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Sector Strategies Evolution

Began in 1980s with Commonwealth Corp (Boston) & Center for Employment Training (San Jose) and 1990s with Casey’s Jobs Initiative and other employer-driven models, e.g., QUEST (San Antonio), Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership, VIDA (South Texas), Capital IDEA (Austin).

- **Target specific industries** and/or clusters of occupations
- **Intervene through credible organizations** (e.g., workforce intermediaries)
- **Support workers** competing for quality job opportunities
- **Address employer needs and competitiveness**
- Create **lasting change in labor market systems helping both workers and employers**
Address 3 main goals simultaneously:

1. Increase worker skills
2. Improve productivity
3. Enhance regional competitiveness

Spread in 2000s through work of NGA, Aspen Institute’s Sectoral Training Academy, National Network of Sector Partners, National Fund for Workforce Solutions.

By 2009, 1,000+ sector partnerships operating across the US:

- 227 organizations targeting 20 industries
- 39 local workforce boards funded by USDOL
Common Career Pathway Elements

- **Targeted to regional labor markets, often on particular sectors.** CP strategies aren’t all sector based, and not all sector strategies feature CPs. But, CPs are increasingly being integrated into sector strategies.

- **Provide frameworks for workforce development,** helping to integrate services and resources of community colleges, workforce/social service agencies into structured sequences.

- **May offer 3 levels of training**—basic skills, entry-level & upgrade training—plus **paid internships,** e.g., Joyce Foundation’s 2007 6-state *Shifting Gears Initiative*.

- Often **feature occupationally contextualized ‘bridge’ programs** to help raise low-skilled student proficiency for taking credit courses.
Strong Emerging Evidence

Rigorous impact evaluations have been conducted since the mid-2000s.

P/PV-Aspen (Maguire et al. 2009) estimated experimental 24-month impacts from 3 sectoral training (healthcare, IT) programs: Jewish Vocational Services (Boston), Per Scholas (NYC), and Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership (Milwaukee). Participants—

- Earned significantly more ($4,500 or 18.3%) than controls over 24 months, fully 29.3% more in 2nd year post.
- Were more likely to work and work more consistently and, if employed, worked more hours and earned higher wages.
- Were more likely to work in jobs with employee benefits.
Evidence (Maguire et al. 2009)...

Figure 1: Total Earnings by Month

- **Earnings** vs. **Month**
- Control
- Treatment
- Significant Difference, p < .10
Evidence (Elliott & Roder 2017)...

Economic Mobility’s 6-year experimental evaluation of San Antonio’s Project QUEST (healthcare etc.) found that:

• QUEST participants’ earnings were significantly greater than controls in years 3-6 and earnings impacts were continuing to increase: earnings impacts were $2,286 in year 3, rising to $5,080 in year 6.
• QUEST participants worked more consistently and earned higher wages than controls in years 4-6.
• QUEST participants enjoyed significantly greater financial stability than controls by year 6.
• Earnings for QUEST participants were such that they were economically self-sufficient in San Antonio where almost all of them remained post-completion.
Ray Marshall Center longitudinal, quasi-experimental evaluation (King, Smith et al. 2011, 2012) found large, lasting, statistically significant impacts and high ROI for Capital IDEA (nursing, allied health, electrical trades, water/wastewater):

• Employment rates for all participants increased by 12.3 percentage points (to 74.3%) over all available quarters after participation, i.e., more than 7 ½ years.

• The share of participants monetarily qualified for UI benefits increased by 12.3 percentage points.

• Participants enjoyed a $759 advantage in average quarterly earnings (11.9 percentage points) over the period.

There were no significant differences in rates of UI benefit filings.
Evidence (King, Smith et al. 2011, 2012)...

