



EVAL HUB

Evaluation and Research Hub

What the Evidence Says About Employer Engagement

A brief report for the

U.S. Department of Labor
Office of Policy Development and Research
Division of Research and Evaluation

Prepared and edited by
Margaret Patterson, PhD
Michelle Carson, M.S.
Safal Partners
December 2021

Acknowledgements

This review of existing research and completed evaluations is a collaboration of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL), Employment and Training Administration, Office of Policy Development and Research, Division of Research and Evaluation (DRE) and Safal Partners. We benefited from the vision, support, and ongoing feedback by Gloria Salas-Kos, Neil Ridley, and Wayne Gordon. At Safal Partners, Margaret Patterson compiled the brief report, *What the Evidence Says About: Employer Engagement* and Michelle Carson, Ingrid Schonfield, and Placido Gomez contributed to the review.

This brief report was produced by Safal Partners and funded, either wholly or in part, with federal funds from the USDOL Employment and Training Administration under task order number: 1630DC-19-E-F-0024 and contract number 1630DC-18-A-0005. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of USDOL, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement of the same by the U.S. government.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Challenges Surrounding Employer Engagement	2
Business and Workforce Development Partnerships	2
Studies that Demonstrate Use of Employer Engagement Features or Design Elements	4
Considerations for Future Evaluations	6
Appendix A: Features of Studies Reviewed in This Brief	7
Appendix B: Methods	12

Table of Figures

Figure 1. Employer Engagement and Partnership with Workforce Programs	4
---	---

Introduction

State and federal workforce policies encourage partnerships between workforce development programs and businesses¹ and have promoted employer engagement since at least the 1980s.² The *Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act* (WIOA), enacted in 2014, emphasizes employer involvement in state and local workforce programming and planning.³ WIOA also includes a core performance indicator on effectiveness in serving employers and establishes “new performance metrics related to employer engagement, encouragement that states and local areas adopt sector- or industry-based strategies, ... and changes to employer contribution requirements for customized training programs.”⁴

However, engaging businesses in partnerships to enhance workforce development programs and activities is not without challenges.⁵ These challenges may include:

- conducting outreach,
- working through differences in organizational cultures,
- understanding business needs in an uncertain labor market, and
- forming enduring partnerships with businesses.

This brief report reviews current research about employer engagement and some of the challenges identified in recent studies. It also describes and synthesizes key elements identified for developing business partnerships with workforce system programs. Lastly, this review outlines related research and evaluation findings that may strengthen workforce agency capacity with employer engagement.⁶ This synthesized review of employer engagement and business partnerships with workforce development programs may also be useful to researchers, state and local evaluators, and workforce development program staff who seek to increase the use of effective employer engagement strategies.

This brief reviews the following topics:

- Key elements of business / workforce system partnerships
- Integral roles of employers in partnerships
- Strategies that successful partnerships employ
- Outcomes of partnerships
- Activities and features of employer engagement
- Employer engagement as a design element in evaluation

Acknowledging an earlier quantitative evaluation that examined employer engagement strategies, *Tuning in to Local Labor Markets: Findings from the Sectoral Employment Impact Study*,⁷ this brief report reviews a series of evaluations, research, and case studies completed between 2015 and 2020. This review yields insights into what works and does not work with employer engagement in workforce development programs.⁸ Recommendations from four sets of case studies, an implementation study, an outcomes study, and three impact studies that may inform future research and evaluation are also included. A series of tables that feature these studies is included in Appendix A of this brief.

Challenges Surrounding Employer Engagement

Current research notes the challenges involved with ongoing and relevant employer outreach and involvement in program development and implementation. Workforce programs may struggle with effectively involving businesses, in part due to institutional barriers as well as to high costs of recruitment, engagement, and training development.⁹ Evaluation findings from the Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCCT), Accelerating Opportunity, and Shifting Gears grant projects point to a need for effective outreach to and engagement of businesses and industry, beyond representation on workforce development boards or advisory councils.¹⁰ Employers may see little value in engagement, given the perceived costs and time constraints, or may be wary of working with other businesses who may be competitors.¹¹ Researchers note that some employers are skeptical of public job programs and may perceive such programs as having a lack of sufficient funding and capacity to fill their skill needs.¹²

