Chafee, Director of Management Innovation*
    - *Jenne Russo Rennie, Deputy Mayor’s Office*
    - *Dan Symon, Deputy Mayor’s Office*
  - Cincinnati Partners for a Competitive Workforce (Partners)
    - *Ross Meyer, Executive Director*
    - *Lucy Crane, Manager, Community Impact, United Way of Greater Cincinnati*
- Experts with a national perspective about related initiatives
  - Evelyn Ganzglass, Director, Workforce Development at the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), which has been a frequent advocate for better integration of workforce data systems and more aligned performance measures . CLASP is also leading a two-year initiative to identify criteria and metrics for high-quality career pathway systems. Illinois is one of 10 states participating in the initiative, called the Alliance for Quality Career Pathways.
  - Christopher King, Director of the Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources, LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas in Austin, who has extensive experience working with public workforce data initiatives at the state and local levels; and
  - Eric Seleznow, State Policy Director at the National Skills Coalition in Washington, DC, and author of the NSC report *Beyond Degrees*, about a Maryland-based initiative to integrate data about skills credential attainment in the state.

The SRC team also reviewed other documents and resources for additional background, including:

- Summaries of various state projects that are part of the US Department of Labor Workforce Data Quality Initiative;
- Summaries of other Workforce Innovation Fund projects;
- A 2005 report on the multi-state Integrated Performance initiative;
- General articles related to collective impact and shared measurement work; and
- A recorded webinar on data governance created for the Early Childhood Data Collaborative, by presenter Micheline Casey, former Chief Data Officer for the State of Colorado.

## **Key Themes: Challenges and Lessons Learned**

The following themes have emerged from our interviews and document review:

- 1. Leadership:** *For data integration projects to succeed, it's essential to have visible champions who can rally key stakeholders together around a shared goal.*

Interviewees stressed the important role that leadership played in different phases of their project. In some cases, this leadership had been partially provided by mandates. For example, Washington State and Texas have been working on integrating data systems for a longer period of time because of 1990's legislation in both states that required data collection and reporting across various workforce and education funding streams. Utah, a pilot state in the early Manpower workforce development legislation, built their initial systems in an integrated way and continues to do so. Chris King noted that unless there is a legislative mandate or cultural/institutional legacy, it will be more challenging to implement an integrated data system, especially in states or municipalities with fragmented program landscapes.

In the absence of these kinds of mandates, interviewees stressed the importance of having key high-level champions who visibly work to convey the importance of this work and help to keep stakeholders at the table in the midst of inevitable project struggles over time. For example, a Maryland project to consolidate information across numerous agencies about credential attainment succeeded because the governor established it as an important state priority and designated the deputy directors of those agencies as his chief implementers.

Several interviewees pointed out that an early role of project leadership is to help individual stakeholders find common ground and become a "we" around the project's core goals. Maria Hibbs noted that the players in the Opportunity Chicago project all had many different funders and requirements that caused them to collect data in a certain way. She acknowledged the value of both the project being a very "public" initiative as well as ensuring all partners understood that the availability of funding was tied to the project's goals—both of which encouraged stakeholders to stay focused on making it work. It was important for the group to first understand what their similarities and differences were and to identify the main issues that needed to be addressed. Another key leadership role was to focus attention on the key issues early, addressing potential roadblocks and building stakeholder buy-in.

Finally, interviewees affirmed the importance of engaging leaders and decision makers in each participating agency as part of the stakeholder engagement and consensus building processes—to better ensure that process or database changes needed at the individual agency level would be made.

- 2. Clear Goals and Communication:** *It's important to be clear about the core goals of the project (both aspirational and functional), and to communicate them consistently with all stakeholders.*

The interviewees as well as the background literature reviewed stressed the importance of having consensus around the core goals of the project and then consistently communicating those goals. To increase stakeholder buy-in and collaboration, time needed to be spent on answering these types of questions:

- What are we trying to achieve overall? What are our shared goals and values? For example, the 741 Collaborative wanted to better position themselves as a talent pipeline for employers, and to be able to identify gaps in services in their shared neighborhoods.
- What do we want to be able to learn from this database, e.g., what are the outcomes for programs serving participants with a particular characteristic?
- What capabilities do we want to enhance, e.g., our ability to make better job matches?

