



The National Fund for Workforce Solutions

2007-2016

We work with leaders in business, education, philanthropy, and workforce development nationally and in our more than 30 partner communities to invest in and scale innovative models that connect individuals to in-demand skills, generate good jobs, and help American business find and develop the talent critical for their success.

Our mission is to drive practices, policies, and investments that enable workers to succeed in good jobs, provide employers with a skilled workforce, and build more prosperous communities.

The data in this report highlight the scale and some of the impact of the National Fund for Workforce Solutions for the period 2007-2016. As the goals of the National Fund are quite broad and far-reaching no single report can adequately demonstrate the impact for various stakeholders-- funders, employers, individuals-- as well as the systems change outcomes for communities in which regional funder collaboratives and industry partnerships operate. This report, however, briefly describes the scale of activities in terms of collaboratives, industry partnerships, employers and especially for the individuals who have been served over the past ten years, and who have benefitted from education, training and support services, and achieved successful outcomes such as job placement or retention.

Goals of the National Fund for Workforce Solutions

The National Fund was founded in 2007 by the Annie E. Casey, Ford, Hitachi, and Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundations and the U.S. Department of Labor, with three primary goals:

- Enable individuals to get jobs and/or advance in their careers focusing on career paths that enable low-income individuals to attain family-supporting wages
- Provide services to employers to address their skill-needs, to help them recruit, retain and advance employees while improving employer metrics such as productivity and quality
- Support collaboratives implement public and private policies and practices that help to increase human capital investments and effectiveness.

Framework for Evaluation and Learning

In 2012 as part of developing its strategy for its second five years, the National Fund added learning goals, and subsequently developed a [Framework for Evaluation and Learning](#) that has guided its evaluation and learning activities since. The framework recognizes the important role of performance management or tracking progress against goals, measuring value to employers and to communities, and of learning or formative evaluation—both among regional funder collaboratives and at the National Fund.

The framework also shows how the evaluation study associated with the Social Innovation Fund (SIF) grant (2010-2016) helped demonstrate the effectiveness of the National Fund model for individuals in improving employment and earnings outcomes.

The framework also guided the work of the National Fund, and its network of regional collaboratives, by providing guidance on the different types of summative or outcome evaluations that could be conducted, as well as the important role of continuous improvement or formative evaluations.

Ten Years of the National Fund

This report summarizes the impact and scale of the National Fund in terms of critical inputs, outputs and outcomes. It addresses the “Performance Management” component of the Framework by providing information on collaboratives, funding for collaboratives, industry partnerships, and the individuals served and benefitting from programs of the

FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATION AND LEARNING AT THE NATIONAL FUND FOR WORKFORCE SOLUTIONS

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

TRACKING
PROGRESS

How much progress has been made against goals? What is the scale of the National Fund?

Sources: National evaluation; annual data brief; annual financial report
Methods: Aggregation of data from collaboratives; comparison of progress to goals
Vendors: Program and Policy Insight, LLC (PPI); the National Fund

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

MEASURING
VALUE TO INDIVIDUALS

What is the value of the National Fund to individuals? To specific sub-populations? Is the National Fund more effective than other approaches?

Sources: SIF evaluation; local evaluations
Methods: Impact analysis and/or wage-record analysis; quasi-experimental design
Vendors: IMPAQ International, LLC; local evaluators

MEASURING VALUE TO EMPLOYERS

What is the value of the National Fund to businesses and employers?

Sources: Business impact studies; surveys of employers
Methods: Kirkpatrick/Phillips model
Vendors: Various

MEASURING VALUE TO COMMUNITIES

What is the value of the National Fund to communities?

Sources: Surveys of key community stakeholders; analysis of social impact
Methods: Surveys and analysis of impact on economic development, etc.
Vendors: Various

MEASURING SYSTEMS CHANGE

What systems change outcomes have been achieved?

Sources: Annual systems change reports
Methods: Reporting on activities and outcomes
Vendors: Collaboratives; the National Fund

FORMATIVE EVALUATION

LEARNING
AMONG COLLABORATIVES

What are collaboratives learning from local evaluations?

Sources: Various
Methods: Assessment of how programs are being improved through evaluation
Vendors: Collaboratives; local evaluators; Program and Policy Insight, LLC (PPI)

LEARNING AT THE NATIONAL FUND

What is the National Fund learning from collaboratives?

Sources: Various
Methods: Identification of innovative practices and sources of success
Vendors: The National Fund; Jobs for the Future (JFF); other

National Fund. The following information is included in this report:

- A. The number of regional workforce funder collaboratives and funds raised
- B. The number of industry partnerships focused on sector strategies
- C. Employers receiving services and actively engaged in industry partnerships
- D. Individuals served, including both job-seekers and incumbent workers, and their characteristics
- E. Education/training and support services provided to individuals
- F. Employment outcomes achieved by individuals, such as credentials, job placement, and retention and advancement. As many partnerships and vendors are not able to successfully track individual outcomes this data may not show the full impact. Hence the results of partnerships with better and more robust data collection practices are shown separately.

