

PROGRAM OUTCOMES AND HIGHLIGHTS

Persons Served

- Total persons served 18,425 – Goal was 18,317
- 973 served in Vocational Services
- 17,452 served in Career Development Services
 - 2,914 received Prisoner Re-entry Services
 - 801 received goodChoice Services
 - 404 received Partnership for Families Northside services

Earnings and Placements

- Total placement for the organization was 1,385 – Goal was 1,403
- Average hourly wage at placement \$11.33 – Goal was \$10.00
- Average hourly wage of \$6.46 for enclave placements under the Special Wage Certificate (Goal \$5.00)
- Average hourly of \$8.67 for supported employment/individual model placements (Goal \$9.00)

Retention

- 74% of TANF customers maintained employment for 90 days (Goal 85%)
- 100% of customers placed through transitional services maintained employment for 90 days (Goal 90%)
- 100% of customers placed through supported employment maintained employment for 24 weeks (Goal 75%)

Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Service Access

- Community Employment Centers met or exceeded performance goals for people served, people placed, and average wage
- Vocational Services exceeded performance goals for persons served
- 86% of the persons referred for services in TANF programs completed the intake process (Goal 80%)
- 6 Supported employment placements per quarter (Goal 14/quarter)
- 100% of the enclave participants achieved at least one annual service plan goal (Goal 70%)
- 80% of participants in skills building achieved at least one annual service plan goal (Goal 60%)
- 87 % of participants in skills building, attended the program as scheduled (Goal 90%)
- 81% of TANF enrollees actively participated in work experience and job readiness training (Goal 80%)
- 84% of persons enrolled in work adjustment training successfully completed the program (Goal 80%)
- 98% of persons completing work adjustment identified a feasible vocational goal (Goal 81%)
- 70% of work adjustment enrollees attended all scheduled program days (Goal 75%)
- Average program duration was 29 days in work adjustment (Goal 30 days)
- Service Access: Persons were denied services in Vocational Services due to funding cuts, not program capacity issues
- Petersburg CEC Business Advisory Council expanded its membership by 3 new members, increasing membership from 11 to 14

- Mechanicsville CEC brought in a record number of employers to its “How to Get Hired” events (at least 2 businesses per month) to work with job seekers
- CECs expanded Soft Skills training offerings for job seekers and Goodwill was invited to provide customized Job Readiness and Soft Skills training for City of Richmond, Hilliard House, and Prison Re-Entry Initiative thereby generating funds to help expand training options

Satisfaction

- Client Survey – 1330 respondents, 961 from Vocational Services, 369 from Career Development – 93.2% satisfaction rate
- Business Survey – 11 respondents – 91% satisfaction rate
- Referral Survey – 44 respondents out of 111 emails to referral source case managers – 80% satisfaction rate

Quality Assurance

In 2010 375 files in Vocational Services’ were reviewed. Goodwill has an extensive quality assurance process designed to monitor case records and billing in the Vocational Services Unit. Case record reviews and billing audits are conducted at least quarterly with the Compliance Manager assuming the primary responsibility for the process. This includes notifying staff members and supervisory personnel of findings, identification of appropriate corrective measures, and preparing quarterly and annual reports.

3 Year Program Outcome Comparison Report

The following chart lists Vocational Services objectives, goals by programs, and the outcomes by year. The variance in each chart reflects the increase or decrease from last year’s (2009) outcome as it is compared to the 2010 outcome.

Variance Chart Key

↑	Increase outcome in 2010 from 2009
↓	Decrease outcome in 2010 from 2009
✓	Outcome is the same for 2010 as 2009
NA	Category not applicable to 2010
No Data	No Data was available at the time of the survey

**Situation Assessment clients are placed in this program for a very limited time then transferred to Supported Employment, therefore they do not complete satisfactions surveys. These clients would complete satisfaction surveys under the Supported Employment Program.*

*** In the enclave model of supported employment currently enrolled persons are employed. Program vacancies tend to occur only if someone resigns or is no longer eligible for the program. Due to funding cuts Goodwill was unable to enroll new persons in this program: therefore, there were no eligible participants for the objective of maintaining 24 weeks of employment. For this reason the rating for this objective in 2010 was NA.*