Moreover, businesses and workforce programs operate within different organizational cultures that may hinder engagement.¹³ According to researchers, the differences foster miscommunication about needs since “vastly different organizational cultures, workforce organizations and employers do not speak the same language.”¹⁴ Barnow and Spaulding add, “Public sector organizations may not be able to speak the same language as employers because of their different views of the world. For example, employers view their workers as a means to producing their goods and services, but government agencies and other workforce organizations may see it as their mission to help the less fortunate escape from poverty. They [workforce development agencies or organizations] may find it difficult to [also] recognize employers as a primary customer.”¹⁵

Additionally, businesses continue to experience gaps in finding well-prepared candidates through the workforce system for middle-level skilled positions.¹⁶ Thus, while businesses may have an immediate need to hire staff with middle-level skills, workforce development programs and their training partners need time to ramp up to meet that need. For example, in healthcare, technicians in phlebotomy or radiology may be needed, but local service providers require time to train and place jobseekers.

Business and Workforce Development Partnerships

Research indicates that developing relationships with businesses and responding to employer skill needs takes time and resources.¹⁷ Employer engagement through a partnership implies workforce development agencies and program managers know the business and its needs intensively. It is also important to take the necessary steps to involve employers in designing workforce development programs, services, and activities that can enhance jobseekers’ success (see inset on p. 3).¹⁸ Examples of business and workforce program partnership activities are to co-develop curricula for training, customize programming for a business, or collaborate to deliver sector-based strategies.

Local partnerships typically involve workforce development agencies, employers and industry associations, training providers, unions, and community organizations.¹⁹

Five Strategies to Engage Employers:²³

1. Carefully select employers to engage and form partnerships.
2. Acquire deep knowledge of employer and jobseeker needs.
3. Build trusting relationships with employers by providing quality services.
4. Use targeted strategies to remove any negative employer perceptions.
5. Leverage partnerships and knowledge of the community.

Employers and industry associations engage increasingly with community colleges or other training providers on training in specific sectors, such as healthcare, advanced manufacturing, and information technology (IT).²⁰ The types of employer engagement discussed in the research literature include involving employers in program management and oversight, program design, and hiring.²¹ Strong partnerships engage a core group of employer “champions” to set a partnership agenda, involve employer senior management in partnership operations, include businesses in planning and implementing training, and encourage high-performing employers to recruit and then mentor or coach incoming employer champions.²² According to a 2018 study, strong partnerships tend to involve several employer staff and require collaboration to pursue grant funding or develop multiple training programs.²³

In a TAACCCT evaluation, an employer-focused sector advisory council is noted as enhancing workforce-employer partnerships in implementation.³⁸ The evaluation employed propensity score matching to draw causal inferences and found these positive participant outcomes:

- Program completers earned 30% higher average wages.
- Employment rates for non-incumbent workers improved from 58% to 83%.

A high level of employer engagement in operational aspects of a partnership is critical to successful sector strategies²⁴ driven by businesses.²⁵ An example is Project Quest, a program “explicitly designed to be driven by employers in key sectors of the economy (e.g., health care).”²⁶ Since 1992, this project has served more than 7,000 low-income adults in San Antonio, providing them access to middle-class career opportunities in IT, manufacturing, and healthcare. This project “worked with community colleges and employers to ensure that graduates had the skills to meet employers’ needs.”²⁷ “Sector strategies are industry-driven, as distinct from including industry as a primary customer. Without a high level of industry engagement, there can be no real sector partnership.”²⁸ Strong partnerships ensure

workforce programming aligns with current labor markets and create opportunities to change employer practices,²⁹ which are important to potential and incumbent employees.³⁰

Several studies mention incumbent worker training as an opportunity for advancement,³¹ as part of a package of services to businesses,³² or as an element of college-employer partnerships.³³ One study referred to its potential role in employer engagement: “The Lancaster [Workforce Investment Board] also finds that incumbent worker training is an effective method for quickly engaging new employers. The training enables quick outcomes and can be useful in building relationships. As trust in the system builds, employers tend to be more willing to look to a workforce board to meet other needs, as well.”³⁴