Data Collection

This report is prepared based on annual data collection by the National Fund and its evaluator, Program Policy Insights (PPI) using the following tools:

- NA1 – Annual Collaborative Funding Report
- NA2 – Industry Partnership Profiles
- Annual data collection by Program, Policy Insights (PPI) from regional collaboratives and industry partnerships, especially with details on individuals served, placed in jobs, retained etc.

There is a third report, NA3 – Report on Systems Change Activities and Accomplishments, that is used to gather information on outcomes associated with changes in education/workforce systems, funder practices, and employer practices.

Published Reports

Since 2009 the National Fund has published annual evaluation reports tracking its progress against goals, often with specific focus on special topics such as fidelity to its model, and systems change. The National Fund has also published [reports](#) on the evaluation conducted for the Social Innovation Fund (SIF), demonstrating results from Ohio and Wisconsin using quasi-experimental design methodology.

In 2015, a comprehensive report on [Systems Change in the National Fund](#) was also published utilizing the annual reports submitted by regional collaboratives.

In 2016, a [Sustainability Guide for Funder Collaboratives](#) was published that summarizes the National Fund's learning on what contributes to the sustainability of regional collaboratives. Most recently the National Fund has published reports on using qualitative and quantitative evaluations for continuous improvement, [Making Data More Useful for the Next Generation of the National Fund](#) and [How to Use Qualitative Research in Workforce Development](#).

Several regional collaboratives have also published evaluation reports on various topics, from ROI studies to systems change reports to case studies to comprehensive impact studies.

The National Fund for Workforce Solutions: Scale and Impact 2007-2016

Number of Active Regional Collaboratives at the end of 2016: 32

Number of Active Industry Partnerships at the end of 2016: 77

A. REGIONAL COLLABORATIVES

1. Funding

National Fund grants	\$27 million
Funds leveraged by regional collaboratives	\$318 million

2. Leveraged funds:

Pooled Funds flowing through collaboratives	\$113 million
Aligned Funds flowing to partnerships/vendors	\$205 million

3. Leveraged funds by Type of Funder:

Private (Foundations):	\$162 million (51%)
Public (Federal, State, Local):	\$130 million (41%)
Employers:	\$25 million (8%)

B. INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIPS

TABLE B.1 Industry Partnerships: Distribution by Industry Sector

Industry Sector	2016 Active Partnerships (No.)	2016 Active Partnerships (%)
Health Care	26	34%
Manufacturing	17	22%
Logistics/ Transportation/ Distribution	9	12%
Construction	7	7%
Information Technology	5	6%
Multisector	5	6%
Energy	2	3%
Financial Services	2	3%
Other (biotech, Hospitality, Landscaping, Retail)	4	5%
Total	77	100%

TABLE B.2 Industry Partnerships: Target Populations Served

Target Population	Number of Active Partnerships	Percent of Active Partnerships serving specific Target Population	Percent of Partnerships Since Fund Inception that served specific Target Population
Young Adults	37	54%	51%
Immigrant Workers	34	19%	16%
Single Parents	19	28%	29%
Formerly Incarcerated	18	26%	23%
Veterans	18	26%	27%
Target Racial Ethnic Population	16	24%	25%
Limited English Proficiency	14	21%	19%
Public Housing Residents	13	19%	19%
Youth	13	19%	17%
Older Workers	11	16%	15%
Homeless	7	10%	15%
Individuals with Disabilities	7	10%	9%
Migrant and Seasonal Workers	1	1%	1%
Other Population (other specify)	21	31%	29%

C. EMPLOYERS: Employer Served and Engaged in 2016

TABLE C.1 Employer Engagement

<i>Employer Category</i>	#	%	
Core	575	30%	*Core Employers -consistently contribute to the success of the partnership.
Partner	468	25%	**Partner Employers - consistently participate in the partnerships but do not lead.
Affiliate	849	45%	***Affiliated Employers -- participate sporadically and/or at a basic level.

TABLE C.2 Employers Engagement

<i>Employer Activity</i>	#	%
Hire Individuals Trained and/or Referred by the Partnership	956	56%
Contribute Resources to Help Achieve Partnership Goals	786	42%
Contribute Regularly to Strategic Decision-Making	609	32%
Change Practices in Pursuit of Partnership Goals	548	29%
Participate in Workforce Advocacy Efforts at the State or National Level	254	13%

TABLE C.3 Employers Services Received

<i>Service Received by Employers</i>	#	%
Assessment of Employer Needs	1254	66%
Screening and Referral of Job Applicants	1143	60%
New Entrant Occupational Training	962	51%
New Entrant Basic Skills Training	888	47%
Brokering Training Services	607	32%
Development of Training Plans for Employer	532	28%
Incumbent Worker Occupational Training	559	30%
Development of Career Ladder Program	488	26%
Incumbent Worker Basic Skills Training	353	19%

