

117TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 5028

To amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to prioritize programs that provide evidence of performance.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

SEPTEMBER 29, 2022

Mr. BRAUN introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

A BILL

To amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to prioritize programs that provide evidence of performance.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

4 This Act may be cited as the “Prioritizing Evidence
5 for Workforce Development Act”.

6 **SEC. 2. PRIORITIZING PROGRAMS THAT PROVIDE EVI-**
7 **DENCE OF PERFORMANCE.**

8 Section 102 of the Workforce Innovation and Oppor-
9 tunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3112) is amended—

10 (1) in subsection (b)—

1 (A) in paragraph (1)—

2 (i) in subparagraph (D), by striking
3 “and” after the semicolon;

4 (ii) in subparagraph (E), by striking
5 the period at the end and inserting “;
6 and”; and

7 (iii) by adding at the end the fol-
8 lowing:

9 “(F) a description of how the State plans
10 to prioritize the funding of evidence-based pro-
11 grams for which evidence from a rigorous eval-
12 uation of the programs shows a positive effect
13 on the target population for the programs, with
14 highest priority given to programs that are
15 high-evidence interventions, next priority given
16 to programs that are moderate-evidence inter-
17 ventions, and next priority given to programs
18 that are low-evidence interventions.”; and

19 (B) in paragraph (2)(C)—

20 (i) in clause (vii), by striking “and”
21 after the semicolon;

22 (ii) in clause (viii), by striking the pe-
23 riod at the end and inserting “; and”; and

24 (iii) by adding at the end the fol-
25 lowing:

1 “(ix) how the State will prioritize the
 2 funding of evidence-based programs for
 3 which evidence from a rigorous evaluation
 4 of the programs shows a positive effect on
 5 the target population for the programs.”;
 6 and

7 (2) by adding at the end the following:

8 “(d) DEFINITIONS.—In subsection (b):

9 “(1) EVIDENCE-BASED.—The term ‘evidence-
 10 based’, used with respect to an activity, strategy, or
 11 other intervention, means a high-evidence, moderate-
 12 evidence, or low-evidence intervention.

13 “(2) HIGH-EVIDENCE.—The term ‘high-evi-
 14 dence’, used with respect to an intervention, means
 15 an intervention that is shown to produce a sizable,
 16 sustained effect on important outcomes, in—

17 “(A) two or more well-conducted experi-
 18 mental studies carried out in typical community
 19 settings and conducted at different implementa-
 20 tion sites; or

21 “(B) one large multisite well-conducted ex-
 22 perimental study carried out in such a setting.

23 “(3) LOW-EVIDENCE.—The term ‘low-evidence’,
 24 used with respect to an intervention, means an inter-
 25 vention that is shown to produce or have the poten-

1 tial to produce a positive effect on important out-
2 comes, in a study based on a reasonable hypothesis
3 and with credible research findings, such as a cor-
4 relational study with statistical controls for selection
5 bias or descriptive research such as a case study.

6 “(4) MODERATE-EVIDENCE.—The term ‘mod-
7 erate-evidence’, used with respect to an intervention,
8 means an intervention that is shown to produce a
9 positive effect, that is sizable but not yet conclusive,
10 on important outcomes, in at least one well-con-
11 ducted experimental study, or in a rigorous quasi-ex-
12 perimental study from which a researcher can draw
13 a causal conclusion regarding the intervention’s ef-
14 fectiveness.

15 “(5) WELL-CONDUCTED EXPERIMENTAL
16 STUDY.—The term ‘well-conducted experimental
17 study’ means an experimental study such as a study
18 with randomized controlled trials.”.

○