## Governor’s Workforce Development Taskforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development Council and Industry Partnerships</td>
<td>Increase the role and responsibilities of an industry-driven Workforce Development Council to champion the development and implementation of a statewide, strategic workforce development plan that meets industries’ needs today and tomorrow.</td>
<td>Executive Order issued; new WDC structure will have heavy focus on industry partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development Training Fund</td>
<td>Establish a sustainable funding mechanism for the Workforce Development Training Fund (WDTF).</td>
<td>Additional $2.5m appropriated. Will include forecasting needs in WDC operational plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Engagement</td>
<td>Develop and implement a comprehensive statewide public engagement initiative utilizing technology and other engagement strategies to increase awareness of career opportunities for all Idahoans.</td>
<td>Legislation drafted to add public engagement as use of WDTF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Owner: Governor & WDC*  
*Owner: WDC & IDOL*  
*Owner: WDC & Cross Agency Leadership Team*
Governor’s Workforce Development Taskforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecting Education to Careers</td>
<td>Idaho’s K-through-Career education system should value and support all pathways for students to achieve education, training and workforce skills that align to their career aspirations.</td>
<td>NGA Work-Based Learning Policy Academy supports this effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner: State Board of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Training Centers and Adult Training Support</td>
<td>Enhance support for Idaho’s six Workforce Training Centers and the individuals they serve with short-term, industry-focused training.</td>
<td>ICTE has line item request for $750k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner: Idaho Career &amp; Technical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Career Advising</td>
<td>Ensure that there is equity and access for all Idaho students to occupational pathways by establishing stronger requirements for the secondary education system in deploying college and career advising.</td>
<td>Governor’s Office spearheading cross-agency initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner: State Board of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Governor’s Workforce Development Taskforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Readiness</td>
<td>Incentivize Idaho school districts to incorporate workforce readiness skills throughout secondary curriculum.</td>
<td>ICTE has included framework to establish incentive program in legislative proposal. Funding request would come in FY20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner: Idaho Career &amp; Technical Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeships</td>
<td>Continue the development of apprenticeship programs throughout the state.</td>
<td>Apprenticeship Committee focus on building support system and replicable models. WDTF could support ongoing apprenticeship initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner: WDC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Career and Technical Education Programs</td>
<td>Strengthen Idaho’s talent pipeline by expanding CTE programs at the secondary and post-secondary level.</td>
<td>ICTE has multiple line item requests to support recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner: Idaho Career &amp; Technical Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alignment of Curricula

Training and Education

The Workforce Development Function

Outreach – Two-way line-of-sight between jobseekers and employers

Connecting Businesses and Education to create an outstanding workforce for today and tomorrow
## Workforce Development Council Responsibilities

| Develop and implement a comprehensive workforce development strategy | Improve the effectiveness, quality and coordination of programs and services designed to maintain a highly skilled workforce | Helps provide for the most efficient use of federal, state and local workforce development resources | Increase public awareness of and access to career education & training opportunities |
Develop and implement a comprehensive workforce development strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve the effectiveness, quality and coordination of programs and services designed to maintain a highly skilled workforce</td>
<td>Helps provide for the most efficient use of federal, state and local workforce development resources</td>
<td>Increase public awareness of and access to career education &amp; training opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategy

The Council

Alignment

• Industry Partnerships
• Workforce Development Training Fund
• Workforce Innovation & Opportunity Act

Outreach

• Connecting Education to Careers
• Public Engagement
• Career Advising
Alignment

Industry Partnerships
• Partner with existing associations/organizations
• Assist with creation of industry-led partnerships where needed

Workforce Development Training Fund
• Resources to implement industry-led initiatives
• Approximately $5m annually – if needs are greater, request general fund appropriation
• Current fund balance ~ $6m (includes $2.5m for implementation of Task Force recommendations)

Workforce Innovation & Opportunity Act
• Responsibilities of a state workforce investment board
State Workforce Investment Board Responsibilities

1. Strategic Plan: Comprehensive, Streamlined Workforce Development System
2. Proven & Promising Practices
3. Continuous Improvement
4. Technology Improvements
5. Accountability and Program Oversight
6. Workforce Research and Labor Market Information
Outreach

Connecting Education to Careers
  • Cross-agency effort to streamline resources
  • Work-Based Learning Policy Academy
  • ApprenticeshipIdaho

Public Engagement
  • Line of Sight – new use of Workforce Development Training Funds

Career Advising
  • Models for industry engagement
Develop strategies to scale work-based learning opportunities that connect youth and young adults ages 16-29 (“young adults”) with middle-skills career opportunities that require knowledge in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) in STEM-intensive industries including advanced manufacturing, health care, energy, and information technology.

