

PY 2023 Grant Performance Assessment

Overview

Following the conclusion of a program year, the Department of Labor assesses the performance of the core SCSEP measures. A grant's actual performance is compared with agreed-upon performance goals, after adjusting goals using the Statistical Adjustment Model (SAM).

This document provides an overview of the PY23 Grant Performance Assessment (GPA), including the data sources used in the assessment and details on the adjustment applied to the employment-based goals in PY23.

Performance Goals – the basis for the assessment

The Department negotiates expected levels for the core performance measures on a two-year basis. PY22 and PY23 were proposed and negotiated together; the final agreed-upon levels of performance can be found on the [SCSEP DOL webpage](#).

Past performance was the basis for the proposed goals, while considering levels that promote continuous improvement and comparable levels across grantees. If a grantee's performance was above the nationwide average, the grantee received its baseline as the base goal. If the grantee's performance was below the nationwide average, the grantee received 75% of the distance between their performance and the nationwide average as the base goal. A 2-percentage-point continuous improvement increase was applied from PY22 to PY23 for all measures.

Two adjustments were then made to the three employment outcome measures – participant characteristics and economic factors, using the Statistical Adjustment Model (SAM). A cap and a floor are then applied to the three goals. The other four core measures are not adjusted using the SAM. The performance goals for service level, community service, most in need, and indicators of effectiveness are not adjusted.

Grantees had the option to negotiate the proposed levels by submitting additional data to show an additional adjustment was warranted. Finalized goals are then published and made publicly available. For a full explanation of the methodology for the goal-setting process, visit the [Community of Practice Performance Hub](#).

Actual Performance – Quarterly Performance Report (QPR)

A grant's annual performance is calculated and documented through QPR. Data for the program year was finalized on November 8, 2024 and is available in the Grantee Performance Management System. The assessment's Most in Need (MIN) measure was calculated outside of GPMS to account for corrected Urban/Rural designations to match the RUCA codes. This process is now automated in GPMS, moving forward, the MIN rate in the QPR will accurately reflect the data. The indicators of effectiveness measure is calculated using the customer satisfaction surveys (CSS), which are outside of GPMS. A full report on this measure will be provided at a later date.

PY23 Goal Adjustments – refreshing the SAM

To reflect actual conditions from the program year being evaluated, the SAM was refreshed with GPMS data on characteristics from PY23 and the most recently available census data.

Economic adjustments factor in census data on poverty level, unemployment rate, and the average weekly wage rate. A customized weighted estimate is created for each grant, reflecting service area down to the county level. Through a quartile system, points are subtracted from a grant's goal based on

which quartile they are in for each economic factor - the higher the quartile, the more points are subtracted, reducing the goal accordingly. Note that economic adjustments are only unidirectional.

The adjustment for participant characteristics uses the SAM to determine which characteristics have a statistically significant impact on employment outcomes. The following characteristics, with corresponding arrows to indicate direction, were found to be statistically significant. When a grant is more than 1 standard deviation above the nationwide average on any of the above factors, points are either added to or deducted from the goal, this adjustment is bi-directional.

Employment At Q2	Employment At Q4	Median Earnings
Percent Male ↓	Percent Male ↓	Percent Male ↑
Percent Displaced Homemaker ↓	Percent Displaced Homemaker ↓	Percent with a Disability ↓
Percent with Bachelor's Degree or Master's Degree ↑	Percent with Bachelor's Degree or Advanced Degree ↑	Percent with an Advanced Degree ↑
	Percent Poverty ↓	Percent Receiving Public Assistance ↓
		Percent with Low Employment Prospects ↓

GPA Aggregation

After adjustments are applied to performance goals, actual performance is compared to the adjusted goal, and the percentage of the goal achieved is calculated (actual performance divided by performance goal). The aggregate percentage of goals achieved is then calculated by averaging the percentage achieved on the seven core measures.

If a grant's aggregate percentage of goal achieved is:

- In excess of 100%, the grant has exceeded the expected levels of performance;
- In the range of 80 to 100%, the grant has met the expected levels of performance; and
- Below 80%, the grant has failed to meet the expected levels of performance.

GPA Next Steps

Grantees who fail to meet expected levels of performance must submit a corrective action plan addressing:

1. For each measure that achieved less than 80% of goal achieved, discuss the reasons the goal was not met.
2. The steps that will be taken to meet the expected levels of performance in the subsequent program years.
3. Any technical assistance needs to address data or programmatic issues documented in items one and two.

The department will provide compliance assistance based on the needs of each grant detailed in the CAP.