As one interviewee noted, having clarity about the vision for the project helped motivate participants when navigating through its sometimes painstaking work.

It was also useful to understand that *how the project is framed in communication is key to building trust among stakeholders*. Some goals may not be as attractive to some stakeholders as assumed. For example, the consultant to the NYC HS Data project noted that standardizing definitions and reducing the amount of reporting wasn't compelling to some providers, because they feared that in a competitive contracting environment their results would not look as strong within the new framework.

**3. Stakeholder Engagement:** *A variety of strategies is needed to develop stakeholder buy-in, understand their unique issues, and create thoughtful and nuanced proposals about data collection and reporting.*

Many of the projects interviewed used a variety of strategies to obtain stakeholder input, increase buy-in and develop consensus. Root Cause, the consulting firm assisting the HS Data project in New York City, used two *provider surveys* to obtain a picture of success indicators collected across a wide variety of program services and how those indicators were defined. Response rates in New York were relatively low (roughly 25%), possibly due to the length of the survey.

*Provider focus groups or brainstorming sessions* were used by most of the projects to get more specific input about the data providers felt was most important to capture and how it should be defined. In Cincinnati those meetings involved both providers as well as representatives from the regional workforce investment boards and United Way, and there was "extensive give and take" over a one-year period. For the DFSS Cityspan project, agency evaluation staff also attended the meetings and were asked about the types of research questions they were interested in addressing.

*Meetings with individuals or a small leadership group* proved very helpful for drilling down on definitional issues with providers or funders. Several interviewees said that on reflection they wished they had spent more time on these meetings or used them sooner in the process, as the meetings could have helped them develop better initial working documents to submit to a larger group for discussion.

Interviewees also stressed the importance of having the participation of staff representing *different functions and levels of the organization*. Executive directors often brought a "how will this affect funding?" lens, while senior managers were more focused on operational and work flow issues. The participation of frontline staff gave the project a better feel for service delivery needs as well capacity levels around using data.

Finally, interviewees suggested that stakeholder engagement is an *ongoing process, needing a mechanism for continued feedback*. It is important for stakeholders to understand who will receive their input and how it will be used to inform the process at various stages. For example, the consultant from the New York HS Data project admitted there was not enough communication as part of their stakeholder engagement and consensus building processes about how the technology piece might actually work, and there was very little communication from the City after the initial survey and focus groups. On the other hand, in the Cincinnati Partners project the WIBs and United Way providers were regularly engaged as a “users group” as more agencies were brought onto the G-Stars system.

**4. Identifying and defining measures to collect:** *It’s essential to agree early on a core template of required and optional data to collect, but reaching consensus on definitions is an iterative process that can take a long time.*

During the interviews we were able to collect a number of documents related to projects’ outcome measures, database elements, data definitions, and performance reports or dashboards. A summary of these resources is at the end of this report. These documents will be very useful to the System Requirements team over the next few months as we work with stakeholders to agree on IWIS elements. Key points from conversations with other projects, as well as broader articles on shared measurement, included these:

- It’s important to get as much agreement as possible early on about a template of data that will be collected, and critical to develop clear and precise definitions for each element. The CHA/Opportunity Chicago project reported that core data elements and definitions were not well articulated with service providers in their first year, and because of that the projects experienced a major issue with missing information.
- The Cincinnati Partners project reported that it took at least a year for the participating WIBs and United Way providers to agree on the data elements they would collect and their definitions—and that they continued to refine their work with further mapping of data fields during the second year of the project. They also noted that it took a few rounds of data collection and review to understand where there was still ambiguity in certain definitions.

Over time both initiatives have created more detailed user manuals and data dictionaries, and the CHA project uses more standard assessment tools. This has allowed projects to develop more of a *common language*, another factor which projects identified as essential, so that a term like “case management” was understood in the same way across individual environments. The New York HS Data project has also focused on developing clearer shared definitions of services across programs.