Focus Areas
- Vision & Communication
- Data & Measurement
- Resources & Policy

Cross Agency Collaboration
- WDC, OSBE, SDE, ICTE, Commerce, IDOL, STEM Action Center, IDVR, IDHW
Measuring Success

Where do we start?

• Economic Indicators – Craig Shaul, Idaho Department of Labor
• Return on Investment – Salvador Vasquez, Idaho Department of Labor
• Demand Side – Jay Larsen, Idaho Technology Council
• Supply Side – Jessica Ruehrwein, Treasure Valley Education Partnership
Unemployment Rate
Seasonally Adjusted 2006-2017\textsuperscript{Nov.}

Source: Idaho Department of Labor, U.S. Federal Reserve – December 2017
Unemployment Rates
Idaho and Surrounding States, 2017\textsuperscript{Nov.}

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics

\begin{itemize}
  \item Nevada: 5.0%
  \item California: 4.6%
  \item Washington: 4.5%
  \item Arizona: 4.3%
  \item Wyoming: 4.3%
  \item Oregon: 4.2%
  \item Montana: 4.0%
  \item Utah: 3.2%
  \item Idaho: 2.9%
\end{itemize}
Idaho Labor Force Components
Totals 2000 to 2017\textsuperscript{Nov.}

- **Civilian Population**: 1,306,100
- **Labor Force**: 835,900
- **Employment**: 811,700
- **Unemployment**: 24,200

\textit{Source: Idaho Department of Labor, December 2017}
Idaho Labor Force Components
Change from 2000 to 2017

Civilian Population
+363,100, 38.5%

Employment
+187,700, 30.1%

Labor Force
+181,900, 27.8%

Source: Idaho Department of Labor, December 2017
Total Employment
Seasonally Adjusted 2007-2017\textsuperscript{Oct.}

- **Current**: 804,924
- **Projected**: +2.6%

*Source: Idaho Department of Labor, December 2017*
# Key Growth Industries

2-Yr. Job Increase: 2017Q1-2019Q1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Jobs 2017Q1</th>
<th>Jobs 2019Q1</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Care &amp; Social Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,004</td>
<td>+4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,331</td>
<td>+4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation, &amp; Warehousing</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>+2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,526</td>
<td>+3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>+4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>+5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td>955</td>
<td>+1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Idaho Department of Labor, December 2017*
Idaho’s Total Nonfarm Jobs
Percent change from 2007\textsuperscript{Jan} to 2017\textsuperscript{Oct}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>+9,500,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>+70,500</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Idaho Department of Labor, December 2017
Year-over-Year Job Growth
Idaho and Surrounding States, 2017

- Idaho: +2.3%
- Utah: +2.1%
- Nevada: +2.0%
- Washington: +2.7%
- Oregon: +2.8%
- California: +1.7%
- Arizona: +1.5%
- Montana: +1.5%
- Wyoming: -0.6%

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics
Idaho Business Cycles
Nonfarm Jobs Increase from Trough Month to Peak Month

Source: Idaho Department of Labor, December 2017
2016 Idaho Median Wage
Surrounding States with National Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Median Wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$67,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$47,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$43,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$38,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$37,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$35,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$34,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$32,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$32,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>$29,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$20,240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Idaho Department of Labor, December 2017
Population Growth
Mid-2016 to Mid-2017

Source: US Census Bureau, December 2017
Idaho’s Urbanization
Population Net Percentage Growth, with 2026 Projection

- Urban: +65%
- Rural: +16%

Source: Idaho Department of Labor, December 2017
Share of Population by Age, Idaho

- **14 and Younger**
- **15 to 64**
- **65 and Older**

**2001**
- 14 and Younger: 11%
- 15 to 64: 23%
- 65 and Older: 66%

**2016**
- 14 and Younger: 15%
- 15 to 64: 22%
- 65 and Older: 63%

*Source: US Census Bureau – December 2016*
Idaho Total In-Migration, 2016

Top 10 Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total of People Moving into Idaho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>17,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>9,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Country*</td>
<td>8,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>7,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>4,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>3,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>3,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>2,606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Out-migration from foreign countries is not available.

Source: American Community Survey, 2017
Idaho Total Out-Migration, 2016

Top 10 Destinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Out-Migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-55,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>-11,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>-9,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>-4,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>-3,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>-2,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-2,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>-2,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>-1,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>-1,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>-1,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Out-migration from foreign countries is not available.