As another example, a recent evaluation noted the role of a business-focused sector advisory council in enhancing Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College Career Training (TAACCCT) partnerships with employers and the public workforce system, guiding strategy implementation and review, and reviewing programs and research (see findings in inset on p. 4).³⁵ Through the sector advisory council, the TAACCCT partnership determined business demand for skills training in targeted industries, identified gaps in current career training programs, and selected an evidence-based model for programming. The sector advisory council was an “invaluable part of the project” in determining curriculum and making program improvements, according to implementation evaluation interviews and observations.³⁶

Another TAACCCT national evaluation studied community college relationships with employers to more fully understand employers’ perspectives on developing and maintaining strong relationships with colleges.³⁷ Employers served in advisory roles, as hands-on partners, and as strategic partners. The study collected information on how colleges initially approached employers and maintained relationships with them. “Most employers with strong relationships with a college said they got a positive return on their investment from their collaboration,” including access to skilled employees and savings from retaining employees.³⁸

In a 2016 case study, five “pioneer employers” in the healthcare sector were highlighted “for their ability to solve not only business challenges but also social problems” through innovative workforce development strategies and models.³⁹ In partnership with area community colleges, pioneer employers implemented two strategies to benefit frontline healthcare workers: team-based work structure and skill development opportunities. Teaming up frontline workers with skilled nursing staff promoted cross training and efficiency. Offering salary increases for more training and providing career ladders to frontline workers appeared to benefit employee retention, job performance, and job satisfaction. The case study concluded that similar “strategies of team-based operational groups and informal training opportunities could be applied to other industry sectors, such as food services, manufacturing, and retail.”⁴⁰

Studies that Demonstrate Use of Employer Engagement Features or Design Elements

As a result of the studies highlighted in this brief, we adapted a 2015 framework to enhance the organization and description of the goals of employer engagement and workforce program goals and employer services provided. (see Figure 1).⁴¹ The framework may inform research and evaluation of such partnerships, too.

Figure 1. Employer Engagement and Partnership with Workforce Programs*



*This figure is adapted from [Spaulding, S. & Martin-Caughey, A. 2015](#)

Employer engagement is a key feature or design element – though not the focus of the evaluations – in several recent major workforce evaluation studies. A major quantitative evaluation providing insights on employer engagement, the Sectoral Employment Impact Study of 2010, is a large-scale randomized controlled trial (RCT).⁴² Three longstanding sectoral programs were studied for impact. All three programs increased participant employment and earnings during the 24 months after a baseline survey.⁴³ The study reported engaging employers in program design and delivery. Employers participated in program delivery through participant work experience or activities such as mock interviews and job fairs.⁴⁴

A 2017 evaluation of seven central Texas training programs for high-demand occupations, including Skillpoint Alliance’s Gateway program, began with a need to more fully engage businesses in shaping training that would be responsive to their hiring needs. By matching its training to the needs of businesses, the Gateway program aimed for trainees to learn the skills and earn the industry-recognized certifications needed to become employed. The evaluation included descriptions of programming and support services and analyses of participant demographics and outcomes across five cohorts. The Gateway program reported a quarterly employment gain of 20 percentage points, with a quarterly earnings gain of \$3,412. The program also led to a 79 percent reduction in Unemployment Insurance (UI) compensation claims and a 22 percent increase in those eligible for UI benefits following the program.⁴⁵

Project Quest, as referred to earlier, provided thousands of low-income adults access to career opportunities in IT, manufacturing, and healthcare. A 2019 Project Quest impact evaluation found significant earnings impact was sustained over a nine-year period after enrollment, with program graduates earning an average of \$46,580 by the final year of evaluation.⁴⁶ While employer engagement was not explicitly evaluated, in their discussion of long-term recommendations, Project Quest evaluators referred to the potential payoff from collaboration with businesses. The Pathways for Advancing Careers and Education (PACE) evaluation, sponsored through the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, is a multi-site, RCT evaluation of promising strategies for increasing employment and self-sufficiency among low-income families. One of nine PACE programs, YearUp, provides training, postsecondary credentials, and internship opportunities in IT and financial services sectors to youth ages 18 to 24.⁴⁷ YearUp’s impact and implementation evaluation found large effects on increased earnings for participants. Another component of YearUp’s success is employer engagement. Employers are engaged in advisory roles, in-demand skills identification, and training program design. Year Up also engages employers as guest speakers, elective instructors, and participants in Year Up activities. “Year Up’s success in engaging employers demonstrates the potential for not only expanding opportunities for work-based learning in fast-growing professional occupations, but also for mobilizing private sector financing of organizations that serve as intermediaries between newly skilled job seekers and employers.”⁴⁸

