



NYC Center for Economic Opportunity  
Independent Evaluation

*Workforce Innovations:  
Outcome Analysis of Outreach,  
Career Advancement and  
Sector-Focused Programs*

January 2010

**Prepared for:**  
New York City Center for  
Economic Opportunity (CEO)

**Prepared by:**  
WESTAT  
1600 Research Boulevard  
Rockville, MD 20850  
and  
METIS ASSOCIATES  
90 Broad Street  
New York, NY 10004

**Westat®**

**NYC Center for Economic Opportunity  
Independent Evaluation**

***Workforce Innovations: Outcome  
Analysis of Outreach, Career  
Advancement and Sector-Focused  
Programs***

**Authored by:**  
Kathryn Henderson  
Crystal MacAllum  
Mustafa Karakus

**January 2010**

**Prepared for:**  
New York City Center for Economic  
Opportunity (CEO)

**Prepared by:**  
WESTAT  
1600 Research Boulevard  
Rockville, MD 20850  
and  
METIS ASSOCIATES  
90 Broad Street  
New York, NY 10004

## Foreword

---

The Center for Economic Opportunity (CEO) is committed to evaluating its programs and policies and has contracted with Westat and Metis Associates in order to inform decision-making within CEO and the sponsoring city agencies. Westat and Metis have developed a collaborative team approach in the planning, design, and implementation of various types of evaluations, including impact, outcome, and implementation studies. In some cases, staff from both Westat and Metis share duties and responsibilities in implementing the study. In other cases, staff from either Westat or Metis is responsible for conducting the study. This study of the Advance at Work, Workforce1 Transportation Career Center, and Community Partners Program employment programs was conducted by staff from both Westat and Metis.

The analytic plan was developed by Kathryn Henderson of Westat and Donna Tapper of Metis. Analysis was conducted by Kathryn Henderson of Westat, who is the principal author of this report. Crystal MacAllum of Westat also assisted with the writing of the report. The cost analysis presented in Appendix F was completed by Mustafa Karakus. Additional contributions were made by Jennifer Hamilton, Debra Rog, Liz Quinn, Andrea Piesse, and Saunders Freeland.

We would like to acknowledge the cooperation of the SBS staff, and Zarana Sanghani, specifically, for all of their assistance in accessing the data and familiarizing the evaluators with the various program models. All of the individuals who were contacted for background information or to review drafts of the report generously offered their time and their ideas. We also appreciate the help provided by the staff of CEO, especially David Berman, who facilitated this relationship with SBS, and has served as an invaluable resource during the project.



253 BROADWAY, 14TH FLOOR  
 NEW YORK, N.Y.  
[www.nyc.gov/ceo](http://www.nyc.gov/ceo)

March 8, 2010

I am pleased to share with you *“Workforce Innovations: Outcome Analysis of Outreach, Career Advancement and Sector-Focused Programs.”* This is one of many evaluations of Center for Economic Opportunity (CEO) programs conducted this year by our external evaluators. The report demonstrates the effectiveness of three of CEO’s workforce programs run by the NYC Department of Small Business Services (SBS).

Three years ago, Mayor Bloomberg showed his commitment to fighting poverty and his belief in the value of innovation by creating CEO. We tackle issues that matter: disconnected youth, unemployment and low-wages, intergenerational poverty, and measuring poverty in a more accurate way that can better shape public policy. CEO carefully assesses the impacts of our programs and works with City agencies to break down the silos that inhibit results. The City’s financial investment has leveraged millions of new private and federal dollars, and our programs are making a real difference in the lives of New Yorkers.

