How to Improve States' Priority of Service for High-Need Adults in WIOA State Plan Updates
Plans vary greatly, but no state includes all of CLASP's recommendations

WIOA required states in their original 2016 plans to describe how they will implement and monitor this priority. CLASP recommended that states respond with a number of elements:

- Restate the implementation language in the legislation,
- Offer substantive implementation direction,
- Mention monitoring,
- Provide a substantive monitoring description,
- Specify a target for the percentage of high-need adults served,
- Include recommendations or consequences for when the priority is not implemented as described in the plan, (e.g. technical assistance, improvement plans, requirements for more outreach); and
- Mention or cite more specific, detailed state guidance.

The following table includes a state-by-state breakdown of responsiveness to CLASP recommendations.

As the March 15, 2018, deadline for the two-year plan update approaches, states should improve their answers on the priority of service question by including CLASP's recommendations. In so doing, states will demonstrate leadership to the field on how to prioritize high-need adults. During comment periods, advocates should encourage states to show that leadership.

For questions on finding your state's answer to the priority of service question, feel free to contact Anna Cielinski, CLASP Senior Policy Analyst, at **acielinski@clasp.org**.

Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) State Plan Question:

Describe how the State will implement and monitor the priority for public assistance recipients, other low-income individuals, and individuals who are basic skills deficient in accordance with the requirements of WIOA sec. 134(c)(3)(E),which applies to individualized career services and training services funded by the Adult Formula program.

State	Restates Implementation Legislation	Substantive Implementation Direction	Mentions Monitoring	Substantive Monitoring Description	Mentions Target?	Percent Targeted	Technical Assistance, Improvement, Outreach, Sanctions	Mentions Guidance
Alabama	✓		✓					
Alaska	✓		✓					✓
Arizona	✓		✓					✓
Arkansas	✓		✓					
California	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Colorado	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		Technical Assistance and Training	✓
Connecticut								
Delaware			✓	✓				
DC	✓	✓	✓					
Florida	✓		✓	✓				
Georgia	✓	✓	✓	✓			State could issue a finding	
Hawaii			✓		✓	51%	Conduct active outreach	
Idaho	✓		✓					
Illinois			✓					
Indiana	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	50%	Targeted Technical Assistance	
Iowa	✓		✓	✓				
Kansas	✓		✓					✓
Kentucky	✓		✓	✓	✓	50%		✓
Louisiana	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	51%		✓
Maine	✓		✓	✓		97% last 4 quarters		✓
Maryland	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Massachusetts	✓							
Michigan	✓	✓	✓	✓			Technical Assistance	
Minnesota			✓					
Mississippi	✓							✓

State	Restates Implementation Legislation	Substantive Implementation Direction	Mentions Monitoring	Substantive Monitoring Description	Mentions Target?	Percent Targeted	Technical Assistance, Improvement, Outreach, Sanctions	Mentions Guidance
Missouri	✓		✓	✓				✓
Montana	✓	✓	✓	✓		100% meet one category		
Nebraska	✓		✓				Technical Assistance	✓
Nevada	✓		✓					✓
New Hampshire	✓		✓					
New Jersey	✓		✓					
New Mexico	✓	✓						✓
New York	✓						Technical Assistance being developed	
North Carolina	✓	✓	✓	✓				
North Dakota	✓	✓				All required to meet POS		✓
Ohio	✓	✓	✓	✓			Technical Assistance	✓
Oklahoma	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Oregon								
Pennsylvania	✓	✓	✓		✓	70%	Technical Assistance if not at 70%	
Rhode Island			✓				Technical Assistance	
South Carolina							Outreach	
South Dakota			✓	✓				✓
Tennessee	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Texas	✓	✓						
Utah	✓							
Vermont								
Virginia	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓
Washington	✓	✓						
West Virginia	✓	✓						
Wisconsin	✓	✓	✓					
Wyoming	✓	✓					Outreach	