Another qualitative evaluation of a youth career and technical education grant program examined early grant implementation activities including employer engagement activities. All 24 grantees were surveyed to identify the percentage agreeing/strongly agreeing to whether the employer partner engaged in development and support or workforce preparation activities. The top five activities that demonstrated employer engagement were 1) helped define strategies and goals, 2) actively participated on advisory board, 3) provided resources to support education / training, 4) provided field trips to employers’ work sites, and 5) provided leadership outside the advisory board.⁴⁹

Considerations for Future Evaluations

Our review of the literature serves as the basis for the recommendations that follow regarding data collection, metrics, and future evaluation of employer engagement strategies. Fundamentally, service providers need to “place a premium on the use of data to inform decision making and investments” by identifying metrics and collecting data that can be employed in a rigorous experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation, including UI wage data, when appropriate.⁵⁰ Examples of approaches for quality data collection on employer engagement metrics include administering a survey of sector trends and analyzing results, conducting “an in-depth analysis of the key jobs in each sector and the tie between those jobs and regional economic impact,” and partnering with regional workforce boards “to build up research and analysis expertise.”⁵¹ Surveying and interviewing employers that participate in high-functioning partnerships can determine dimensions of relationship strength, ways to initiate and maintain partnerships, and the value of workforce agency relationships to businesses.⁵²

There are few evaluations with an explicit connection between employer engagement and obtaining employment, length of employment, earning gains and other major economic outcomes. Additional studies are needed to identify effective workforce programming that fills those gaps. Although several recent papers have described higher-functioning workforce/business partnerships,⁵³ deeper and rigorous evaluation of such partnerships and employer engagement is needed to measure the impacts of these relationships. Richer descriptions of those successful partnerships, formed between workforce agencies and business,⁵⁴ would benefit workforce service providers. Implementation of employer engagement strategies, as proposed in the framework in Figure 1, also needs to be systematically evaluated, examining “what effective employer engagement strategies look like and how they are organized and managed within workforce systems and workforce sector partnerships.”⁵⁵ Furthermore, examining such relationships can occur with thoughtful research questions for evaluation. Examples of research questions include: *How do we measure employer engagement? Which aspects have the most value for employers and program participants? How do you identify effective partnerships involving employers and workforce programs?*

This compilation may prove useful for workforce staff in the development and implementation of employer engagement strategies and for researchers in continuing to build evidence with strategies that work. Appendix A contains a series of tables with the studies reviewed for evidence about business partnerships and employer engagement. The four tables highlight the features of impact and outcome studies, implementation studies, case studies, and research/policy studies. Each table contains the following features: employer engagement activities, employer partnership model, research design, participant impact or outcome, study sample, and author.

Appendix A: Features of Studies Reviewed in This Brief

IMPACT AND OUTCOME STUDIES					
Employer Engagement Activities	Employer Partnership Model	Research Design	Participant Impact/ Outcome	Study Sample (N)	Author(s)
Having a business-focused sector advisory council guiding strategy implementation and review, and reviewing programs and research	TAACCCT	Quasi-experimental, propensity score matching	Program completion, employment gain, earnings increase	2,087 adults	Harpole (2017).
Engaging employers in program design and delivery, including through participant work experience or mock interviews and job fairs	Sectoral Employment Impact	Randomized control trial	Employment gain, length of employment, earnings increase, hours worked	1,014 low-income adults	Maguire et al. (2010).
Working with community colleges and employers to ensure that graduates had the skills to meet employers' needs	Project Quest	Randomized control trial	Earnings increase, length of employment	410 low-income adults	Roder & Elliott (2019).
Providing training, postsecondary credentials, and internship opportunities in IT and financial services sectors, advisory roles, in-demand skills identification, training program design, guest speakers, and elective instructors	Year Up	Randomized control trial	Earnings increase, credential completion	2,544 youth 18-24 years	Fein & Hamadyk (2018).
Providing support services, shaping training that would be responsive to their hiring needs, and planning for trainees to learn the skills and earn the industry-recognized certifications needed to become employed	Gateway	Quasi-experimental, propensity score matching	Employment gain, length of employment, earnings increase, program completion	4,887 county workforce development system participants	O'Shea et al. (2017).