Source: American Community Survey, 2017
Idaho’s Net Migration
2016, Top Five States by Amount

Total Net In
- California: 13,421
- Nevada: 2,287
- Wyoming: 1,956
- Arizona: 1,547
- Colorado: 1,507

Total Net Out: -12,796

* Out-migration from foreign countries is not available.

Source: American Community Survey, 2017
Year-over-Year Labor Force Growth
Idaho and Surrounding States, 2017

- Oregon: +3.5%
- Utah: +2.7%
- Washington: +1.9%
- Nevada: +2.2%
- Arizona: +3.4%
- Idaho: 1.9%
- California: +1.2%
- Montana: -0.4%
- Wyoming: -2.4%

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics
Summary
Estimates for 2017 - 2019

• Idaho’s low unemployment rate is expected to persist with an average of 3.5 percent through calendar year 2019.

• Annual job growth and total employment are projected to increase by 2.6 percent from first quarter 2017 to first quarter 2019, or 1.3 percent annually.

• Key growth industries:
  • Health Care & Social Assistance
  • Leisure and Hospitality
  • Trade, Transportation, & Warehousing
  • Construction
  • Financial Services
  • Manufacturing

• Idaho is 93 months into its present business cycle, the third longest and slowest growing on record.

• The growth in Idaho is concentrating in its urban counties.

• Idaho leads the nation in population growth, however building a sufficient labor force - both in numbers and skills – that can satisfy growth demands remains the foremost and foreseeable challenge to Idaho’s workforce in the short-term future.
Questions?

Craig Shaul
Research Analyst, Supervisor
Craig.Shaul@labor.idaho.gov
208-457-8789 ext. 3201
Workforce Development Training Fund
Revenue Forecast 2018-2023 and Outcome Evaluation 2010-2016, Preliminary Results
Overview of Workforce Development Training Fund

- **Established in 1996**
  - Funded through 3 percent offset to the unemployment insurance taxes paid by employers
  - Reduces training cost for new and incumbent workers
  - Funds employer grants, industry sector grants and micro-grants of $25,000

- **Previous evaluation completed in 2012 (years 2000 – 2009)**
  - 40 percent of contracts rated as successful
  - Average wage increase of 6.2 percent
  - Average cost of training was $1,671
Overview of Workforce Development Training Fund

**Economic Impact of Evaluated Contracts (2010-2016)**

- $19.7 million dollars to Idaho’s economy
- 886 estimated new jobs created
  - 489 direct jobs
  - 91 indirect
  - 306 induced jobs
- Combined economic impact of $44.5 million
Workforce Development Training Fund
Revenue Forecast

Workforce Development Training Fund
Revenue Forecast ($M)

- Actual Revenues
- Forecast @1.5
- Forecast @1.3
Workforce Development Training Fund
Evaluation (2010 – 2016) – Preliminary Results
Workforce Development Training Fund
Evaluation (2010 – 2016) – Preliminary Results

- 103 Awards
- 90 Employers
- 7,994 Employees
- $2,480 Average Cost Per Trainee

Evaluating: Traditional Awards Employer/Employee
Performance Metrics: Employment Related

$19.7 M

Not-Evaluating: Sector/Micro Grants
Performance Metrics: Inconsistent/Unavailable

$1.75 M

- 3 Sector Grants
  - BSU - Computer Science Expand
  - NIC - Wood Products Industry
  - ISU - Physician Assistants

- 1 Micro-Grant
  - Community Action Partnership (St. Maries)
### Performance Measures by Training Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainees</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Average Annual Prior Wage</th>
<th>Average Annual Post Wage</th>
<th>% Wage Change</th>
<th>Employee Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Employee Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,799</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>$31,496</td>
<td>$40,068</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent Employee Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,836</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>$42,888</td>
<td>$46,564</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Balance of records unable to be verified
# Performance Measures by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (Contract Closed)</th>
<th>Number of Trainees</th>
<th>Percent of Total Trainees</th>
<th>Employee Retention</th>
<th>Average Cost Per Trainee</th>
<th>Unverifiable Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>$2,290</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>$1,246</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>$2,143</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,346</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>$2,635</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2,806</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>$3,544</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>$4,735</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>$1,367</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,944</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>$2,480</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Program Trainees</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-14.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advanced Manufacturing Wage Performance 2010-2016