- The process of identifying cross-funder core indicators and definitions in New York City, facilitated by Root Cause Consulting, was contracted to last for six months. While Root Cause was able to produce a draft set of measures and definitions, there were a number of areas where recommendations could not be made because of a lack of agreement across providers. Root Cause said in our interview that more time would have allowed them to dig deeper to understand where agencies and funders were flexible in terms of how items were defined. Other interviewees acknowledged that it takes time for relationships of trust to develop that will enable better dialogue between agencies and funders.

- “Less is more.” Projects also said that it’s helpful to focus on a smaller number of shared baseline data elements that all stakeholders will commit to providing, with the option for organizations of adding additional data as their capacity to do so increases.
- Other criteria for selecting shared data elements mentioned by interviewees also include:
  - What will best demonstrate the impact of our services and tell the story about results?
  - What will capture important participant risk factors (e.g., low literacy levels)?
  - What will demonstrate improvement or progress from a baseline?
  - What will provide the most useful “real time” information (e.g., why a participant leaves a job, critical monthly milestones)?
  - What will best help providers in managing services and work flow (e.g., prompts about needed follow-up)?

Several sources suggested that there be some kind of tiered approach to identifying the measures to collect, for example, 1) A relatively small number of data elements for which all will be accountable to submit; 2) a larger menu of shared indicators that are optional, and 3) indicators unique to each program’s work.

A challenge in this area identified by some projects was getting clarity about what individual federal mandates actually are and where there may be administrative flexibility at the state or local level.

**5. Integrating technologies and transferring data:** *Cities and states are using several different approaches to “integrating data” – from using a single agreed-upon software to attempting to create a “datahub” that connects multiple databases.*

The projects interviewed are taking a variety of approaches to integrating technology and transferring data. Their goal has been to be able to “follow the person, not the funding” and to better tell the story about what’s happening with participants and employers over time.

- Chris King at the Ray Marshall Center noted that a few states have or are currently integrating a variety of public data streams (DOL, TANF, SNAP, and others), and these states will be the focus of more in-depth follow-up by SRC team members to understand how the technology operates. Priorities include Florida’s Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), the Texas Workforce Information System (TWIST), and possibly efforts in Minnesota and Washington State.
- Because some Chicago youth service providers are already heavily invested in their own in-house programs, the DFSS Cityspan project is attempting to build a “datahub” so that providers with existing software systems can upload required data fields into Cityspan (with those data fields having been standardized in terms of definition). However, if a provider does not have an in-house system they will also be able to do data entry directly into Cityspan. The 741 Collaborative is taking a similar approach, in terms of having a separate database (mPower) that captures certain shared data

elements from member providers. Members have the option of entering data directly into mPower or uploading it from another database after conversion into an Excel spreadsheet.

- Some other projects have gone the route of requiring that all or most participating agencies use the same licensed software: Opportunity Chicago /CHA (Salesforce), LISC (Efforts to Outcomes), Cincinnati Partners (G-Stars). These lead agencies were already users of the respective software, were satisfied with it, and wanted to use it as their collaborative system. In some cases the lead agency has a master or enterprise license to the software, and participating providers often have individual sub-licenses. In Cincinnati there are different enterprise versions of G-Stars, but because they all have a similar platform they can be easily integrated. These projects stressed the cost efficiency they experienced of having a system that was developed and maintained externally.
- Interaction of licensed software and public systems: CHA's YARDI database is their system of record and includes all resident demographic information. Salesforce is used to track service provision, and there is a regular upload of YARDI data into Salesforce. In Cincinnati, one of the larger providers is a Salesforce user, and there is a monthly upload of Salesforce data into G-Stars. This requires extra mapping (which has proven cumbersome) and an additional fee to the G-Stars vendor.

Some interviewees suggested that ideas for technology to address IWIS needs should also be sought in the corporate sector, where creative companies and entrepreneurs are developing more cutting edge approaches.

