

117TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. _____

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

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BRAUN introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on _____

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.”.