- Program Trainees - Advanced Manufacturing
- Statewide
High Tech* Wage Performance 2010-2016

* Definition: http://labor.idaho.gov/publications/Core_High-Tech_Report_FINAL.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainees</th>
<th>Average Annual Prior Wage</th>
<th>Average Annual Post Wage</th>
<th>% Wage Change</th>
<th>Employee Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Tech and Advanced Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695</td>
<td>$70,161</td>
<td>$72,374</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Tech Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697</td>
<td>$57,496</td>
<td>$67,726</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Manufacturing Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>$36,775</td>
<td>$39,790</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,437</td>
<td>$31,124</td>
<td>$37,307</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction of Quantitative Funding Model
Introduction of Quantitative Funding Model

• Implemented in March of 2014

• Objective assessment using a department-developed formula in six areas:
  o Job’s wages
  o Job’s economic multiplier
  o Business’s unemployment insurance tax rate
  o County unemployment rate where the job will be performed
  o Concentration of the job type in the overall economy
  o Transferability of the skills and the type of training or education planned

• Other important WDTF Upgrades:
  o Program for tracking outcomes and expenditures
  o Cross match system to track grantees and tax records
  o Grant application form and processes
# Performance Quantitative Funding Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trainees</th>
<th>Average Annual Prior Wage</th>
<th>Average Annual Post Wage</th>
<th>% Wage Change</th>
<th>Employee Retention</th>
<th>Unverifiable Records</th>
<th>Cost Per Trainee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Methodology (Post 2014)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>$24,020</td>
<td>$39,216</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>$2,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Methodology (Pre 2014)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,618</td>
<td>$40,700</td>
<td>$44,828</td>
<td>10.14%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>$2,764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Findings
Evaluation (2010 – 2016) – Preliminary Results

- **Manufacturing is primary recipient (60.6 percent of trainees) in 2017 evaluation**
  - Admin & support services were primary recipient in 2012 evaluation

- **Data collection and record keeping have improved with Quantitative Funding Model**
  - 3.1 percent unverifiable records vs. 17.1 percent before new methodology
  - $2,468 per trainee vs. $2,764 before new methodology

- **63.3 percent were best performers in this report (40 percent were rated successful in 2012)**

- **$34.1 million funding was authorized, $19.7 million was paid (66 percent utilization)**

Additional findings will be published in full report
Recommendations
Evaluation (2010 – 2016) – Preliminary Results

• **Sector grants & micro-grants**
  - Establish performance metrics
  - Formalize a protocol for collecting data from educational institutions

• **Improve accountability**
  - Review performance expectations and data reporting obligations
  - Review data collection processes
  - Establish protocols to prevent training reimbursement for unverifiable records

• **Limit and standardize contract lengths**

Additional recommendations will be published in full report
Set amid beautiful Idaho scenery is a thriving tech landscape, made up of novel start-ups and towering tech giants. Look closer and you find eager talent, willing capital and ready paths to market. Oh, and one amazing view.
The New Economy
IdahoKnowledge Report

• Today’s economy is:
  • Knowledge-dependent
  • Is global
  • Is rooted in information technologies
  • Is driven by innovation

In the United States IT was responsible for two-thirds of total factor growth in productivity between 1995 and 2002 and virtually all of the growth in labor productivity.
What is Our Purpose?

Why define and study Idaho’s knowledge based economy?

Knowledge-Based Economies are associated with:

• Knowledge-intensive and high-technology industries
• Highly-skilled, highly-educated and well-paid jobs that carry higher economic impacts.
“Neither RedBox nor Netflix are even on the radar screen in terms of competition,” said Blockbuster CEO Jim Keyes, speaking to the Motley Fool in 2008. “It’s more Wal-Mart and Apple.”
Who is creating disruption in Idaho?
Distruptive Technology Trends
AI Fueled--Bots Usurp Apps
From Augmented Reality to Mixed Reality
Cybersecurity Wars
The Things Are Taking Over the Internet
Self Driving Vehicles On the High Street
Renewables and Clean Energy Diversify
Idaho kNOWledge Report

- [http:ncstir.com](http:ncstir.com)
Compensation

- California: $163,058
- Washington: $128,674
- Massachusetts: $117,539
- National Avg: $117,539
- Virginia: $97,818
- Texas: $97,818
- Maryland: $97,818
- Tennessee: $97,818
- South Carolina: $97,818

North Carolina: $117,539
Defining the Knowledge Economy
A Simple Taxonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manual</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Share of Idaho Employment
Knowledge Intensity in Idaho
4-Digit NAICS
Share of Employment by Occupation Type