Note: N/A = not applicable to study

IMPLEMENTATION STUDIES

Employer Engagement Activities	Employer Partnership Model	Research Design	Participant Impact/ Outcome	Study Sample (N)	Author(s)
Involving local workforce investment board to engage employers, hosting on-the-job training opportunities	Jobs and Innovation Accelerator Challenge	Qualitative	Employment gain, length of employment, earnings increase, improved career advancement and mobility	7,603 ETA trainees	Angus et al. (2017).
Offering development, support, and workforce preparation activities	Youth CareerConnect	Qualitative	N/A	14,249 high school students	Maxwell et al. (2017).

Note: N/A = not applicable to study

CASE STUDIES

Employer Engagement Activities	Employer Partnership Model	Research Design	Participant Impact/ Outcome	Study Sample (N)	Author(s)
Providing a team-based work structure and skill development opportunities for frontline healthcare employees	Pioneer Employers	Descriptive	Operational efficiency increases, patient outcomes, staff turnover declines, job satisfaction, career advancement	5 healthcare employers	McKay & Giovannitti (2016).
Contributing customized training programs and getting involved in program management and oversight, program design, and hiring	Sectoral Employment Impact, Capital IDEA, CETA On-the-Job Training	Experimental and quasi-experimental	Program participation, employment gain, hours worked, earnings increase	1014 low-income adults for SEIS; 879 low-income adults for Capital IDEA; varies for CETA	Barnow & Spaulding (2015).
Engaging in operational aspects of a partnership	Bay State Skills Corporation, Project QUEST, JOBS Initiative, National Network of Sector Partners, Sectoral Employment Impact, Washington State Skills Panels, Accelerating Adoption of State Sector Strategies Initiative, Capital IDEA, Comprehensive Employment Training, Year Up, I-BEST	Experimental and quasi-experimental	Program participation, employment gain, hours worked, earnings increase	Multiple studies reviewed – no N provided	King & Prince (2015).
Aligning workforce programming with current labor markets and creating opportunities to change employer practices	N/A	Descriptive	N/A	3 community-based organizations	Spaulding & Blount (2018).

Note: N/A = not applicable to study

RESEARCH/POLICY STUDIES

Employer Engagement Activities	Employer Partnership Model	Research Design	Participant Impact/ Outcome	Study Sample (N)	Author(s)
Meet specific employer skill requirements, and building employer confidence over time in the workers' developing skills	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Holzer (2017).
Providing technical assistance and financial incentives for employers	N/A	N/A	N/A	Census Bureau and Bureau of Labor Statistics samples, no N provided	Holzer (2017).
Setting a partnership agenda, involving employer senior management in partnership operations, including businesses in planning and implementing training, and encouraging high-performing employers to recruit and then mentor or coach incoming employers	Bay State Skills Corporation, Project QUEST, Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership, Washington State Skills Panels, Worksystems, Lancaster County Workforce Investment Board, SCPA Works	N/A	N/A	N/A	Prince, King, & Oldmixon. (2017).

RESEARCH/POLICY STUDIES

Employer Engagement Activities	Employer Partnership Model	Research Design	Participant Impact/ Outcome	Study Sample (N)	Author(s)
Involving multiple employer staff and requiring collaboration to pursue grant funding or develop multiple training programs	N/A	Mixed	N/A	41 TAACCCT employer-partners	Scott, et al. (2018).
Aligning education and training systems to employer needs, reforming Pell grants and financial aid, and creating better work supports	Year Up	N/A	N/A	N/A	Spaulding et al. (2015).
Providing program design and delivery, oversight, recruitment and hiring, and financial or in-kind resources	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Spaulding & Martin-Caughey (2015).