**6. Organizational Capacity and Staff Development:** *Building organizational capacity for using the system and maintaining quality data are challenges that will require ongoing staff development, consistent data monitoring and designated staffing to be sustainable.*

Because organizational data capacities will vary significantly, staff in data integration projects that had been operating for several years stressed the importance of not only having clearly defined data fields but also building the organizational capacity to ensure that program staff understood those definitions, had the necessary technology skills and had a process in place to monitor data quality. Both CHA/Opportunity Chicago and the Cincinnati Partners relayed that several factors contributed to low data quality in the first couple of years of data collection: insufficient documentation for users, inadequate staff training, infrequent data monitoring and difficulty in obtaining long-term follow-up information. They and other projects are responding to these needs in a variety of ways:

- More detailed user manuals, with screen shots and data dictionaries;
- Regular face to face trainings, including software introductions and refresher sessions. LISC, for example, does at least two face to face trainings per year, as well as online webinars that are recorded for future access;
- Informal assistance from power users of the software as “lead mentors”; and
- Designated in-house staff who review fields for missing or inappropriate data, create and update user manuals, and provide staff training or specific technical assistance as needed. In the Cincinnati and LISC projects this staff person also assists with the development of templates for queries or reports to assist staff who may not have that capacity.

A related organizational capacity challenge reported by projects was that of staff turnover. The 741 Collaborative noted that during the time it took to come to agreement on data elements and definitions there was turnover among key organizational staff at least 2-3 times, resulting in a loss of existing institutional knowledge and commitment to the project. This in turn further slowed the collaborative process, but reinforces the need for ongoing engagement of partners and detailed documentation for data users.

**7. System governance:** *It is important to be intentional from the beginning about how decisions about the database will be made and with whose input, and that the identified “business objectives” drive those decisions.*

Conversations with various projects helped surface questions about IWIS “system governance” over the long-term. For systems like those used by Opportunity Chicago/CHA, LISC and the Cincinnati Partners, the decisions about updates or changes are made by the lead agency with input from users. LISC, for example, has an advisory committee of “power users” that meets quarterly and provides input about issues they are experiencing with the ETO templates as well as feedback to proposed changes. Cincinnati also regularly convenes a user group of relevant WIBs and providers.

For the 741 Collaborative, oversight is provided by a data subcommittee that includes provider and affiliate representatives and CCI, the software creator. Close communication between the committee members and the vendor has been critical. For the CitySpan project, DFSS is currently providing oversight but would eventually like to see a third party manage and maintain the data.

As part of the document review, a webinar related to governance of an early childhood services data collaborative was also useful. Presenter Micheline Casey noted that governance goes far beyond the establishment of a leadership team or data sharing agreements, and that it needs to include establishing the “rules of engagement” under which everyone will operate, for example:

- What will be the “master” data source, e.g., that with the most complete and accurate info?
- Who will maintain “data about the data” – e.g., master data tables, definitions, information about compliance or privacy requirements, security and hardware?
- What processes will we all use to ensure data quality?
- Who will have access to which data?
- Who will have final decision-making authority around the data system?
- What processes will govern how we make changes to the system, e.g., when funder requirements change or new fields need to be added?

The webinar also stressed the importance of having the system be governed and driven by the “business process and rules”—i.e., focusing on the questions we are trying to answer and the processes we want to improve—with IT’s role being to implement those business rules.

**8. Data Confidentiality:** *Careful work will be needed to ensure that individual-level confidentiality expectations are met through the IWIS system.*

Several of the projects we interviewed have confidentiality restrictions related to the sharing of individual information. For the 741 Collaborative, all member provider staff and clients sign

confidentiality agreements acknowledging that data may be shared with other organizations in the collaborative, but not outside of it.

While CHA has a data sharing agreement with IDES for individual wage data, it cannot share that data directly with its sub-contractors. CHA does a physical match of the data and then enters it into Salesforce. In Cincinnati, United Way does not have access to individual level UI wage data. But they are working to see if data obtained by third-party researchers evaluating their National Fund for Workforce Solutions project might be shared, or if it is possible for providers to get some aggregate information about their specific participants. In the LISC network, each site has a sub-license for ETO and “owns” its specific individual data. The national and regional LISC datasets are drawn down on an aggregate level, with no individually identified information.