- **Routine & Manual**: 27% (All Idaho Industries), 17% (High Tech Industries)
- **Routine & Cognitive**: 26% (All Idaho Industries), 22% (High Tech Industries)
- **Complex & Manual**: 12% (All Idaho Industries), <1% (High Tech Industries)
- **Complex & Cognitive**: 36% (All Idaho Industries), 61% (High Tech Industries)
IDAHO'S TECHNOLOGY PLATFORMS:

BUILDING ON THE STATE’S CORE COMPETENCIES

PREPARED FOR:
Idaho Commerce and Labor

PREPARED BY:
Battelle
Technology Partnership Practice

November 2006
Figure ES-2: Methodology

Assessment of academic and industrial R&D base

Publications Analysis

Patent Analysis

Cluster Analysis

Core Competencies

Technology Platforms and Market Niches
Idaho Core Competencies

Power/Energy
- Alternative energy and fuels (High)
- Engines and related devices (Medium)
- Sensors, voltage regulators, and related electrical instruments (Low)
- Thermal devices (Low)

Agricultural/Biosciences
- Ag-Bioscience (High)
- Biochemistry/molecular biology (High)
- Biomedical (High)
- Climatology and earth sciences (Medium)

New Materials/Nanotechnology
- Advanced materials coatings & related applications (High)
- Metallochemistry & powder metallurgy (High)
- Semiconductors, memory & other computer components (Medium)

Imaging
- Imaging (High)

From Research Clusters to Core Competencies
FIGURE 1. Idaho's High Technology Industry Employment by Export Orientation and Industry Mix

Size of Circle Indicates Relative Employment Size in 2009.
The 2008 State New Economy Index

Benchmarking Economic Transformation In the States

The Information Technology & Innovation Foundation

KAUFMAN The Foundation of Entrepreneurship
## Benchmarking Economic Transformation in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Change From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 26.</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 12</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 15</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 25</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 50</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[www.kauffman.org](http://www.kauffman.org)
Milken institute

North America’s High-Tech Economy: The Geography of Knowledge-Based Industries

2007 rankings: Idaho (BOISE) was not mentioned.
Figure 1. State Technology and Science Index Map 2010

Legend:
- Top 10
- Second tier
- Third tier
- Bottom 10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Private Jobs</th>
<th>Government Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>15 million</td>
<td>8.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>11.5 million</td>
<td>22.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Wall Street Journal
Knowledge Economy
Research Paradigm

- **Industries**
- **Staffing Patterns**
- **RESEARCH**
  - High-Tech Industries
  - Routine Jobs
- **O-Net**
- **Occupations**

- **Experience Requirements**
  - Skills

- **Worker Requirements**
  - Knowledge

- **Worker Characteristics**
  - Abilities

- **Projections**

- **Unknown Unknowns**
  - R&D horizon
  - Velocity of change
  - Policy variables

- **Known Unknowns**

- **Informed Strategies**
  - Legislative
  - Business
  - Education

**Knowledge Economy**

**Research Paradigm**
Idaho kNOWledge Report
Idaho Technology Platforms with Innovation Clusters

**Industry Verticals**
- Energy
- Environment
- Transport
- Agriculture
- Defense
- Healthcare

**Idaho Technology Platforms - Core Competency Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>Materials &amp; CHEM</th>
<th>Sensors</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Food Services</th>
<th>Air Transport &amp; Avionics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mech</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “X” indicates known existing research capabilities in Idaho.
Idaho kNOWledge Report

• Idaho has the second-fastest growing tech sector in the nation!

• Fastest growing Software Industry as a percent of state GDP
Idaho kNOWledge Report
a dashboard to help IWDC and Industry to gain synergies
Idaho kNOWledge Report will Drive Industry

“Drive thy business or it will drive thee.”

-Benjamin Franklin
✓ Connect the community
✓ Address local education needs
✓ Create a shared vision for change
✓ Align resources
✓ Field test practices (that can be scaled)
✓ Use data as a flashlight to guide efforts/track progress
✓ Empower students!
TVEP’s Footprint

Key
- School District
- Boise State University
- College of Western Idaho
- Northwest Nazarene University
- University of Idaho
- Idaho State University
- Treasure Valley Community College