Note: N/A = not applicable to study

Appendix B: Methods

To develop this brief report, the authors reviewed current research and existing evaluation reports about employer engagement. Key workforce system themes for employer engagement challenges, key elements in business partnerships with programs, and related findings with potential to strengthen workforce agency capacity were identified. Sources for the review included WorkforceGPS, CLEAR, Google Scholar, ResearchGate, and ERIC. Types of studies reviewed include 19 evaluation, research, and case studies completed from 2015 to 2020, plus two relevant earlier studies, that yield insights on employer engagement. While employer engagement was a key feature or design element of each study, it was not necessarily the focus in any of the studies included in this review. Additionally, Figure 1 adapts a 2015 framework to describe employer engagement, employer services, and workforce development programs goals that may be used to inform future study of partnerships.

To summarize the analysis from this employer engagement review, the authors extrapolated recommendations from case studies, an implementation study, an outcomes study, and impact studies for consideration by the readers of this review. Following the recommendations, a series of tables that feature these studies as evidence about business partnerships and employer engagement are included in Appendix A. With respect to study type and design, five impact and outcome studies employed experimental (3) or quasi-experimental (2) designs; four case studies discussed experimental and quasi-experimental designs (2) or descriptive analyses (2), two implementation studies were qualitative, and a research study employed mixed methods to understand employer perspectives (see Appendix A). Each table contains the following features: employer engagement activities, employer partnership model, research design, participant impact or outcome, study sample, and author. The highlighted recommendations and Appendix A may be helpful and inform future research and evaluation of employer engagement.

References

- Angus, M. H., Bellotti, J., English, B., Boraas, S., Hollenbeck, K., & Osborn, S. Regional collaboration to create a high-skilled workforce: Evaluation of the Jobs and Innovation Accelerator challenge grants. Mathematica Policy Research, 2018. <https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/OASP/evaluation/pdf/Regional-Collaboration-to-Creat-a-High-Skilled-Workforce-Eval-of-JIAC-Grants-Report.pdf>
- Eyster, L., Scott, M., & Anderson, T. Employer perspectives on building partnerships with community colleges: Lessons for local leaders and practitioners. Brief prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor, Chief Evaluation Office. Abt Associates and The Urban Institute, 2020. https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/OASP/evaluation/pdf/ETA_EmployerPerspectivesStudy_Brief_Sep2020.pdf
- Fein, D., & Hamadyk, J. Bridging the opportunity divide for low-income youth: Implementation and early impacts of the Year Up program. OPRE Report, 65, 2018. https://www.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/opre/pace_8_year_up_narrative_6_1_18_508.pdf
- General Accounting Office. Employment training: successful projects share common strategy. Statement of Carlotta C. Joyner, Director Education and Employment Issues Health, Education, and Human Services Division, 1996. <https://www.gao.gov/assets/110/106442.pdf>
- Harpole, S. H. Final evaluation Golden Triangle Modern Manufacturing Project. Submitted to the Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration, 2017. <http://www.skillscommons.org/bitstream/handle/taaccct/15669/Final%20Evaluation%20Golden%20Triangle%20Modern%20Manufacturing%20Project.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Holzer, H. Job market polarization and US worker skills: A tale of two middles. Economic Studies, The Brookings Institution, 2015. https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/polarization_jobs_policy_holzer.pdf
- Holzer, H. J. Building a new middle class in the knowledge economy. Psychosociological Issues in Human Resource Management, 5(2), 96-126, 2017. https://www.progressivepolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/PPI_MiddleClassJobs_2017.pdf
- Holzer, H. J. The role of skills and jobs in transforming communities. Cityscape, 19(1), 171-190, 2017. <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/periodicals/cityscape/vol19num1/ch9.pdf>
- Maguire, S., Freely, J., Clymer, C., Conway, M., & Schwarz, D. Tuning in to local labor markets: Findings from the Sectoral Employment Impact Study. Public/Private Ventures, 2010. <https://clear.dol.gov/Study/Tuning-local-labor-markets-Findings-Sectoral-Employment-Impact-Study-Scholas-Maguire-et-al>
- Maxwell, N. L., Whitesell, E., Bellotti, J., Leshnick, S. S., Henderson-Frakes, J., & Berman, D. Youth CareerConnect: Early implementation findings. Social Policy, 2017. <https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/OASP/legacy/files/YCC-Implementation-Report.pdf>
- McKay, S., & Giovannitti, J. Investing in frontline health care workers: Cases from Maryland, West Virginia, and North Carolina. Developing Career-Based Training, 30, 2016. <https://www.frbatlanta.org/-/media/documents/community-development/publications/special/ebooks/2017/developing-career-based-training-2017-03-28-pdf.pdf#page=33>

