

---

Conference Papers

Staff Papers and Presentations

---

12-17-2008

## Statistical Targeting to Support Reemployment Services

Christopher J. O'Leary  
*W.E. Upjohn Institute, [oleary@upjohn.org](mailto:oleary@upjohn.org)*

Scott Gibbons  
*U.S. Dept. of Labor*

Cheryl Atkinson  
*U.S. Dept. of Labor*

Gary Gonzalez  
*U.S. Dept. of Labor*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://research.upjohn.org/confpapers>

---

### Citation

O'Leary, Christopher J. 2008. "Profiling and Targeting Public Employment Services." Presented at Statistical Targeting to Support Reemployment Services webinar, at U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, DC, December 17.

This title is brought to you by the Upjohn Institute. For more information, please contact [repository@upjohn.org](mailto:repository@upjohn.org).

## WORKFORCE<sup>3</sup> ONE

### TRANSCRIPT OF WEBINAR

Statistical Targeting to Support  
Reemployment Services

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2008

Transcript by  
Federal News Service  
Washington, D.C.

**GARY GONZALEZ:** All right. With that I want to turn things over now to today's moderator, Cheryl Atkinson, the administrator for the Office of Workforce Security at the Employment and Training Administration. Take it away, Cheryl.

**CHERYL ATKINSON:** Thank you, Gary. And good afternoon and welcome to the webinar Statistical Targeting to Support Reemployment Services. This session is one in a series focusing on facets of the reemployment function and it's intended to prepare you for more informed participation in the reemployment summit scheduled for January 27 through 29, 2009.

Today we're going to hear from two very knowledgeable individuals about two approaches to targeting reemployment services. First, Scott Gibbons of the – ETA's Office of Workforce Security will discuss the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services system. Scott joined the Department of Labor in 1998 as part of the team supporting the original profiling technical assistance. He has worked for over 10 years in building, evaluating and improving worker profiling models and has done multiple training sessions related to WPRS. Scott holds a master's degree from American University.

WPRS was originally conceived in response to the understanding that a growing segment of laid off workers eligible for unemployment benefits were laid off permanently rather than on a temporary layoff related to the business cycle. Congress wanted to ensure that these unemployed workers got the help they needed to reenter the workforce and created a requirement for states to have in place Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services systems. Acknowledging the need for services can exceed capacity, WPRS is designed to prioritize which UI beneficiaries to serve first and relies on the workforce system as a partner to provide those services.

Scott's talk will provide an explanation of how the WPRS system works, an explanation of how WPRS models select claimants, areas for potential improvement and an introduction to other services that can be supported by statistical targeting.

Second, Dr. Christopher O'Leary of the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research will discuss the Frontline Decision Support System. Chris O'Leary is the senior economist at the Upjohn Institute. His research includes numerous work on unemployment insurance; job training; wage subsidies; public work; self-employment; employment service programs in the U.S., Canada and

other countries. Specifically for the U.S. Department of Labor Chris has developed a prototype Frontline Decision Support System for One-Stop Career Centers under the Workforce Investment Act, which is what he will discuss today. And he has analyzed practical aspects of implementing personal reemployment accounts.

His papers have appeared in numerous professional journals. He completed his undergraduate studies at the University of Massachusetts and earned a doctorate from the University of Arizona.

Chris will talk about how the Frontline Decision Support System – which was developed as a tool for cross-trained staff in One-Stop centers – is an aid for staff of backgrounds in various programs to help job seekers identify the most useful information and services for reemployment. Chris's talk provides a summary of the U.S. experience with targeting reemployment services, details the pilot system developed for Georgia, provides an overview of profiling and targeting employment services in other countries, and outlines ways a simplified Frontline Decision Support System could be tested and tried by states.

So with that introduction I would turn to our first presenter, Scott Gibbons.

**SCOTT GIBBONS:** Good afternoon, everyone. Thanks for taking the time to join us. I know especially at this time of year everyone's real busy and the fact that you've blocked out the time to listen to what we have to say is great; we're very appreciative for that.

Before I get started I'd just like to mention really quickly, to I guess reemphasize what Cheryl just said, this presentation is I believe number four in a series of webinars that are supporting the overall employment TAT project. The Web link is right there on the slide and I encourage you all to take a brief look there at the overall effort. There's a tremendous amount of work that's being done. Some really interesting and innovative ideas are being produced and I think that it will help you to understand the context for a number of the webinars that are happening.

A logical place to start for my presentation is what is WPRS and how does it work? We deal with a lot of acronyms and so the first thing I'm going to do is to start off by describing what it is we're talking about.

Worker profiling is the process of using characteristics and demographics of UI claimants and turning those into a model to identify who is going to be in need of job search assistance. The worker profiling component is really a kind of a data mining approach. We look for the trends and patterns in data in who is likely to experience difficulty in becoming reemployed.

The second bullet indicates that we target claimants through data. We take the worker profiling part and we turn that into a mathematical model that we use for forecasting purposes. When UI claimants enter the system they are going to be assigned a probability or a score related to their difficulty in becoming reemployed. This second bullet really refers to what many states call the ranking. Most UI claimants who are put in payable status will be profiled and as a result will be ranked.

The third bullet is the reemployment services. This is the second part of WPRS. For those UI claimants who are deemed more likely to be exhaustive, most likely to need job search assistance, those people are going to be referred to the One-Stop in the hopes that services can be provided to hopefully get them back to work more quickly, get them back to their base period wages.

The fourth bullet is kind of a roundtrip or a feedback loop. We want to monitor the claimants following intervention and determine whether or not our overall actions have been successful.

The rationale for WPRS is fairly straightforward. It's really a resource allocation methodology. We're not stipulating that a certain number of people have to be served. Really what we're doing is we're prioritizing service. What we're trying to say is that there aren't sufficient funds or services available to serve all the people that need them and so what we're going to do through this ranking is determine those that are most in need of service and then fill those slots with those with the highest scores.

The goal of the program is early identification and action. In general, if we can't get to a claimant within about five weeks we will not follow through with that person, specifically with WPRS. That doesn't mean that they won't receive other services through self-service or through other state programs, just that WPRS emphasizes a kind of an early intervention. And if the program works there's a potential for a win-win there. The hope is that through reemployment the claimant benefits by returning back to their base period wages and the state benefits by sort of having them both off the UI rolls and back to sort of gainful employment.

Why serve WPRS claimants? Well, there are two primary reasons I think. There's an obvious legal basis, which is Public Law 103-152. But I think for me the more pragmatic reason is that these people are very good candidates I believe for service and for placement. Among those that are deemed most likely to exhaust through the WPRS system, there are a number of things we can say about them in terms of their characteristics. They generally are not what we would refer to as job attached. They generally are what we would sort of refer to as dislocated workers. We specifically screen out for people who have union hiring hall arrangements or people who have a definite recall date. And many states, just as a result of the way they build their targeting models, will often times find that they have a relatively low proportion of either repeat filers or seasonal employees in their population as well.