Goodwill of Central Virginia | 2010

Objectives	GOAL	2008	2009	2010	Variance
Program: Transition to Independence Employment (TIE)					
Effectiveness: % of participants referred to program and completing Intake	80%	38%	55%	86%	↑ 31%
% of post-orientation program participants receiving case management services	100%	100%	99%	100%	↑ 1%
% of participants actively participating in work experience, job readiness and job seeking skills training	80%	100%	89%	81%	↓ 8%
% of participants referred to Placement	100%	72%	90%	73%	↓ 17%
% of participants obtaining employment	75%	72%	39%	52%	↑ 13%
% of participants who are placed in competitive employment & earning an average of \$7.50 per hour	80%	82%	88%	84%	↓ 7%
% of participants who maintain employment for 90 days	85%	48%	67%	74%	↑ 7%
Efficiency: % of daily attendance	80%	74%	78%	83%	↑ 5%
Satisfaction: % of completers who are satisfied with program	80%	98%	88%	93%	↑ 5
Service Access: % of participants who wait less than 5 days from referral to assessment	100%	81%	No Data	100%	↑ 29%
Objectives	GOAL	2008	2009	2010	Variance
Program: Extended Employment Services In-House					
Effectiveness: % participants referred to Supported or Placement	2%	18%	0%	0%	√
Average hourly wage under special wage certificate in-house	\$4.00	\$5.48	\$6.27	\$6.47	↑ \$.20
% who meet at least one goal annually	70%	86%	85%	90%	↑ 5%
Efficiency: % of daily attendance	85%	100%	86%	88%	↑ 2%
Average participant productivity	40%	81%	79%	89%	↑ 10%
Time to fill positions	15 days	5 days	NA	0	√
Satisfaction: % participants who are satisfied	85%	94%	100%	100%	√
Service Access: number on waiting list	5	0	0	0	√
Objectives	GOAL	2008	2009	2010	Variance
Program: Transitional Services					
Effectiveness: # participants placed in competitive employment per quarter	2	4.25	1	3	↑ 2
Average hourly wage of employed participants	\$9.00	\$9.09	\$9.46	\$10.36	↑ \$.90
% participants who maintain employment for 60 days	90%	89%	100%	100%	√
Efficiency: Time from program entry to plan development	5 days	5 days	4.5 days	6 days	↑ 1.5 days
Satisfaction: % participants who are satisfied	80%	NA	100%	90%	↓ 10%
Service Access: number on waiting list	0	0	0	0	√

Objectives	GOAL	2008	2009	2010	Variance
Program: Prevocational Services					
Effectiveness: % participants accomplishing at least one goal on Annual Plan	60%	74%	44%	80%	↑ 36%
Efficiency: % daily attendance	90%	95%	71%	87%	↑ 16%
Satisfaction: % participants who are satisfied	85%	100%	87%	90%	↑ 3%
Service Access: number on waiting list	5	5	0	0	√

Objectives	GOAL	2008	2009	2010	Variance
Program: Work Adjustment Training					
Effectiveness: % of participants recommended for Placement or Supported/Transitional	30%	35%	83%	72%	↓ 11%
% of terminees identifying a feasible job goal	81%	86%	84%	98%	↑ 14%
% of participants placed in recommended program at 60 day follow up	40%	38%	25%	50%	↑ 25%
% of completers recommended for EES or Prevocational Services	15%	27%	28%	6%	↓ 22%
% of successful program completers	80%	73%	67%	84%	↑ 17%
Efficiency: average length of time in program	30 days	41 days	24 days	29 days	↑ 5%
% of daily attendance	75%	69%	75%	70%	↓ 5%
Satisfaction: % of completers who are satisfied with program	80%	94%	90%	90%	√
Service Access: number on waiting list	0	0	0	0	√
days from intake to start of program	5 days	16 days	0	0	√
Objectives	GOAL	2008	2009	2010	Variance
Program: Supported Employment					
Effectiveness: # participants placed in competitive employment per quarter	14	11.5	14	6	↓ 8
% employed participants	75%	75%	98%	64%	↓ 34%
% participants placed in jobs w/ benefits	60%	56%	91%	93%	↑ 2%
Average hourly wage of employed participants	\$9.00	\$7.82	\$9.00+	\$8.67	↓ 1%
% participants who maintain employment for 24 weeks	75%	86%	94%	100%	↑ 6%
Efficiency: # Follow Along hours per quarter for those in competitive employment	15	10.7	9	8	↓ 1
Satisfaction: % participants who are satisfied	80%	97%	85%	85%	√
Service Access: number on waiting list	0	0	0	0	√

Objectives	GOAL	2008	2009	2010	Variance
Program: Situational Assessment					
Effectiveness: % who identify a vocational goal	90%	100%	100%	100%	√
% enrollees who successfully complete the program	90%	100%	100%	100%	√
% completers referred to placement	85%	100%	100%	100%	√
Efficiency: # days from referral to program start	10	3	5	0	↑ 5
Satisfaction: % completers who are satisfied	80%	No Data	No Data	*No Data	√
Service Access: number on waiting list	0	0	0	0	√
Objectives	GOAL	2008	2009	2010	Variance
Program: Supported Employment Enclave					
Effectiveness: % participants referred to Independent Supported/Transitional Employment or Placement	2%	0%	0%	0	√
Average hourly wage (special certificate)	\$5.00	\$5.73	\$6.23	\$6.46	↑\$.23
% participants who meet at least one goal annually	70%	82%	100%	100%	√
% participants who maintain employment for 24 weeks	80%	100%	87%	**NA	**NA
Efficiency: % of participants demonstrating positive work habits	85%	93%	97%	92%	↓ 5%
Average participant productivity	80%	86%	92%	80%	↓ 12%
Satisfaction: % participants who are satisfied	85%	100%	87%	87%	√
Service Access: number on waiting list	5	5	0	0	√