Figure 14. Unconditional Earnings Over Time, Capital IDEA Participants vs. Comparison Group

- Capital IDEA
- Comparison group

Quarter Before and After Participation Began

NOTE: As time increases past the 8th quarter, fewer participants are included in the results.
ROI Analysis

- Participants spent on average 1.5 years in program at an estimated cost of $6,459/participant.
- Over the first 10 years, each dollar invested in Capital IDEA returns $1.65 to taxpayers, for an annual rate (IRR) of 9%
- Over 20 years, each dollar returns $5.01 to taxpayers, for an annual rate (IRR) of 17%
Enacted in July 2014, WIOA fully embraced these strategies, among other things:
• Mandating that governors implement sectoral strategies statewide as part of their states’ workforce development systems;
• Mandating that governors embrace evidence-based approaches to delivering remedial education services, e.g., I-BEST; and
• Encouraging governors and local workforce boards in their states to pursue career pathway approaches in order to deliver more effective services to jobseekers.
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CAP Family Life Study


• Surveys, child assessments, focus groups, administrative data

• Sample of 253 participants: 141 in CareerAdvance® and 112 in the matched comparison group (propensity score matching)

• 98% female, 30% single parents, average age 29 years, avg. household income $15,372, only 30% white, 49% high school/GED or less

• 62% of participants still enrolled at one year
1-Year Impacts: Certification

Comparison Group: 0.03
CareerAdvance Group: 0.61

Significance: ***
1-Year Impacts: Employment

**Employed**
- Comparison Group: 0.63
- CareerAdvance Group: 0.67

**Employed in healthcare**
- Comparison Group: 0.31
- CareerAdvance Group: 0.49

*** indicates statistical significance.
1-Year Impacts: Economic Well-Being

• Participants experienced decreased earnings ($2,045) while in school, but no increase in perceptions of material hardship

• They enjoyed average incentives and in-kind assistance in year 1 of $2,560
1-Year Impacts: Psychological Well-Being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effect Size, SD units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to work &amp; career</td>
<td>0.28 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>0.27 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>0.31 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1-Year Impacts: Stress & Psychological Well-Being

- Perceived stress: -0.05
- Psychological distress: -0.16
1-Year Impacts: Children’s Head Start Attendance

School days attended (%)
- Comparison Group: 0.87
- CareerAdvance Group: 0.90

Chronically absent (y/n)
- Comparison Group: 0.65
- CareerAdvance Group: 0.48

Significance levels:
- *: p < 0.05
- **: p < 0.01
- ***: p < 0.001
Qualitative Evidence

• Partner (e.g., Tulsa Community College, Tulsa Tech, Union Public Schools), CAP, CareerAdvance® and employer interviews are very encouraging.

• Participant focus groups and interviews since 2010 tell us CareerAdvance® and its components are largely on the right track.
Child Development Career Pathway Challenges Then & Now

CAP Tulsa and its funders considered pursuing a child development career pathway in 2009, but opted not to for several reasons, among them:

1. Entry points and opportunities for career advancement were limited compared to alternatives.

2. Expected time between certification/degree levels and job progression was longer than alternatives.

3. Employment demand was lower than alternatives and most of the demand for early childhood teachers resulted from turnover, not new job growth.

4. Compensation for starting and intermediate career positions was well below levels required for family economic self-sufficiency.
Figure 1: Early Childhood Education Career Path

- **CDA Certificate**
  - 9 credit hours + 480 hours experience
  - Teacher’s Aide
  - Starting Wage: $7.80-$8.75/hr
  - TCC Catalog, pg. 148

- **Certificate of Mastery**
  - 9 credit hours + 480 hours experience
  - Teacher II – CAP-Tulsa
  - Starting Wage: $7.94-$9.59/hr
  - TCC Catalog, pg. 148

- **Assoc. in Applied Science**
  - 60 credit hours

- **Assoc. of Science: Early Childhood Dev.**
  - 63 credit hours

- **BS in Early Childhood Education**
  - PK – Grade 3 Certified Teacher
  - Starting Salary: Appx $30,000/yr