What can we say about them? What do they have? Well, generally these claimants have a long-term attachment to the workforce and that's demonstrated through both longer job tenures and relatively higher wages. They have similar industry and occupational profiles and base period earnings to the UI population as a whole, and what I mean by that is they're not dramatically different than most other UI claimants. And they have strong financial incentives to return to work. On average most of the people who are referred through WPRS have less than 33 percent of their base period wages all set by their unemployment insurance entitlement. And so these are people who are working on a fraction of what they had before. So as sort of a proxy for job search intensity these people should be eager job search participants.

And just so you know that I'm not talking about this strictly in a qualitative way, we know these

types of things. I'm talking about them as generalities, but this all comes from the microdata that we used to build the models. When we build these WPRS models states provide us with at least one year of data on almost everyone who is put into payable status. So we have voluminous amounts of information about the trends and patterns in the people who are moving through the UI system and so we can really make some definite statements about what's going on with those people. And I think that in general these people will serve as pretty suitable candidates for both services and for placement.

I'd like to sort of walk you through kind of a flow diagram of what the system looks like and talk about a couple of aspects of the program which I'll refer to a little bit later in the presentation. The process starts when someone files a UI claim. If they're put in payable status, which we refer to as a first pay, generally they will be profiled.

The profiling process draws data – a lot of it from the UI initial claim – about their characteristics, their demographics, what industry they worked in, what occupation they had, how long their tenure was, what their level of education was. We may also draw on local labor market information. We may draw on state-specific measures like whether the person was in a declining industry or not. All of those factors are going to go into a profiling model and a probability score is going to come out.

When I'm talking about the model, to give you an idea of what types of things we use – I just mentioned some of them – some of the things we're using are claimant characteristics, education, tenure, industry, occupation. In some cases these are going to be categorical variables or binary variables, such as does the person have a high school degree or not? In other instances we may code it into a continuous variable. We may convert the industry code into a measure of the growth rate in the industry or the occupation. We can use labor market information. We can use local area unemployment rates as a proxy for the environment into which the person is going to be looking for a job. We can look at declining occupational growth rates or wages.

We can also use proxies for job search intensity, such as wage replacement rate, prior exhaustions, number of base period employers and severance pay. We don't necessarily use all of these. These various factors are tested on a state-by-state basis. All of them have sort of a nice intuitive reason for us but each state has a slightly different model and slightly different characteristics that they use for this targeting process.

Once the –

MR. GONZALEZ: I just want to break in. Is there anybody on the phone line that has any questions or comments? Again, it's \*1. Go ahead.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay. Thank you. Once the profiling model has run, the state will rate the scores from highest to lowest. The state will then do a two-step process where they'll move the people into what's called the profiling pool. They'll use a threshold and that's a state-specific criteria. Some states have a higher threshold, some a lower. It's not a particularly important part of the process.

However, referrals to service can only be made from the profiling pool. The state is going to make referrals to service based on service capacity. If the state has 20 slots in a particular One-Stop for a particular week, they will fill those 20 slots. Sometimes a little more, sometimes a little less, but generally referrals to service are made based on service capacity. In some states this is a little bit more centralized, where it's all done from a main office. Many states use a kind of delegated system where the scores are shipped out to the local offices and the local offices can select from the list and call in.

To give you an idea programmatically of what we're talking about, these are the claimant flows that we saw in fiscal year 2008. Now, the numbers that you're seeing here are based on around 8.8 million first pays, which means people who were beneficiaries in the UI system in fiscal year 2008. Of those, 7.3 million, 7.4 million were profiled. 3.39 million were put into the pool which I just described and from the pool approximately 1.2 million were referred to services. So that's a fairly large number of people moving into the workforce system as UI claimants. Those completing at least one service a good proportion of the total referred.

Once the referrals are made, as you can see the majority do move on to service delivery at the One-Stop. A number are broken out as exemptions. I'm not going to speak too much about that. If your state has a high percentage of exemptions that is often times an indication that the model is not doing an effective job of identifying the correct people. So if that's something that the frontline personnel are experiencing, you're welcome to contact us and we can either make some suggestions to you about alternative modeling approaches or put you in touch with other states that have had similar experiences and have worked through those problems.

To give you an idea of the services that were delivered in fiscal '08, the majority of claimants that come in receive an orientation; that is, a benefits right interview. And the orientation varies quite a bit from state to state. It's not standardized. Some may run the entire day, some may be relatively brief. But the orientation and the call-in in general represent a nice opportunity to get the UI claimant into the One-Stop, demonstrate to them what sorts of opportunities are there, what types of services are available. And of the states that I have talked to specifically about this, most of them have felt that this is a very good opportunity to get the people in, to talk to them and to show them what they can do.

Finally, after the services are delivered there's some roundtrip reporting. There are two principle ETA reports associated with worker profiling. They are the 9048 and the 9049. The 9048 describes the service delivery and the 9049 is a longitudinal report that looks at a number of aspects of the outcome for the cohort of claimants that we referred. They will answer questions such as, what percentage of the claimants referred became employed in the four quarters following the referral? And what percentage became employed in a different industry? How did their wages once they were employed compare to their pre-separation wages? So there are a number of different indicators there that you can use as sort of very basic performance measures for your program.

There have been two recent evaluations of the worker profiling system. The first one was done by Coffey Communications and was very limited in scope. It dealt with worker profiling models. And the basic question it was seeking to answer is, when states do the worker profiling part of

Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services how good are the rankings that they are making which the referrals are based on? The general conclusion of the report was that a number of states have not updated their models, but in spite of that most of the states were doing a pretty reasonable job. In general, those that were referred did tend to have higher exhaustion rates and show characteristics which were favorable for referral. That paper is available from the ETA library on our Web site.

The second was a sort of simultaneous GAO evaluation of the WPRS system. That is available from the GAO Web site. It had a number of recommendations, actually, which I will be discussing very shortly. It had some nice things to say. It also had some strong suggestions for changes that could be made to the program and we've begun working out on some of those topics. However, rather than summarize those I would recommend that you scan them. The executive summaries of both are relatively brief and fairly easy to digest.

I think that the reemployment TAT project actually provides an excellent opportunity to refocus many aspects of this program on the overall goal of reemployment. This program has been running in the background for a long time and it's really one of the principle ways that we get UI workers – dislocated workers – into the One-Stops. And I think that I'm going to step through some suggestions that I have that – some of which come from the evaluations I just mentioned and some of which come from having worked with the program for a while and having seen some of the dynamics going on. I think there's a tremendous amount of potential in this program if we can get over a couple of fairly small barriers.

