

118TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 5111

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

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 1, 2023

Mrs. HOUCHIN (for herself, Mrs. McCLAIN, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. JAMES, Mr. BEAN of Florida, and Mr. LAWLER) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce

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—

1 (1) in subsection (b)—

2 (A) in paragraph (1)—

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

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

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

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

20 (B) in paragraph (2)(C)—

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

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

1 (iii) by adding at the end the fol-
2 lowing:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 “(3) LOW-EVIDENCE.—The term ‘low-evidence’,
2 used with respect to an intervention, means an inter-
3 vention that is shown to produce or have the poten-
4 tial to produce a positive effect on important out-
5 comes, in a study based on a reasonable hypothesis
6 and with credible research findings, such as a cor-
7 relational study with statistical controls for selection
8 bias or descriptive research such as a case study.

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

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

○