### **9. Project Scope and Goals:** *The IWIS project vision is ambitious but important for the field.*

A number of people interviewed, especially those familiar with other projects across the country, indicated that the goals and vision of the IWIS project are broader than most current state or city projects. As noted by Chris King, most are focused primarily on reporting what is required by state and federal agencies, although we may be able to learn from a few that are trying to push toward making their systems more useful for program management and improvement. Others encouraged the IWIS team to focus what would be truly “innovative”—not just tweaking at the edges—and to see the project as an opportunity to make recommendations back up to the federal level. Interviewees advised the project to stay focused on what would make providers’ and funders’ experience better (e.g., more common definitions, better data integrity, more useful reports), and to “not let the perfect get in the way of improvement.” In our interview with Evelyn Ganzglass at CLASP, she noted that there was surprise at the federal level that none of the Workforce Innovation Fund grantees had indicated an intention to apply for a federal waiver related to data requirements. She recommended that we consider doing so if a waiver would help the IWIS project accomplish its vision and goals.

The DFSS Cityspan staff specifically requested that we continue to communicate with other related projects, especially those whose scope might overlap with that of IWIS. For example, the Cityspan project is currently identifying fields for its database related to summer youth employment, and wants to be sure that its work aligns in some way with the direction of the IWIS system.

### **Implications for IWIS**

Some of the feedback received from other projects reinforces directions that the IWIS team is already taking, e.g.,

- Using multiple strategies for stakeholder engagement, and engaging multiple levels of staff;
- Using surveys, meetings, and smaller focus groups early in the process to go into more depth on key issues and provider needs; and
- Developing and consistently using clear communication about the project’s goals and process.

As we move forward with requirements planning and engagement of stakeholders, it also seems important to pay attention to some of these other lessons shared by colleagues in the field:

- The critical role of the leadership team, including being visible champions for the project and its vision and paying attention to what the long-term “business rules” and governance of the database need to be;
- The importance of continued communication about the project after initial stakeholder engagement activities, with additional options for feedback;
- The iterative process of developing consensus on definitions of measures, and the fact that it may take a long period of time;
- Openness to a variety of technology approaches (and creative hybrids) for achieving the project’s aims;
- The suggestion to take a “tiered” approach to deciding what data to collect;
- The need to build organizational capacity and support staff training needs in an ongoing way, as well as the need for a clearly defined process of data monitoring; and
- The recommendation to push for what will be truly innovative in accomplishing the project’s vision, seeking areas where there may be flexibility at the state or federal levels.

### **Next Steps**

Next steps to the interviews and document reviews completed to date include these:

- Discussion of these themes and lessons learned with the overall IWIS planning team and the Leadership Team;
- Further contacts with the IT staff involved in data integration efforts in the recommended states, to get more clarity on their technical details; and
- Further review of the specific data elements and definitions being used by these other projects, to inform the IWIS stakeholder engagement and requirements development processes.

## **APPENDIX A – Project Summaries**

### **Cityspan Initiative – Department of Family and Support Services (DFSS), Youth Services Division.**

DFSS's use of Cityspan software to track youth services across multiple providers has its roots in a multi-million dollar grant awarded to the City of Chicago in 2007 from the Wallace Foundation, for the purpose of integrating data infrastructures and beginning to standardize performance measures. DFSS, Chicago Public Schools, the Chicago Park District, After School Matters and a few other city departments have since made an investment in customizing Cityspan to track services. Youth serving agencies receiving DFSS funding are now required to use Cityspan to track enrollment, attendance and services provided. A new initiative within the Youth Services Division is attempting to standardize the ways various programs and departments are using Cityspan, in order to get a better longitudinal picture of how youth are participating in various services and what the results are for those youth.

### **Human Services Data Project—New York City, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Health & Human Services**

The NYC Human Services Data Project (HS Data) was a cross-sector initiative to help New York City's nonprofit organizations more easily and effectively manage data, benchmark performance, and share information with stakeholders and funders. Its vision in 2011 was to identify key results of program services through a broadly inclusive process and to standardize their definitions for use by City agencies in their respective service procurements. It also envisioned making aggregate performance data more open and accessible so providers and others could gain perspective on their relative performance.