What I'm going to emphasize in the next couple of slides is the last bullet point right here. The system really works if all the elements work together. Unfortunately, if this is a highly siloed program it's effectiveness is really going to be restricted. And I'll step you through some concrete examples of that.

The first aspect is referrals to service. And I'm starting with referrals to service because in an upstream/downstream sense this is really the first step in the worker profiling process if you go back to the flowchart I was using a few minutes ago. The process begins with UI claimants who are profiled. And the truth is that if the initial profiling scores that are assigned are not accurate and the rankings are not precise, the referrals are not going to be accurate. And even if everything downstream from that point is perfect, if services are ideal and service delivery is impeccable, the overall performance will be suboptimal because you're not identifying the correct cohort of claimants to begin with. So what we really want to emphasize is staying on top of the modeling process.

Both the GAO evaluation and the Coffey study both said that you don't necessarily need to completely reinvent your model. In many cases simply updating your targeting criteria with more recent data so that it better reflects the trends and patterns that you're looking at right now would really be sufficient to get some good performance gains. And I don't think that that would represent a significant burden in terms of time or effort.

In addition, claimants really need to follow through. And this point is sort of premised on the first bullet. If states have a good model and they really do believe that higher scores are

associated with people that need job search assistance, and they determine that the claimant needs help, and the claimant essentially refuses by not participating in the process, they really do need to hold the claimant accountable.

It's interesting that many states run sort of a – a slightly different program called ERP, or eligibility review. This is generally done by random assignment. They will call in UI claimants and they will check to see if they're doing things like their work search. And this is generally done randomly. A claimant who doesn't respond to an ERP will generally be held accountable and they put a hold on their claim. Yet with WPRS, where you've used a database empirical model to make an objective – as opposed to subjective – determination that this person needs help, many states will not hold that claimant. They may dock them for a week and try to reschedule or they may not. But this is something that states may want to look at. If you believe that you've got a good model and you've made a determination that that claimant needs help, this may be something that you'd like to focus on.

In terms of providing services, the needs obviously vary from person to person. It's not the case that we can construct a perfect system where we can come up with an ideal solution for every single claimant; however, I think that we can make some very good informed decisions about what to do with them. The – (inaudible) – the GAO report in particular, emphasized we'd benefit from taking a cohesive – (inaudible) – service delivery. By this I mean do we want to service slightly less claimants more intensively? Do we want to serve slightly more claimants less intensively?

Many states didn't have a kind of general philosophy about how they were going to serve this population; it was sort of done on an ad hoc basis. And the particular characteristics of this population were not really taken into account. The additional data that we have on these people, the additional nuance of the profiling model was not used to sort of further the service delivery. And so sort of stepping back and asking what it is that we are seeking to do with this pool of claimants who are coming in can sort of only help to provide structure to those referrals.

It was also indicated that many states lack benchmarks and a systematic monitoring system beyond the 9048 and 9049. States don't seem to have any sort of system for judging whether or not the interventions they're making are successful or not. I don't want to pin that entirely on the states. This has been sort of a long-term problem with this program. Because it's an entitlement, we can't run things like control groups and so there is not a really well-established methodology out there for doing evaluation. But even in terms of tracking specifically for UI claimants among One-Stop outcomes what's going on, this can be troubling for the states.

So one – I think that the single most positive thing that many states could do to enhance their WPR system is to establish a series of feedback loops. And really at its core this is about communication. All components of the system must communicate with and inform other components. The people who are serving on the frontlines are the people who are working directly with the claimants. They are the people who are seeing the results of the referrals. And if they are seeing streams of people coming in who they can't really serve, that information needs to find its way back to the people who are producing the models and the people who are doing the referrals, otherwise the system can't possibly change for the better.



In addition, service providers should be briefed based on the work that the modelers are doing on what types of trends and patterns they can expect. When we build models under sort of tech assistance for states, among the various pieces of documentation we provide are descriptions of the industrial breakdown, the occupational breakdown, various types of demographics of all the UI claimants, so that the people who are going to be receiving these referrals will have a pretty good idea what type of person's going to be coming in. What's the profile of the person you're going to be asked to serve? And using that also a dialogue to say, well, are the services we have appropriate for this population? If not, are we referring the right people? If not, should we consider doing something different?

And finally, making sure that if the UI claimants are not attending that UI is notified so that action can be taken. Communication is absolutely the key to making – (inaudible).

In terms of what we are doing to improve reemployment outcomes through WPRS here at the national office, we provide unlimited technical assistance to states to produce new and updated models. We have floated out a number of supplemental budget requests to states to help them cover IT costs of implementing new models and are currently providing technical assistance to a variety of states in coding up new models. If you're interested in discussing that with us, please feel free to touch base with us and we'll get you started down the right path.

We're trying to foster discussion with states also about program goals, methods and tools, talking about integrating the referrals and the service delivery. Often times we're doing that in conjunction with building a new model, but if you're interested in talking about that we can try to help you along those lines or we can try to put you in touch with states that have best practices or have dealt with similar problems.

We're looking for ways to fund additional services and we're doing a lot of discussion about improving program reporting and assessment, benchmarking performance and helping states to better understand, value the actions that they're taking right now.

Are there any questions anyone has at this point?

MR. GONZALEZ: We have one question queued up right now. "Why do the claimants have to first receive a payment to be eligible?"

And before we address that question I just want to remind everyone if you want to participate over the phone line it's \*1. You'll be prompted to un-mute your line and once we've addressed this first question we'll see if we have any on the teleconference line. So let's see what we have for this first question in the queue.

MS. ATKINSON: I believe that the law requires that all claimants who actually receive a payment must be profiled. But states are free to include those who merely file a claim before they receive a first payment. But as Scott said, there's a legal basis for the profiling system itself and that's sort of the minimum federal requirement. But states are free to include folks beyond that requirement.

MR. GIBBONS: Cheryl's absolutely right. And I often times here people in the One-Stop say, well, we serve everyone. There's nothing stopping anyone from going in and attempting to receive services. But under the WPRS program generally you won't be referred until first pay. You don't want to get into a situation also where you're referring people at initial claim, not entirely sure if they're going to get a first pay or not, because we don't want to be referring people if they're not going to have UI entitlement, specifically under this program.

MR. GONZALEZ: Now, do we have anyone on the phone line?

OPERATOR: There are no questions from the phone line.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay. I'll move on and finish my part and then I'll turn the remainder over to Chris O'Leary. I'm going to move fairly quickly through this next section.