- 9 School Districts & Bishop Kelly
- 6 Higher Education Institutions
- Nonprofits
- Government
- Business (IBE partners)
- Early Education
## Beyond High School Working Group: Senior Exit Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of 2015</th>
<th>Class of 2016</th>
<th>Class of 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,368 total responses</td>
<td>5,433 total responses</td>
<td>3,546 total responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55% completion rate from participating schools</td>
<td>75% completion rate from participating schools</td>
<td>77% completion rate from participating schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 districts and Bishop Kelly High</td>
<td>All 9 districts and Bishop Kelly High</td>
<td>8 districts Bishop Kelly High (West Ada did not participate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students’ Fall Plans

Which of the following BEST describes your plans after high school (Fall 2017)? (n = 3,537)

- Attend a 4-year college, university, or military... 50%
- Attend a 2-year college 17%
- Work full-time 11%
- Join the military 6%
- Attend a technical or trade school 4%
- Take a break 4%
- Prepare for a religious mission 4%
- I don’t know 2%
- Work part-time 1%
- Other 1%
- Participate in an internship or apprenticeship 0.5%

✓ 71% plan to attend college / school
✓ ~46% actually enrolled
Lifetime Education Goals

What is the highest level of education you plan to complete in your lifetime? (n = 3,405)

- **Master's degree or higher**
  - Male: 32%
  - Female: 39%

- **Bachelor's degree (4 years)**
  - Male: 34%
  - Female: 36%

- **I don't know yet**
  - Male: 17%
  - Female: 15%

- **Associate's degree (2 years)**
  - Male: 9%
  - Female: 6%

- **High school diploma**
  - Male: 5%
  - Female: 3%

- **Certificate (1 year or less)**
  - Male: 3%
  - Female: 2%

- **80% plan to complete a degree in their lifetime**

- **More females report they plan to obtain a 4 year degree or more**
When did you decide you were going to continue your education after high school? (n = 2,441)

- 7th grade or earlier: 64%
- 12th grade: 10%
- 11th grade: 7%
- 10th grade: 6%
- 9th grade: 8%
- 8th grade: 4%

64% in 7th grade or earlier
Influential People

When deciding what to do after high school how influential were the following people? (n = 3,513)

- **Family**: 77% Influential or Very influential, 15% Somewhat influential, 7% Not influential
- **Teacher**: 55% Influential or Very influential, 24% Somewhat influential, 21% Not influential
- **Friends**: 52% Influential or Very influential, 32% Somewhat influential, 17% Not influential
- **Someone else from my community**: 39% Influential or Very influential, 21% Somewhat influential, 40% Not influential
- **Counselor**: 39% Influential or Very influential, 24% Somewhat influential, 37% Not influential
- **Coach**: 28% Influential or Very influential, 18% Somewhat influential, 55% Not influential

“Other” answers fell mostly into the provided categories, except n=41 indicated “self” or “personal goal”.
## Important Factors

How important were the following factors when you were deciding what to do after high school? (n = 3,485)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Very important or important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making money</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a job I love</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not wanting to take on debt</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding my horizons</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family responsibilities</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being near my family</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving my country/community</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being involved in my church</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Career Fields of Interest

In what career field do you hope to work? (n = 3,475)
Key Take-Aways

- Discrepancy between what students’ report they plan to do and what they actually do in the fall

- 80% plan on some form of postsecondary education in their lifetime

- Hispanic students are ~ 2x more likely to report the highest level of education they plan to complete is a certificate or two year degree

- 76% are making their education decisions before 9th grade
  - Hispanic students report they are making this decision later

- 77% identified their family as the primary influencer
Future Opportunities

• Continue to collect actionable data to help inform TVEP working groups, schools and policy

• Utilize student data to target interventions, supports and messaging

• Potential to implement statewide and analyze trends

• Deeper analysis of current data (year over year findings, cross tabs, comparisons, etc.)
Beyond High School
Working Group: What’s next?

• Implement Senior Exit Survey in 2018

• Assess workforce development landscape
  • Review local/national better practices
  • Create common definitions
  • Look for opportunities to align

• Co-create strategies (industry and education partnerships with a career readiness focus)
Questions?

Jessica Ruehrwein, Executive Director
jruhrwein@idahotvep.org
208-364-4609
Strategy

THE COUNCIL

Executive Director

Alignment

• Industry Partnerships
• Workforce Development Training Fund
• Workforce Innovation & Opportunity Act

Grant Manager

Outreach

• Connecting Education to Careers
• Public Engagement
• Career Advising

Industry Liaison

Public Information Officer

Administrative Assistant
Committee Proposal

- WDTF
- Executive Committee
- Grant Review
- One-Stop
- Outreach
- Youth (ad-hoc)
- Apprenticeship