The City contracted with the consulting firm Root Cause to coordinate a stakeholder engagement process and make recommendations about what shared outcome measures could be in three areas of city services: workforce development, senior services, and services to adults with a criminal background. Root Cause reported to the Deputy Mayor's Office on the recommended measures and definitions in fall 2011, although there were still areas where further consensus and development were needed. To date a shared outcome reporting process for workforce programs has not been proposed by the city.

The HS Data Project has been since been folded into a larger initiative—HHS Accelerator—which seeks to reduce the administrative burden for nonprofit agencies receiving funding through 11 city agencies and increase the capacity for cross-agency coordination and performance assessment. The Accelerator includes a recently-launched online document vault where providers can store organizational and financial documents needed for various procurement processes, a standardized application to establish eligibility for city contracts, and a Client and Community Services Catalogue with common terminology for describing populations and the types of services offered by various programs.

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/nonprofit/html/benchmarking/benchmarking.shtml>

<http://www.nyc.gov/html/nonprofit/html/procurement/procurement.shtml>

## **LISC Centers for Working Families Initiative**

Local Initiatives Support Corporation—Chicago (LISC) organizes capital and other resources to support initiatives that will stimulate the comprehensive development of healthy, stable neighborhoods and foster their connection to the socioeconomic mainstream of the metropolitan region. As part of this work, LISC supports 12 Chicago community-based organizations in implementing the Centers for Working Families (CWF) model originally conceived by the Annie E. Casey Foundation. The CWF sites help families and individuals become more financially secure through services that include job services and long-term case management, one-on-one financial and money management counseling, customized banking products, free tax preparation services, and state-of-the art screening for public benefits.

The national LISC organization has built on the CWF model to establish more than 65 sites—called Financial Opportunity Centers (FOCs)—in 25 cities. The initiative has multiple public and private funding sources, include a national Social Innovation Fund grant. All of the LISC CWF and FOC sites use Efforts to Outcomes software (ETO) from vendor Social Solutions.

<http://www.lisc-chicago.org/Our-programs/Centers-for-Working-Families/index.html>

## **Opportunity Chicago**

Opportunity Chicago was a 2006-2010 initiative to help 5,000 public housing residents prepare for and find employment, improving the workforce development system along the way to create a smoother path for other low-skilled, low-income jobseekers to come. A collaborative effort of The Partnership for New Communities (PNC), the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA), and the Department of Family and Support Services (formerly Mayor’s Office of Workforce Development), it was designed as a cross-sector collaboration that strategically convened and leveraged resources. The initiative was funded by a variety of public and private sources.

The Chicago Jobs Council (CJC) facilitated and managed the Initiative, working with a Strategic Advisers Group of stakeholders to guide implementation of the Initiative’s strategic priorities. The Initiative invested in and implemented a range of program offerings and strategies to foster longer-term labor market success of jobseekers residing in public housing in Chicago, including:

- FamilyWorks case management program
- City Colleges of Chicago literacy, career bridge and technical skills training programs
- Workforce Investment Act programs
- Transitional jobs
- Industry skills training
- Contextualized literacy programs

When the project started, CHA was already using Salesforce software for its case management services, and Salesforce eventually became the main repository of Opportunity Chicago data.

[http://cjc.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/OC-Evaluation\\_July2012.pdf](http://cjc.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/OC-Evaluation_July2012.pdf)

## **Partners for a Competitive Workforce – Cincinnati**

Partners for a Competitive Workforce is a partnership in the Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana tri-state region focused on meeting employer demand by growing the skills of the current and future workforce. Partners include businesses, workforce investment boards, chambers of commerce, educational institutions, labor, service providers and philanthropic funders. The partnership grew out of the collaboration of four workforce investment boards in the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana tri-state area, and now also includes non-profit providers funded through the United Way of Greater Cincinnati. Managed through United Way, it is funded by the National Fund for Workforce Solutions, foundations and a variety of public sources.

The Partners collaborative is creating a regional workforce dashboard to analyze and report key outcomes across multiple service providers, to better understand regional performance and to identify gaps in service delivery. The participating WIBs and service providers all use a version of G-Stars software to report on key participant demographics, barriers, services and outcomes. Approximately 50 public and nonprofit agencies use the system.