I'd like to sort of introduce very briefly something that I'm going to do a much fuller presentation on at the reemployment summit that's going to be held in January. Worker profiling has been around for a long time and it's seen a couple of different generations of worker profiling models come and go. The models now are vastly superior to the models that were around at the beginning of the program, so much so that I think that it's time to really start seriously considering doing a fair amount of statistical targeting using both profiling scores – or profiling-like scores – and profiling data to be able to target other types of services. And I'm going to cover this briefly because I think Chris is actually going to talk about this in a little bit more length and will give a kind of fuller, richer treatment of this.

What I'd like to sort of propose for you very briefly is the idea that if you believe that your profiling model is operating effectively, which is that people with higher scores are more likely to exhaust and people with lower scores are less likely to exhaust, then really there are some different services and programs that we run that could really benefit from statistical targeting.

The diagram that I'm showing you right now is a kind of a box. And you can think of it as a kind of a graph that's been flipped so that the axes are sort of along the top and along the left side. Along the top is the probability of exhaustion or the UI claimant. And on the left side is the weeks of potential duration on UI, where the top side is the low end of potential duration and where – sorry – where the top side is the low end of potential duration and the bottom side is the high end of potential duration.

Most worker profiling models that we're building now incorporate potential duration into the dependent variable. So when we're targeting claimants for referral to services, we're not just targeting people who are going to use a lot of their benefits, we're also targeting people who have the potential to be on UI for a long time. Ideally, if we can intervene with them and get them back to work we will not just sort of get them back to base period wages, we'll also have a good outcome for the UI system as well.

So the question is, where on this spectrum would WPRS referrals be made? The answer is down in this lower right hand corner. The idea candidate for WPRS is people who have a relatively

high probability of exhaustion and also who are eligible for relatively high number of weeks of potential duration, so that if the intervention is successful we're going to be able to intervene with them, hopefully shorten their duration on UI, get them back to work quickly.

Now, some of you may be familiar with another program we're running which is called REA, or Reemployment and Eligibility Assessment. This is – it's a little bit like WRPS in the sense that it works primarily with UI claimants and it calls them in to do a kind of an eligibility assessment, to their work search and to do some additional types of service delivery. Generally states are pulling those groups from the area surrounding that. They're taking the people who don't have profiling scores quite as high as WRPS but have sort of comparable durations.

The point that I would like to make is that there are a number of other programs that could really benefit from something like this. As I mentioned earlier, eligibility review is generally done as a random program where states will call in a random cohort of people and check to see if they're doing their work search. What I'm saying is you really ought to be doing that from this area right here. These are people who have a low probability of exhaustion – again, this is based on our model – and they have a high duration on unemployment insurance. So if we believe that the people at the high end are going to exhaust, we believe that the people at the low end are not going to exhaust. If we believe that you're not going to exhaust and you have the potential to be on unemployment insurance for a long time, you have an objective basis for questioning this person, like why are you on UI?

To sort of tab this out just a little bit more, I think that we could look at some other types of services that are being offered and you could sort of do your own mapping about where you feel the ideal range for those types of services are. For instance, I think that this area right here in the upper left hand corner is a great area to do job referrals. These are people who have a low entitlement on UI and they've got a low probability of exhaustion. They're not going to be on UI for long. They need to get back to work quickly. And so as a result I think that if you were going to do job referrals this might be a good population.

Whereas if we were to move slightly up this axis along this line, here I think you're talking about something more like resume writing. Again, they've got a low probability of exhaustion. What they might need is job search assistance. They don't really need something intensive like training. They've got a low probability of exhaustion, a slightly longer duration on UI. Here we might want to talk with them to figure out if they've got a high reservation wage or what types of things – maybe they've been in the workforce a long time and really what they need is just to be pointed in the right direction to find a job, to look for a job.

Down here, this might be an area where we would want to do something slightly more intensive, like counseling. Here you're beginning to move into an area where the person has the potential to be on UI for a long time but has a sort of a medium probability of exhaustion.

You may find in your state that you don't necessarily agree with my particular assignments. My point is, if you sit down with this chart you should be able to map out using both potential duration – or maybe other types of things, like industry or occupation, declining industry, wage growth by industry – and figure out what types of services you might like to make, what types of

decisions, actions, interventions you would want to take with this particular person.

In addition I think that, the underlying data that we use to build WPRS models can really be used to do an awful lot.

I'm going to sort of – I'm using up a lot of my time so I'm going to sort of skip quickly to the next slide.

We have a tremendous amount of information. I mean, it's kind of trite to say that we're swimming in data, but we absolutely are. We've got rich data from One-Stops, rich data from labor market, rich data from Bureau of Labor Statistics, rich data from UI claims information. And really what we ought to be able to construct is a kind of a cascade to say there are particular types of things that we can do for people with particular kinds of profiles. And really there are a number of different kinds of programs that we should be able to target by sort of starting with – if you'll pardon the pejorative term – the worst case first, and then working down to say – as you work down the list to find what kinds of actions we can take on behalf of each claimant. I believe that there's a lot of potential there if the states sit down and really give some deep thought to sort of aligning their overall service delivery strategy with the data that they have to assist their decision making and sort of a program goal about what they want to do.

And with that I'll take any brief questions. And if there are none, I'll go ahead and turn it over to Chris.

OPERATOR: And if you would like to ask a question at this time, please \*1 on your telephone keypad.

MR. GIBBONS: “How many states use a ‘we have 20 slots’ method versus a ‘we refer based on a specific score method’? Advantages to each?” I don't know enough about that. For the last two years we have tried to get a research project on the reemployment intervention part of WPRS and we have failed. I have some anecdotal information but none of it answers your basic question about whether states have a preference for one or the other. My general impression, though, is that within the state there are not differences by WIB. Basically, the state makes a single decision and they execute that from a kind of a centralized perspective.

MR. GONZALEZ: And I see another question about a contact list from the previous session. We are going to be making that available on Workforce<sup>3</sup> One. We're doing some site maintenance. We're going to be having that posted for you this coming Monday, on the 22nd. So check back. All you need to is, as I said previously, just log into your account. You'll be able to access it from your My Events page.

MR. GIBBONS: Someone posted something that's not so much a question as a comment but I'd just like to emphasize it. It says, “Of course people who are eligible for fewer weeks are more likely to exhaust their benefits.” And yet that is not something that a lot of the WPRS models have taken into account. In general the original guidance said, “Identify those most likely to exhaust their benefits.” And that necessarily means you're going to be targeting those with the shortest potential duration. And one of the points I'm trying to make here is that I believe that

you're targeting and your service delivery are all parts of your overall program goal, how you're going to operate the program. And so I'm emphasizing the point to make sure that the model is operating in concert with all other aspects of the program.

MR. GONZALEZ: And I'm going to ask are there any questions over the phone line?

OPERATOR: We have a question from the line of Laurie Schleicher (ph).