D. INDIVIDUALS SERVED

Table D.1 Employment Status => Mostly Job-seekers are being served

Employment status	In 2016	Since 2007
Job-seekers	8,065 (85%)	67,542 (73%)
Incumbent Workers	1,417 (15%)	24,835 (27%)
Total	9,482	92,377

Table D.2 By Gender => In 2016 mostly men served; overall slightly more men served*

Gender	In 2016	Since 2007
Men	4,668 (61%)	39,465 (52%)
Women	2,961 (39%)	35,794 (48%)

Table D.3 By Race About two-thirds served are Minorities*

Race	In 2016	Since 2007
Asian	149 (2%)	2,902 (4%)
African American	3,924 (64%)	32,224 (48%)
White	1,638 (27%)	23,384 (35%)
Other or Multiple Races	461 (7%)	8,968 (13%)

Table D.4 By Ethnicity=> 14% served are Latinos/Hispanic, fewer served in 2016*

Gender	In 2016	Since 2007
Hispanic/Latino	382 (6%)	8,453 (14%)
Not Hispanic/Latino	5.762 (94%)	50,360 (86%)

Table D.5 By Education => About 76% in 2016 and 63% since 2007 have HS or less education

Education Level	In 2016	Since 2007
12th grade or less	579 (10%)	6,521 (11%)
HS diploma or equivalent	4,021 (66%)	32,106 (52%)
Some college	956 (16%)	14,304 (23%)
AA degree	228 (4%)	3,106 (6%)
BA or higher	274 (5%)	4,059 (7%)

Table D.6 By Age => About 44% youth or young adults served

Age Range	In 2016	Since 2007
14-18	194 (3%)	2,307 (3%)
19-29	3,251 (47%)	30,030 (41%)
30-54	2,946 (42%)	33,685 (47%)
55 and Older	591 (8%)	6,368 (9%)

E. EDUCATION, TRAINING AND SUPPORT SERVICES PROVIDED

Table E.1 Education and Training Services-Number of Individuals Completing

Education or Training Type	In 2016	Since 2007
Basic Skill or ESL	609	6,156
Workplace Readiness	2,531	23,730
Computer Literacy	648	8,067
Occupational Training	5,989	40,814
On-the-Job Training	-	10,785
Apprenticeship	153	3,180
Other	596	10,433

Table E.2 Support Services—Number of Individuals Receiving Services

Type of Support Service	In 2016	Since 2007
Assessment	4,922	52,506
Asset Development	170	7,356
Career Coaching	5,250	37,664
Case Management	4,761	33,518
Job Search/Job Placement	6,603	38,626
Supportive Services	3,730	25,888
Other Non-Training Service	583	16,776

F. OUTCOMES

TABLE F.1 Credentials Achieved
(Job-seekers and Incumbent Workers)

Credential	In 2016	Since 2007
AA or AS Degree	5	849
BA or BS Degree	2	423
GED/HS Equivalency	38	1,658
Occupational Skills Certificate/Credential	5,203	39,802
Workplace Readiness Credential	2,990	18,786
Other Credential	309	3,097

TABLE F.2 Outcomes for Job-seekers

Type of Outcome	In 2016	Since 2007	Since 2007
Partnerships (No.)		207	
Employment ¹	3,861	30,010	73% of training completions
Employment in Target Sector ²	3,618	21,330	71% of employed
Employment with Wage > \$15.00 ²	1,799	7,513	25% of employed
Full Time Employment ²	2,689	16,939	56% of employed
Employment with Benefits ²	2,324	11,602	39% of employed

¹ Denominator is the number of jobseekers completing education and training services.

² Denominator is the number of jobseekers achieving employment.

TABLE F.2 Outcomes for Job-seekers in Partnerships with Robust Data Collection

Number of Partnerships	All Partnerships		Partnerships with Robust Placement and Retention Data	
	#	%	#	%
	222		78	
Total Job Placements Achieved	30,010		16,722	
Job Placements in Target Sector	21,330	71%	13,200	79%
Job Placements in Non-Targeted Sector	3,097	10%	2,227	13%
Wage at Job Placement <\$10.00	5,646	19%	3,673	22%
Wage at Job Placement \$10.00-\$14.99	10,796	36%	6,727	40%
Wage at Job Placement \$15.00-\$19.99	5,397	18%	3,016	18%
Wage at Job Placement >\$20.00	2,116	7%	1,517	9%
Wage at Placement Not Available	6,055	20%	1,789	11%
Hours at Job Placement <20	1,050	4%	679	4%
Hours at Job Placement 20-29	2,113	8%	1,425	9%
Hours at Job Placement 30-34	1,634	7%	1,082	6%
Hours at Job Placement 35+	15,305	51%	10,680	64%
Eligible for Benefits at Placement	11,602	39%	7,963	48%
Not Eligible for Benefits at Placement	4,646	15%	3,644	22%