**WIOA *Quick Start* Action Planner (QSAP)**

# Evaluation Readiness Assessment

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 1** | | **Evaluation Culture and Awareness** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Do agency staff and partners understand the benefits of evaluation, use evidence-based results to inform decisions, and plan to conduct evaluations to add to the existing evidence base?* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ratings:** | 1—Not at all | | 2—Making progress, but a long way to go | | | 3—Have some of this, sometimes | | | | 4—Yes, in place now | | 5—In place and exceeding | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Statement** | | | | **Rating** *(Choose One)* | | | | | | | **Notes** | | **Evaluation Toolkit References** |
| **1** | **2** | | **3** | **4** | **5** | |
| 1. Agency staff and partners are familiar with available resources for evidence-based research and evaluation and regularly review recent reports to inform decisions. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1  Pages 1-11 |
| 1. Agency staff work strategically to cultivate cross-agency relationships and support for evaluation from the Governor’s office, State Workforce Boards, agency heads, and State Legislative staff. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1  Pages 1-11 |
| 1. The agency promotes partnerships with universities, foundations, or other entities that have the capacity to conduct evaluation | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1  Pages 1-11 |
| 1. When planning to implement new or revamped programs and services, agency staff and partners regularly consider effective evaluation strategies. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1  Pages 1-11 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 2** | | **Funding Strategies** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Does the state or region actively pursue funding for and invest in evaluations?* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ratings:** | 1—Not at all | | 2—Making progress, but a long way to go | | | 3—Have some of this, sometimes | | | | 4—Yes, in place now | | 5—In place and exceeding | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Statement** | | | | **Rating** *(Choose One)* | | | | | | | **Notes** | | **Evaluation Toolkit References** |
| **1** | **2** | | **3** | **4** | **5** | |
| 1. The state or region uses the Governor’s statewide set-aside funds strategically to conduct evaluations of Title I core programs, as required by WIOA.[[1]](#footnote-1) | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 2.1  Pages 11-12 |
| 1. The state or region uses (or has used) discretionary grants from the DOL Workforce Data Quality Initiative (WDQI) or ED State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) to develop data infrastructure. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 2.1  Pages 11-12 |
| 1. The state or region pursues additional funding for evaluation through competitive grant programs administered by DOL and other agencies. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 2.1  Pages 11-12 |
| 1. The state or region incorporates evaluation requirements into funding opportunity and competitive procurement requirements. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 2.1  Pages 11-12 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 3** | | **Data Management** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Does the agency have adequate operational capacity, IT infrastructure, and policies and procedures for collecting and using data for evaluations?* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ratings:** | 1—Not at all | | 2—Making progress, but a long way to go | | | 3—Have some of this, sometimes | | | | 4—Yes, in place now | | 5—In place and exceeding | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Statement** | | | | **Rating** *(Choose One)* | | | | | | | **Notes** | | **Evaluation Toolkit References** |
| **1** | **2** | | **3** | **4** | **5** | |
| 1. The agency has access to cross-agency longitudinal administrative data that cover a range of public programs, including Unemployment Insurance (UI) wage record data. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 2.1  Pages 13-15 |
| 1. There is a centralized entity in the state or region which maintains data across agencies and there are clear, streamlined procedures for processing data requests. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 2.1  Pages 13-15 |
| 1. The state or region has data sharing agreements to facilitate interstate exchange of UI wage record data for both WIOA reporting and evaluation. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 2.1  Pages 13-15 |
| 1. The agency leverages other federal data collection efforts to support evaluation activities.[[2]](#footnote-2) | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 2.1  Pages 13-15 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 4** | | **Staff Skills, Capacity and Knowledge** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Does the agency have sufficient staff with the skills, knowledge, and experience needed to conduct or oversee third-party evaluations?* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ratings:** | 1—Not at all | | 2—Making progress, but a long way to go | | | 3—Have some of this, sometimes | | | | 4—Yes, in place now | | 5—In place and exceeding | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Statement** | | | | **Rating** *(Choose One)* | | | | | | | **Notes** | | **Evaluation Toolkit References** |
| **1** | **2** | | **3** | **4** | **5** | |
| 1. The agency has an in-house research and evaluation unit. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 2.1  Pages 12-13  Section 5.1, 5.2  Pages 44-46 |
| 1. In the absence of an in-house research and evaluation unit, the agency has designated—and allocated resources to—staff to lead evaluation activities internally or to serve as liaison to a third-party evaluator. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 5.1, 5.2  Pages 44-46 |
| 1. Agency staff are familiar with the major evaluation types and understand the relative advantages and disadvantages of each. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 3.1, 3.2  Pages 18-25 |
| 1. Agency staff know how to select the most appropriate evaluation design based on the primary research questions and other practical considerations. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 3.1, 3.2  Pages 18-25 |
| 1. Agency staff know how to conduct market research to identify third-party evaluators with the necessary qualifications, capabilities, and experience. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4  Pages 44-48 |
| 1. Agency staff can identify and clearly articulate key personnel requirements, such as education level, evaluation experience, and subject matter expertise. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4  Pages 44-48 |
| 1. Agency staff can develop reliable labor effort estimates that accurately reflect the scope of the evaluation. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4  Pages 44-48 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section 5** | | **Strategic Planning** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Does the state have a comprehensive strategic plan that includes evaluation as an integral part of the plan?* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ratings:** | 1—Not at all | | 2—Making progress, but a long way to go | | | 3—Have some of this, sometimes | | | | 4—Yes, in place now | | 5—In place and exceeding | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Statement** | | | | **Rating** *(Choose One)* | | | | | | | **Notes** | | **Evaluation Toolkit References** |
| **1** | **2** | | **3** | **4** | **5** | |
| 1. The state has a process for involving all key agencies in the development of a plan that includes evaluation goals, study priorities, funding mechanisms, and roles/responsibilities. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 2.2  Pages 15-17 |
| 1. The state has developed an ‘evidence portfolio’ on particular subject areas of interest. This evidence portfolio includes evidence reviews and descriptive research using existing data. | | | |  |  | |  |  |  | |  | | Section 2.2  Pages 15-17 |

1. As required by § 682.200(d), States must use funds reserved by the Governor for statewide activities to conduct evaluations of activities under the WIOA title I core programs in order to promote continuous improvement, research and test innovative services and strategies, and achieve high levels of performance and outcomes. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Examples include the Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Federal Statistical Research Data Centers (FSRDCs), and the Center for Administrative Records Research and Applications (CARRA). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)