LAURIE SCHLEICHER: Yes, hi. And I submitted it online too, so this is a duplication. I just wondered if you could briefly explain the fault overpayment detection?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, I can briefly describe that. The state of Utah asked me to take a profiling approach to identify fault overpayments. What we basically did is we used the same demographics and characteristics and state data that we would use to build a profiling model and we built a logistic regression model based on actually fault overpayment data. And the state was happy enough with it that they actually put it into production. It's actually a major part of their system. And I just talked to them the other day; they're exceedingly happy with it.

And so I can talk with you in detail about sort of the variables we used if you want to contact me offline, but the general point of including it is that the methods that we used for statistical targeting are suitable for a variety of different purposes. And I'm actually hoping to get somebody from Utah to maybe talk about this at that reemployment summit. If not, I'll have some detailed information on it when I present there.

Is that responsive to your question?

MS. SCHLEICHER: Sure. That's great. Thank you.

MR. GIBBONS: Sure.

OPERATOR: And at this time there are no further questions.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay. Actually, I think I'm eating into Chris O'Leary's time. So even though there are questions I think the graceful thing here is to bow out.

CHRIS O'LEARY: Thank you, Scott. You have a wonderful lead-in and tremendous information. I learned a lot. I also want to thank Cheryl Atkinson for inviting me to join and Gary for organizing this. Now, Gary, I'm going to click on this. Now, can the people out there see my cursor moving around or no?

MR. GONZALEZ: I can certainly turn that feature on.

DR. O'LEARY: Okay. All right. Well, thank you all for joining us here today. Here's an outline for my talk. First I'm going to give you a couple of quick definitions that you've already probably picked up from what Scott talked about. I'll talk briefly about the U.S. experience with targeting and profiling, the programs implemented in demonstrations. Something about the

European experience, they do profiling too. The Canadians have tried it as well. The Australian experience is notable in particular so I'll mention that.

And I'm going to be talking mainly about the application that we did called Frontline Decision Support System. And we developed it with all the possible features in Georgia and it was quite an involved system. And I have some ideas how a simplified version might be adopted by states – implemented and adopted. Of course, we'd like to pilot test it first to make sure a simpler approach works.

First profiling. It's sorting customers for referral to services based on presumed needs given their characteristics. So the idea is that we have this model and there is some bundle of services that we send them to. What we're more interested in profiling is getting the model right.

With targeting the idea here is – and this is what we did partly with FDSS – is develop methods to refer to services the aim of promoting increased effectiveness based upon sub-group impacts; that is, for a particular sub-group which services worked best, and let's set up a mechanism to get them to that.

So what is the U.S. experience? Two things have been implemented. Scott talked extensively about the WPRS system. You should all know that self-employment assistance is available under federal authorizing legislation and I think about 10 states have programs. Some use it more than others. But profiling by WPRS is involved in referring people to self-employment. That essentially is a work search waiver for people eligible for benefits who want to pursue their own self-employment and they can continue to receive their compensation while they're doing that.

Things that have been tried with profiling methods. Welfare to Work pilot was done in Michigan with random trials to find out if we could link up people with a better set of services. Reemployment bonuses, we've done simulations. I don't know if you've heard about the reemployments bonus experiments that were run back when. I was involved with that and we reexamined the data and examined whether or not referring these people using profiling models would increase the cost-effectiveness, and yes it did. And that's why targeted reemployment bonuses were part of personal reemployment accounts. So targeting was involved in those trials. And then there's the Frontline Decision Support System, which we, again, pilot tested in Georgia and I'll tell you about.

Now, the Frontline Decision Support System has two main modules: a systematic job search module and a service referral module. The systematic job search module has these five main elements. First of all, we have a model for estimating the chance of returning to the same industry. Research tells us that people who get unemployed and cannot go back to their prior industry have bigger earnings losses than those who can go back to their prior industry. So that's an important factor in the second line, estimating reemployment earnings. We have a model where this probability feeds into this model where we estimated reemployment earnings.

That's part of the reality check that we provide in Frontline Decision Support so people can then scan job prospects in the available openings. And if those do not yield any prospects to identify related occupations, this link – this module depends upon the related occupations in the O\*NET

system. And then providing targeted information about specific jobs based upon OES and LMI information that we link to these related occupations. And I'm going to show you actual screens that were in the pilot system in Georgia that present this information in a minute.

The service referral module ranked the available services. This was based upon at that time Wagner-Peyser data. And some of those services remained under Wagner-Peyser and some then were called intensive and are now labeled differently. But we have all of them in this example. And we also – since we subdivide the state and the customer population by characteristics, sometimes the number of observations, the number of participants and services is relatively small. So we present this to the frontline staff as well as the relative effectiveness because some of these are based on relative small samples of participation.

The data sources. We used UI wage records. This tells us – this is the basis for doing the employment and earnings – the earnings models. And we use the program records from ES, UI, WIA, Welfare to Work, and that helped us build models based upon the worker and customer characteristics, program participation and employment history. And then we used LMI and that gave us information on the local unemployment rates, the occupation/industry projections, related/transferrable occupations and mass layoffs.

Okay. The first module in FDSS. We come at intake and the systematic job search module really falls in this access to core services. And the idea of this is when people come in and claim unemployment insurance or register with the ES – and again, I keep saying “come in” but there could be a call in link to this. And again, this was developed as a staff-assisted function. But lots of information is put in, in individual characteristics. And the whole idea of FDSS was to turn that information around and make it useful to guide customers to what might be good strategic decisions in job search and use of reemployment services.

Based upon their intake information they can review with the staff person, can see a full screen of their information and review their work history. They have that estimate of the chance to returning to the prior industry. They have an estimate of what their reemployment earnings is going to be. They can look at job orders with that information behind them and they can look at related occupations.

Then we get to the service referral module which involves intensive or possibly training services. Foundations of the service referral module are the models that we estimate are the probability of reemployment. It's something – if you can think of opposite of the likelihood of long-term unemployment insurance receipt or exhaustion.

And then we group customers by these scores and we rank services using those groups. So we look at people who went through and used the services recently. We evaluate these employability models for them. We group them and we look at their reemployment rates, checking quarterly wage records to see which services were most effective for customers in different ranges of that employability score.

It provides a customized list of – the service referral module provides a customized list of services most effective for participants in each employability group. Again, we divided the

employability distribution into five parts and we divided the state into regions – urban and rural and sub-regions – and we ranked core, intensive and training. And the list is based on service usage and outcome, as I said.

So this is the first screen. I don't know if you can see this very well; I've got it in the middle of this display. But the frontline staff – that's a little better, thank you. The frontline staff in Georgia told us that when they're sitting and talking with a customer they had to go to numerous screens just to see at one place all this background information which is essential for developing a reemployment strategy. Now here it is before them in one screen.