- **Paraprofessional/Teacher’s Assistant**
  - Starting Wage: $8.10-$10.55/hr
  - TCC Catalog, pg. 145, 148
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Tulsa PS</th>
<th>Union PS</th>
<th>Broken Arrow PS</th>
<th>Jenks PS</th>
<th>Tulsa CAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s Aide</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$8.75/hr</td>
<td>$7.80/hr</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$7.94/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s Assistant/Paraprofessional (48 hours college credit)</td>
<td>$8.81/hr</td>
<td>$9.11/hr</td>
<td>$8.10/hr</td>
<td>$8.85/hr</td>
<td>$9.59/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parateacher (60 hours college credit or AS)</td>
<td>$10.06/hr</td>
<td>$9.57/hr</td>
<td>$8.40/hr</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$10.55/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessional (Special Education)</td>
<td>$12.11/hr</td>
<td>$9.11/hr</td>
<td>$8.75/hr</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified ECE Teacher</td>
<td>$32,900/yr</td>
<td>$31,600/yr</td>
<td>$30,686/yr</td>
<td>$32,760/yr</td>
<td>$28,119/yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Salary schedules obtained from employer websites, CAP-Tulsa.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tulsa PS</th>
<th>Union PS</th>
<th>Broken Arrow PS</th>
<th>Jenks PS</th>
<th>Tulsa CAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Insurance</strong></td>
<td>5 options for employees, partly paid by State or ISD</td>
<td>3 options for employees; ISD paid</td>
<td>5 options for employees, partly paid by State or ISD</td>
<td>5 options for employees, partly paid by State or ISD</td>
<td>2 options for employees, partly paid by CAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dental Insurance</strong></td>
<td>7 plans for employees; partly paid by State or ISD</td>
<td>1 plan offered</td>
<td>5 plans offered</td>
<td>7 plans offered</td>
<td>2 options for employees, partly paid by CAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vision or FSA</strong></td>
<td>Offered, no details</td>
<td>Offered, optional</td>
<td>5 plans offered</td>
<td>Offered, no details</td>
<td>1 plan offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Insurance</strong></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Min. $20K offered</td>
<td>Offered</td>
<td>District provided, 20 hrs+/week eligible</td>
<td>1/yr salary covered by CAP; additional coverage available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accidental Death &amp; Dismemberment Insurance</strong></td>
<td>1.5X salary if working 25+ hrs/week</td>
<td>Min. $20K employee coverage, ISD paid</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1.5X salary, $20K min. employee coverage</td>
<td>100% salary covered by CAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term Disability Insurance</strong></td>
<td>ISD paid</td>
<td>ISD paid</td>
<td>Offered, no details</td>
<td>ISD paid</td>
<td>60% salary covered by CAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid Time Off</strong></td>
<td>10 days/yr. for 9-mo.; 12 days/yr. for 12-mo.</td>
<td>1 day of sick leave/month</td>
<td>1 day of sick leave/month, 30+hrs/week eligible</td>
<td>1 day of sick leave/month</td>
<td>18 days per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Business Days</strong></td>
<td>3 days/yr. after 1 yr.</td>
<td>3 days/yr</td>
<td>2-3 days/yr</td>
<td>2 days/yr</td>
<td>1 day per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retirement</strong></td>
<td>OK Teachers Retirement, 7% of salary</td>
<td>OK Teachers Retirement, 403(b) or 457 options</td>
<td>OK Teachers Retirement &amp; 457 option for some</td>
<td>OK Teachers Retirement, 7% of salary &amp; 403(b) and 457(b) supplemental retirement</td>
<td>403(b) 50% employer match up to 6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons & Observations

The need for and benefit from having greater numbers of well trained early childhood teachers are undeniable. But, conditions on both the demand and the supply side are sub-optimal.

**Demand Side**
- Demand is driven too much by turnover
- Compensation — pay & benefits — is inadequate

**Supply Side**
- Education and training progressions are inordinately long
- Too little credit is given to experience in the field
Possible Actions to Consider

- Expanded federal, state and local funding and compensation for early childhood teachers generally
- Expansion of refundable child tax credits
- Introduction of wage supplement programs for early childhood teachers
- Access to better work supports and mentoring for early childhood teachers
- Expanded credit-for-prior learning and related accelerated educational opportunities
- Improved education and training support from employers and better structured career progressions/ladders in early childhood workplaces
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