<http://www.competitiveworkforce.com>

## **The 741 Collaborative**

The 741 Collaborative was founded in 2008 as a partnership involving seven nonprofit agencies providing workforce services. It works with employers and job seekers in the four South Lakefront communities of North Kenwood, Oakland, Douglas and Grand Boulevard. Founding partners include The Cara Program, Quad Communities Center for Working Families, The Community Builders—Chicago, Heartland Human Care Services, Centers for New Horizons, Chicago Urban League and Jobs for Youth—Chicago. It focuses on a shared mission of promoting employment and career opportunities for community residents through improving access to workforce training, career development, internships and permanent job placement services.

The 741 Collaborative is funded through the JPMorgan Chase Foundation. Affiliate organizations providing administrative support, industry-specific coursework and outreach assistance include the Center for Economic Progress, Chicago Jobs Council, New Skill Builders and Quad Cities Development Corporation. The collaborative uses a shared database—mPowr, designed by Community Collaboration, Inc. (CCI)—to capture cross-program data about participants, employers and referrals for service.

<http://www.741partners.org>

## **Data Integration Efforts – Other States Highlighted in Interviews**

**Florida:** In 1985, Florida initiated and piloted The Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), a data collection and consumer reporting system that provides follow-up data on former students and program participants who have graduated, exited or completed a public education or training program. The Florida Agency for Workforce Innovation is expanding the FETPIP with the integration of additional data elements. FETPIP contains workforce, public and private education, and training program provider information. FL has agreements with various state agencies which

provide a range of data elements. In addition to Unemployment Insurance, Wagner-Peyser, Trade Adjustment Assistance, and Dislocated Workers data, the system tracks education, food stamp and public assistance, incarceration and community release, federal employee, U.S. Postal Service employee, and out of state employment data .

<http://www.doleta.gov/performance/pfdocs/WDQIYearOneReport3-13-12.pdf>

**Texas:** Texas is experienced in building longitudinal data systems and well known for data integration. Its current Workforce Data Quality Initiative includes linkages of educational data with data from these programs operated through the Texas Workforce Commission: Workforce Investment Act, Employment Services, TANF Employment and Training, SNAP Employment and Training, Trade Adjustment Assistance, Apprenticeship.

<http://www.doleta.gov/performance/grantrecipientsummaries.cfm#tx>

**Minnesota:** The MN Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED) is creating a longitudinal database mainly in collaboration with the MN Office of Higher Education, MN Department of Education, and MN State Colleges and Universities. Data from the Unemployment Insurance, WIA Title I, Trade Adjustment Assistance, and Wagner-Peyser programs will be linked to post-secondary education, Adult Basic Education, and Minnesota Family Investment program data. The database will allow for performance evaluation of both education and employment programs. MN is adopting the ETL/Business Logic (Extract, Transform and Load) process technology around the WELDS database (Workforce-Education Longitudinal Database System).

MN plans to integrate additional data sets to MN-WELDS to increase its usage as a tool for program performance measures and workforce analysis. These data sets include: employment and training programs managed by DEED: VR, State Services for the Blind, Federal Employment Data Exchange System (FEDES). TANF, SNAP managed by the MN Department of Human Services; the RA program managed by the MN Department of Labor and Industry; and state Driver's License data managed by the MN Department of Public Safety. Additionally, data sets from non-profit organizations, such as Greater Twin Cities United Way and Twin Cities RISE, will be added.

<http://www.doleta.gov/performance/pfdocs/Minnesota.pdf>

**Washington State:** Washington State's Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board leads a project among the states to design the next generation performance management system for workforce development programs. The end product is a report "Integrated Performance Information for Workforce Development: A Blueprint for the States." The intent is for this report to guide a more rational system of performance management across workforce development programs, including: the Workforce Investment Act, Secondary and Postsecondary Vocational Education, Adult Education and Literacy, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, and Vocational Rehabilitation among other programs.

<http://wtb.wa.gov/WorkforceBoard.asp>