Now, these are what we call the fixed factors in the profile and then these factors were changeable. Now, any of you who have worked in unemployment insurance know frequently there's missing wages. These were the wages in the system, this particular – one of the four quarters in the base period. It's possible with these dropdown menus in this section to change these characteristics. Characteristics on the previous screen are fixed, are age and so forth, are profile, the region that you are in the state. Or maybe your educational level is changeable if you go get a GED or a certificate or a credential at a college. So these things were changeable.

Then we calculated the values and we got this information, the reemployment probability and estimated earnings. For this person we had the probability of return to work in the prior industry – this person had retail trade in Barrow County – 40 percent. Pretty good. And estimated job growth in the prior occupation; over the next five years employment in the occupation was expected to grow by 2.9 percent.

On the Upjohn Institute Web site we have a lot of information about Frontline Decision Support and one of the things that we had was a training manual for frontline staff. And in the training manual we gave an explanation of what this information means. Forty percent is a very high growth rate – or probability of returning – and 2.9 percent is a very high growth rate. And we explain what the thresholds are for other cases.

We presented the reemployment earnings in a distribution here and that was all part of the reality check for looking at the vacancy listings. If nothing turned up we turned to the related occupations and this pulled up a bunch. Some of them we had OES data to provide occupational wages. Now, this was OES data at that desegregated level of the sub-state region. And we could make a strategic decision as to what is the appropriate level of disaggregation if we want to populate those things going forward. These are the O\*NET codes, so linking could be done manually as well. Hot links could be built into this.

The service referral module is next. And based on these groupings of customer characteristics we present these rankings of services from the top to bottom. Now, these were the percentage of service users working steadily as judged by checking their quarterly wage records. Testing was the top ranked service but very few people used it. Job search assistance was second ranked and a lot of people used it in this region. Now, remember, these participant numbers are because we've divided up the customers over a period of a year into these sub-regions into one-fifth of the distribution of the employability score. You see, job referrals was a very popular service, as you would expect, and it had a relatively high ranking in terms of the success. We tried to do the



same with the training statistics and this is what we provide.

So that was the first example of a Frontline Decision Support and I'll give you some example – some ideas for simplifying it in a minute. But let me tell you what other states (sic) have done. Maybe you've heard about the Danish experience with flex-security. This is really an example of the success of employment policy. There were a lot of worker protections in Europe and the Danish took the step to un-restrict separations for employers. So employers are free to dismiss workers, much like in the United States now. But the Danish stepped in with a heavy dose of active labor programs; that is, big funding for job training, job search assistance and so forth. And they've got probably the lowest unemployment in Europe still today because of that.

What they did, they had a profiling model that predicted the probability of long-term unemployment and also included case worker assessment. So it had both objective as well as subjective components and they did an early referral to reemployment services. What they did was they put on the case worker's screen a dial that looked like a thermostat and there was a red zone. And they called it the job barometer and if your needle was pointing into the red zone that meant that you had a very high probability of long-term unemployment.

So what this example shows is that you need to be careful in how you use this. This is to be used with staff intervention and maybe not full customer disclosure. The role of the frontline staff is preeminent here. They've withdrawn the job barometer but they still use profiling in Denmark.

In Switzerland they actually did something very much like profiling but – like FDSS that we have developed – and they estimated effectiveness of various services for sub-groups of customers. And they made this tool available to frontline staff on a random assignment basis, 50/50. It turns out that the frontline staff were too busy when they tried this experiment. Unfortunately they didn't get any enrollment so they didn't have an evaluation. But they have tried it. This has been used elsewhere.

In the Netherlands they actually have a mostly subjective profiling method where the staff subjectively assigns the unemployed into one of four employability categories: difficult, moderately, favorable, extremely likely to get employed. They focus their services on the middle two groups and the targets for success are driven by performance measures for the staff.

Other countries, what do they do? They've got these three zones, they call them. They actually group in Austria customers by whether or not they're likely to benefit from just information or they need counseling or they need intensive services. And then for each of these they have bundles of services. The way they profile is they give the customers a survey and they look at the results of that survey and then they let the staff also have subjective input.

The same thing is done in France. The same kind of thing – they have a questionnaire and an interview and they categorize into seven groups in France.

In Germany they use a mixed method based upon a statistical model and a questionnaire and they have four groups.

Hungary is a totally objective statistical model and they use three groups.

Probably the biggest experience has been in Australia dating back to close to the time we instituted WPRS. They privatized their service delivery but the center point of entry is the public employment service, which they call Centrelink over there. And they have what they call a JSCI – Job Classification – Job Seeker Classification Instrument – and it produces a statistical score the probably of long-term unemployment, very much like our WPRS profiling score. And they target intensive services to those at risk of long-term unemployment, but staff judgment supplements the targeting. And they try to serve the highest on that score distribution. Participation in assigned services is required for continued UI eligibility.

Now, things have changed. I don't know if they've changed recently in Australia but they had developed their strategy for next year already at the time of 4.2 percent unemployment. They instituted profiling when unemployment was nearly 8 percent. Their plan is to retain the Job Seeker Classification Instrument, the profiling.

Each customer's going to get an employability – employment pathway plan – an EPP. This type of instrument is common in a lot of countries to have – each customer gets an action plan. The customer groups that they categorize – the work ready, need employability development and the long-term unemployed – they're going to move a lot of them to a dole or public service employment if these services don't work.

At the time they made this plan they were flush with money and they thought they could give a lot to everybody. And they also had a lot of success under the previous structure. They planned customized services for job seekers and they want to serve employers, just as our program emphasizes what employers need.

Now, what about FDSS again? It was pilot tested in Georgia. There were – we tried to implement it during the last recession and Georgia was hit with a high level of claims, didn't have a lot of resources to do staff-assisted services at that time. The question is, what can we do to help other states implement FDSS quicker, easier, but still have it be effective?

Well, the return to industry module is something that requires specific attention. The reemployment earnings module was something that required specific attention. And we could rely on OES data and LMI employment growth projections to replace these kind of things and we could still pull customized values from those data sets for a particular job seeker in a particular region of the state based on their characteristics.

Instead of estimating employability models, could we rely on a WPRS model? And I think that's worth testing whether we could divide up the WPRS scores, much in the way that Scott was suggesting earlier, to identify different groups of customers and see which patterns of services are most effective for those groups of customers.

This system would still require linking data across programs. The systematic job search module then could provide a background information view. You know, the one screen that shows the frontline staff all the background characteristics on the job seeker. It could provide customized

information on prior occupations from the OES and LMI. It could provide customized information on declining industries, very timely data from the mass layoff surveys. It could provide information on related occupations, linking through O\*NET, OES and LMI data; and again, here on the related occupations.