O'Shea, D., Prince, H. J., Juniper, C., & Rodriguez, P. Evaluation of Travis County investments in workforce development 2016 update, 2017. <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/62151>

Prince, H., King, C., & Oldmixon, S. Promoting the adoption of sector strategies by workforce development boards Under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, 2017. http://raymarshallcenter.org/files/2017/05/Sector_Strategy_Final_Report_March_2017.pdf

Roder, A. & Elliott, M. Nine year gains: Project QUEST's continuing impact. Economic Mobility Corporation, 2019. https://economicmobilitycorp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/NineYearGains_web.pdf

Schaberg, K. Can sector strategies promote longer-term effects? Three-year impacts from the WorkAdvance Demonstration" MDRC, 2017. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED577948.pdf>

Schrock, G. Reworking Workforce Development: Chicago's Sectoral Workforce Centers. Economic Development Quarterly 27(3) 163-178, 2013. <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1031.3510&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Scott, M., Eyster, L., Su, Y., Blount, D., Trutko, A., Smith, A., & Gardiner, K. The Employer Perspectives Study: Insights on how to build and maintain strong employer-college partnerships. Round 4 TAACCCT Evaluation. Report prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor, Chief Evaluation Office, 2018. <https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/OASP/legacy/files/Employer-Perspectives-Study-Report-Round-Final.pdf>

Spaulding, S., & Blount, D. C. Employer engagement by community-based organizations. Urban Institute, 2018. https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/98480/employer_engagement_by_community-based_organizations_1.pdf

Spaulding, S., Lerman, R. I., Holzer, H. J., & Eyster, L. Expanding economic opportunity for young men and boys of color through employment and training." Urban Institute, 2015. <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/2000097-Expanding-Economic-Opportunity-for-Boys-and-Young-Men-of-Color-through-Employment-and-Training-1.pdf>

Spaulding, S., & Martin-Caughey, A. The goals and dimensions of employer engagement in workforce development programs. Urban Institute, 2015. <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/2000552-The-Goals-and-Dimensions-of-Employer-Engagement-in-Workforce-Development-Programs.pdf>

Van Horn, C., Edwards, T., & Greene, T. Transforming U.S. workforce development policies for the 21st century. W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 2015. <https://evalhub.workforcegps.org/resources/2018/09/06/15/37/Transforming-U-S-Workforce-Development-Policies-for-the-21st-Century>