The service referral module – if we rely on WPRS, we set up regions in the state and the metropolitan areas of the state and the balance of the state. We could set up five ranges and sort services by groups of WPRS scores. And the skills development and referral module could be added. And some states have things like this where it's a self-service tool to conduct a skills inventory and identify skills gaps for available related jobs and look at a list of available training institutions and look at the customer reports – consumer reports on those institutions.

So key things here. Now, did I go – yeah. The forward thing is that the WPRS models have to be up to date. We need to identify the proper OES and LMI data. We'd have to pull together the recent claims from high layoffs to identify declining occupation groups. That's another thing that could supplement. There's actually taking advantage of the claims data to identify where people shouldn't be looking. Accessing the mass layoff data as well. Again, I would pilot test this and then if we get some good results I think it would be relatively easy to share.

Again, I mentioned the place on our Upjohn.org Web site. Along the left hand side if you click on the Targeting Employment Services hub you'll see lots of resources from things that we developed for Georgia, things that we learned, things from other countries.

Thank you very much. A pleasure. We have lots of time for Q&A.

MR. GONZALEZ: And I'm going to remind everyone that to participate over the phone line it's \*1. Or you can use that chat to the bottom left. I'm going to ask if there is anyone on the phone line that would like to participate in a verbal dialogue.

MR. GIBBONS: We have –

DR. O'LEARY: I see one question here about reemployment bonuses. Shall I answer that?

MS. ATKINSON: Yes.

DR. O'LEARY: Okay. Back in the 1980s there was a series of experiments that the U.S. Department of Labor conducted and I was involved in an experiment in Washington state. And the first experiment was actually done in Illinois and it was done with Reed Act money. And it was done in 1984 and the offer was \$500 for eligible unemployment insurance claimants if they went back to work within 11 weeks. And the bonus would be paid if they kept the job for four months.

And it turned out that the benefit-cost ratio was 2.32. It looked like a fabulous opportunity. Part of the problem – well, and so it looked like a fabulous opportunity and so it was tried in other states.

It was tried as part of the big New Jersey reemployment bonus experiment. There the impact estimates were smaller. The Illinois estimate was about 1.15 weeks duration, shorter UI durations. The New Jersey experiment was more like about a half a week shorter durations. And the experiment that I was involved in Washington and one in Pennsylvania had average durations shortened by about half a week. So they weren't quite as big.

So we went back and looked at the Illinois data and some of those people were on extended benefits. There was a federal supplement compensation program at the time and that was somehow confounding the effect of the reemployment bonus. However, what we did, as I said, was we went back and targeted the bonus offers, did some simulations and said, suppose that we had offered these things to people with high WPRS scores and we got higher cost-effectiveness? And we had longer impacts – larger impacts on shortening UI duration.

So again, I can tell you more about that offline or by e-mail if you have some questions.

Are there other questions here?

MR. GONZALEZ: And do we have any questions on the phone line?

OPERATOR: We have a question from the line of Lloyd Adams (ph).

LLOYD ADAMS: Hello.

MR. GIBBONS: Hi.

MR. ADAMS: I had a question about the graphic that Scott Gibbons had put up earlier about the potential – (inaudible) – and the relationship to the profiling score?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, sir.

MR. ADAMS: Well, you had a spectrum of services over there on the X axis and I'm wondering if you had any data to back up your suggestions or are you suggesting that we take a look at those?

MR. GIBBONS: I'm suggesting that you take a look at those. I've been – right now it's a little bit more speculative. We haven't done like a full-blown research project where we've assessed the effectiveness of doing it. Is that responsive to your question?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, it does.

OPERATOR: Your next question is from the line of Debra Pierce (sp).

DEBRA PIERCE: Hello?

DR. O'LEARY: Hi, Debra.

MS. PIERCE: Hi. My question is in reference to the services that have been implemented, one being the self-employment assistance services. And I was wondering if the self-employment system, is it available to ex-offenders? And if so, what are the limitations?

DR. O'LEARY: I think a question for Cheryl.

MS. ATKINSON: Well, the self-employment assistance program is something that states may choose to enact as part of their state unemployment compensation laws. And it essentially permits people to receive the equivalent of what they would receive in UI benefits as a self-employment stipend of sorts. So if the person, such as ex-offenders, did not have – didn't qualify for UI, then they wouldn't be a potential participant.

DR. O'LEARY: Right. They have to qualify for UI and I think they also have to be selected by the WPRS model. Is that right, Cheryl?

MS. ATKINSON: Steve – (inaudible) – who's here is nodding yes and he's more knowledgeable about that than I. The answer's yes.

DR. O'LEARY: Yes. So it potentially could be used for ex-offenders although, again, like Cheryl said, the ex-offenders would have to be eligible for unemployment insurance and they'd have to be selected by the profiling model as well. And the people who are – the evaluation shows the people who are successful are people who are somewhat more years of experience in the workforce. They maybe have a trade or a skill that is a natural transfer to a self-employment activity, either a manual skill or a financial skill or something either – I don't know too much about it. I guess Steve is the authority here. There are about eight states I think that have active programs. But it's something that could be developed further I think.

MS. PIERCE: Okay.

MR. GIBBONS: There are seven states that are active now. Louisiana I think never implemented its program. But you're right. I mean, it's basically older workers with more tenure who have a fair amount of skill who have been most successful and doing well in the program.

DR. O'LEARY: I've got an interesting question here, Cheryl, from Nevada. Says, "Can the state volunteer to participate in FDSS at no cost to the state?" And maybe somebody else can help me answer that, but we went in and worked with Georgia and Georgia provided some staff time and cooperation and some programming in their Web site. But there was no time to the outside experts from the Upjohn Institute who came in to help. So I think there is a possibility for states willing to devote resources to develop a trial FDSS.

MR. GIBBONS: Chris, why don't you collect the names and find out who's interested? Maybe we can get back to them some time.

DR. O'LEARY: Okay. You can find my e-mail – I'll give you my e-mail over the conference call. It's very easy. I'll say it and spell it, oleary@upjohn.org. It's just O-L-E-A-R-Y at U-P-J-O-H-N dot O-R-G. It's right there on the screen.

There was another question here I think I missed earlier. Can you scroll up on this presenter notes? I can't seem to scroll up on here.

MR. GONZALEZ: We have only a couple of questions in that queue.

DR. O'LEARY: Okay. What was the earlier question up there?

MR. GONZALEZ: (Inaudible) – because it was already addressed. I'm going to ask before we go to the queue as it exists now, is there anybody else on the phone line?

OPERATOR: We do have another question from the line of Kim Marichu (ph).

MR. GONZALEZ: Kim, go ahead.

KIM MARICHU: Hi. My question's already been answered.

OPERATOR: And at this time there are no further questions from the phone line.

MR. GONZALEZ: Okay. And Chris, we have – all the questions available are in the presenter notes area.

DR. O'LEARY: Okay. I'm looking there. There was another question that disappeared. "Are you aware of any states that tie UI benefits to participation and required employability job readiness activities?" I think – well, at least in WPRS my understanding is that here in Michigan, for example, if you are referred to services your payment is suspended until you participate through WPRS. I don't know of any other things. There are certain eligibility review programs and some states have their own eligibility review type programs. I'm not sure about suspending benefit entitlement if you don't come to a call-in.

MS. ATKINSON: I'm not aware of any states that tie eligibility to participation except through WPRS. And that is – that's part of – that's a federal requirement, essentially, that states essentially base benefit eligibility on individuals participating in services to which they are referred through the profiling system.

DR. O'LEARY: Someone wrote in here saying that the current system results in a weak administrative penalty and asks, "Do we advocate more open-ending denial to require some level of compliance?" I'm not sure. I think the idea is to get people's attention and to get them in there. And if you resume benefits until there's been some interaction – if you resume benefit payments before there's some interaction, that doesn't seem reasonable. It seems like you're trying to prompt some interaction.

"What services are states providing individuals selected from WPRS?" That's a good question. When this thing started my understanding was that there was an orientation, which was usually about two hours that was a group event; and then there was about six hours required individual job search activity in the One-Stop center. But I'm sure there's a wide range of treatments for the

WPRS.

MR. GIBBONS: No, not that one.

MS. ATKINSON: There is a wide range of services across states. And Scott had a slide which he's scrolling back to that outlined I believe the number of people who were referred to various types of services.

DR. O'LEARY: There it is. That's right.

MR. GIBBONS: The majority of people get orientation where the state does a benefit rights interview and often times walks the claimant around the One-Stop. As I said earlier, a lot of the states I've talked to have enjoyed the opportunity to get the people in there and show them what they can do in the One-Stops. As you can see, the more intensive types of things like education and training have much lower numbers of participants. The programs are more expensive and the slots are not as available. I'm not sure that this data is perfect, but it does give you a fairly general idea about what's going on out there.

I had one concern about some of the data – administrative data that we're collecting on this program, which is I think some of the states may be doing more interesting or innovative things which we may not be capturing really detail on. We've begun a couple of dialogues here about evaluating some of the interventions that are done through this program and changing some of the reporting aspects of it. And I think sort of talking with states about those specific types of reemployment approaches that they might like to take – might take in the future – would sort of help us to inform a better reporting system for this.

DR. O'LEARY: There is one additional service that's provided by WPRS in the seven states that have self-employment assistance. Just like there's referrals to education and training in the seven states that have self-employment assistance programs, there is referrals through the self-employment systems program.

MR. GIBBONS: I had self-employment on this slide and I actually took it off because, as Steve (sic) said, there are only seven states that are doing it. But he's absolutely right that for those states that have enacted that in their law there is the option to do that.

MR. GONZALEZ: And do we have anyone else on the line?

OPERATOR: We have a question from the line of Helen Parker.

MR. GONZALEZ: Helen, go ahead.

HELEN PARKER: Actually, not a question. Just a comment. I would want to encourage Nevada and any other state who is interested in pursuing perhaps piloting FDSS light to have a conversation with Chris. I was in Georgia for the original FDSS experiment and had been a long-time believer in this tool as a way to help us provide services to the customers who come in our doors. So I really would encourage folks who are intrigued by this at all to give Chris a call and

start a conversation.

MR. GONZALEZ: And do we have anyone else on the line?

OPERATOR: We have a question from the line of Jean Theron (ph).

MR. GONZALEZ: Go ahead, Jean.

JEAN THERON: Can you hear me?

MR. GONZALEZ: Yes, we do.

MS. THERON: Yeah. The numbers – participation numbers you had for profiling the services, was that for an annual period?

MR. GIBBONS: That was for fiscal year 2008.

MS. THERON: Fiscal 2008. It seemed to me that the placement service numbers were rather high and I was wondering if those are actual placements or job referrals.

MR. GIBBONS: They're supposed to be placements. The current reporting instructions are that you're not supposed to take credit for that if you talk about a placement or if you sort of send them to talk about a placement. It's supposed to only be a placement.

MS. THERON: Thank you.

MR. GONZALEZ: And looks like we're coming close to the end of our time so I'm going to ask is there – we have probably time for maybe one more question. Operator, do we have any questions on the line?

OPERATOR: There are no further questions at this time.

MR. GONZALEZ: Okay. Scott?

MR. GIBBONS: I think I'm good.

MR. GONZALEZ: Okay. Chris?

DR. O'LEARY: Well, thank you very much. This has been a pleasure.

MR. GONZALEZ: Thanks, Chris, for taking the time out to join us. Well, I'm going to wrap things up with a couple of housekeeping items.

First I want to speak to everybody who stuck with us just a little bit about Workforce<sup>3</sup> One. As you know, it's a tool built for you and by you and you can use Workforce<sup>3</sup> One if you'd like to have any – post any documents to share, programs to feature or any relevant news or information



that you'd like to exchange with your colleagues. To do so you can submit that content just by clicking the link at the bottom of this slide. And again, as I said, you can – programs to share, documents to feature or anything that you'd like to exchange with your peers.

Now, as I said at the top of today's webinar, we were recording this session. We're going to be making the recording available on your My Events page on Workforce<sup>3</sup> One. And to access your My Events page, just log into your account; you'll be automatically taken to it. And to access the recording, the transcript, the PowerPoint and the handout, you'll just right click the View Resources link to the right of the session title. I'll actually be bringing the file share window back at the end of today's session so you can download the PowerPoint and the handout.

Now, just a bit more about Workforce<sup>3</sup> One. As I said, you can join live Web conferencing sessions that feature leaders and experts from industry, such as today's. But it's also a means of registering to be informed of news and events as they occur. So we really encourage you to make note of Workforce<sup>3</sup> One as it's a powerful tool funded by ETA and powered by you, the community.

Now, if you'd like to learn more about the workforce investment system you can do so by visiting [www.careeronestop.org](http://www.careeronestop.org), or by calling 1-877-US2-JOBS.

With that I want to thank Scott Gibbons and Chris O'Leary for joining us, also Cheryl Atkinson for taking the time out today, and to you for carving out the hour and a half or more for today's session. We hope to see you on future webinars.

I'm also going to be bringing up that file share window so you can download the PowerPoint and the document with the acronyms from today's session. So we're going to leave the room open and feel free to download those documents. All right. Have a good day, everyone.

(END)