Endnotes

- ¹ [Holzer, H. J. \(2017\); Holzer, H. \(2015\).](#)
- ² [Barnow, B., & Spaulding, S. in *Van Horn, C., Edwards, T., & Greene, T.* \(2015\); *GAO.* \(1996\).](#)
- ³ [Spaulding, S. & Martin-Caughey, A. \(2015\).](#)
- ⁴ [Barnow, B., & Spaulding, S. in *Van Horn et al.* \(2015\), p. 234.](#)
- ⁵ [Scott et al. \(2018\).](#)
- ⁶ Within this brief “engagement” is employed as a broad term that encompasses formal and informal partnerships with employers as well as formal and informal relationships.
- ⁷ [Maguire et al. \(2010\).](#)
- ⁸ Employer engagement is not an explicit focus in evaluations cited in this brief. However, it is an important design feature or program component of programs that focused on the effect of sectoral and other programs on participant outcomes.
- ⁹ [Barnow, B., & Spaulding, S. in *Van Horn et al.* \(2015\).](#)
- ¹⁰ [Spaulding et al. \(2015\); Barnow, B., & Spaulding, S. in *Van Horn et al.* \(2015\).](#)
- ¹¹ [Spaulding, S. & Martin-Caughey, A. \(2015\).](#)
- ¹² [Holzer, H. J. \(2017\); Holzer, H. \(2015\); Spaulding, S. & Martin-Caughey, A. \(2015\).](#)
- ¹³ [Spaulding, S. & Martin-Caughey, A. \(2015\).](#)
- ¹⁴ [Spaulding, S. & Martin-Caughey, A. \(2015\), p. 3.](#)
- ¹⁵ [Barnow, B., & Spaulding, S. in *Van Horn, C., Edwards, T., & Greene, T.* \(2015\), p. 255.](#)
- ¹⁶ [Holzer, H. \(2015\).](#)
- ¹⁷ [Maguire et al. \(2010\); Maxwell et al. \(2017\); Schaberg, K. \(2017\); Scott et al. \(2018\).](#)
- ¹⁸ [Spaulding, S., & Blount, D. C. \(2018\).](#)
- ¹⁹ [Spaulding et al. \(2015\).](#)
- ²⁰ [Holzer, H. \(2015\).](#)
- ²¹ [Barnow, B., & Spaulding, S. in *Van Horn et al.* \(2015\).](#)
- ²² [Prince, H., King, C., & Oldmixon, S. \(2017\).](#)
- ²³ [Scott et al. \(2018\).](#)
- ²⁴ [Prince et al. \(2017\).](#)
- ²⁵ [King, C., & Prince, H. in *Van Horn et al.* \(2015\); Prince et al. \(2017\).](#)
- ²⁶ [Prince et al. \(2017\), p. 8.](#)
- ²⁷ [Roder, A., & Elliot, M. \(2019\), p. 12.](#)
- ²⁸ [Prince et al. \(2017\), p. 12.](#)
- ²⁹ [Spaulding, S., & Blount, D. C. \(2018\).](#)
- ³⁰ [Spaulding, S. & Martin-Caughey, A. \(2015\).](#)
- ³¹ [Angus et al., \(2017\); Maguire et al., \(2010\); Schrock, \(2013\); Scott et al., \(2018\).](#)
- ³² [Angus et al., \(2017\).](#)
- ³³ [Eyster et al., \(2020\); Scott et al., \(2018\).](#)
- ³⁴ [Prince, King, and Oldmixon \(2017\).](#)
- ³⁵ [Harpole, S. H. \(2017\).](#)
- ³⁶ [Harpole, S. H. \(2017\), p. 38.](#)
- ³⁷ [Eyster et al. \(2020\).](#)
- ³⁸ [Eyster et al. \(2020\), p. 6.](#)
- ³⁹ [McKay, S., & Giovannitti, J. \(2016\), p. 31.](#)
- ⁴⁰ [McKay, S., & Giovannitti, J. \(2016\), p. 38.](#)
- ⁴¹ Figure 1 is adapted from [Spaulding, S. & Martin-Caughey, A. \(2015\).](#)
- ⁴² [Maguire et al. \(2010\).](#)
- ⁴³ [Barnow, B., & Spaulding, S. in *Van Horn et al.* \(2015\).](#)
- ⁴⁴ [Maguire et al. \(2010\).](#) The evaluation report includes appendices on sample selection and randomization used in the evaluation, as well as methods for determining impact.
- ⁴⁵ [O’Shea, D., Prince, H. J., Juniper, C., & Rodriguez, P. \(2017\).](#) Evaluators’ report considering “options for enriching analysis and improving treatment/ comparison group matching” (p. 61) and share their working four-year evaluation plan (2017 to 2021) in an appendix. This evaluation plan includes potential research questions and methodologies for future evaluators’ consideration.
- ⁴⁶ [Roder, A., & Elliot, M. \(2019\).](#)
- ⁴⁷ [Fein, D., & Hamadyk, J. \(2017\).](#)
- ⁴⁸ [Fein, D., & Hamadyk, J. \(2017\), p. ES-xiii.](#)
- ⁴⁹ [Maxwell et al. \(2017\).](#) The evaluation abstract shares research questions, an appendix lists data sources and survey constructs, and the evaluation report’s Table D.8 displays employer engagement items.
- ⁵⁰ [Prince et al. \(2017\), p. 22.](#)
- ⁵¹ [Prince et al. \(2017\), p. 16.](#)
- ⁵² [Scott et al. \(2018\).](#)
- ⁵³ [Prince, H., King, C., & Oldmixon, S. \(2017\); Scott et al. \(2018\); Spaulding, S., & Blount, D. C. \(2018\).](#)
- ⁵⁴ [Spaulding, S., & Blount, D. C. \(2018\).](#)
- ⁵⁵ [Spaulding, S. & Martin-Caughey, A. \(2015\), p. 11.](#)