This report is based on a quantitative data analysis by Westat and Metis Associates that compares each of the three CEO employment initiatives with the traditional services provided at the City’s One-Stops, called the Workforce1 Career Centers (WF1CC). Key findings include:

- Participants in all three CEO-SBS programs have higher job placement rates than those served by the traditional WF1CC model.
- Advance at Work, a training and coaching program to help low-wage workers advance, and the Transportation Center, the first of three sector-focused employment programs, had higher participant placement rates, higher hourly wages and more weekly hours worked than comparison groups.
- Community Partners, a program that connects CBOs and their clients to the City’s employment services and job opportunities, has the highest job placement rates in the SBS system, but on average participants earned lower hourly wages. The program’s participants are more likely to be African American and have lower levels of education, suggesting success in reaching under-served communities.
- Preliminary cost-benefit analyses of the three programs showed very strong returns on the City’s investment.

The study is a strong endorsement of CEO’s workforce development programming as an anti-poverty strategy, and has valuable lessons for policymakers and practitioners across the country. I hope that you find it interesting. Please visit our website if you are interested in additional information about our programs and evaluation activities.

Best,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Veronica M. White'.

Veronica M. White  
 Executive Director



Robert W. Walsh  
Commissioner

February 8, 2010

110 William Street  
New York, NY 10038

212-513-6300 tel  
212-618-8865 fax

On behalf of the New York City Department of Small Business Services (SBS), I am pleased to respond to the Center for Economic Opportunity (CEO) / Westat evaluation results. The three programs highlighted in this report – Advance at Work, the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center, and the Community Partners Program – represent significant advances in our efforts to offer more comprehensive services to New York City businesses and jobseekers. We are heartened that the analysis conducted indicates positive impacts achieved by each of these programs.

Mayor Bloomberg's Center for Economic Opportunity (CEO) – through both its mission of reducing poverty in New York City and its flexible funding – helped our system pursue fresh approaches to training, incentives, and program services. As a primarily Workforce Investment Act funded agency, restrictive policies and an ever-declining funding environment present us with consistent challenges to balancing daily demands with the desire to innovate. Beginning in 2006, CEO's interest in advancing the working poor built momentum that led SBS to quickly design and test new ideas and national best practices.

The timing and magnitude of the CEO investments were ideal. By launching the programs evaluated in this report in 2007 and early 2008, we were prepared with relatively mature program models to confront the toughest labor market in decades that developed throughout 2009. Collectively, Advance at Work, the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center, and the Community Partners Program served 10,000 New Yorkers during the peak of the economic downturn, with nearly 7,000 achieving placement and/or advancement outcomes.

As the conversation about the future of federal workforce development policy continues, we believe that the lessons and data documented in this report can help guide policymakers weighing how best to promote career pathways and help adults achieve self-sufficiency. We believe that each program evaluated in this report can be adopted by workforce providers not only in New York City, but also across the country. While local applications may differ somewhat, the substance of these programs is entirely replicable with the right focus and investments.

We remain grateful to CEO for their ongoing support of innovative workforce programs that will impact tens of thousands of New Yorkers in the years ahead.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Angie Datta Kamath".

Angie Datta Kamath  
Deputy Commissioner  
Workforce Development

## Table of Contents

---

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary.....	xi
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Research Design.....	6
2.1 Research Questions.....	6
2.2 Data .....	6
2.3 Variables.....	6
2.4 Analytic Framework .....	10
2.5 Limitations and Challenges .....	10
3. Description of Program Participants .....	13
3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Program Participants.....	13
3.2 Descriptive Statistics of Outcome Measures.....	15
3.3 Descriptive Statistics of Services Received.....	18
4. Analysis.....	20
4.1 Comparison of Advance at Work and Similar WF1CC Participants.....	20
4.2 Comparison of Advance at Work and Employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center Participants.....	27
4.3 Comparison of Unemployed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and WF1CC Participants.....	34
4.4 Comparison of Employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and WF1CC Participants.....	39
4.5 Comparison of Unemployed Community Partners Program and WF1CC Participants .....	46
4.6 Comparison of Employed Community Partners Program and WF1CC Participants .....	53
5. Summary of Findings .....	60
6. Conclusions and Implications.....	63

---

## Table of Contents (continued)

<u>Appendixes</u>	<u>Page</u>
A Using an Alternative Measure of Quantity of Services Received .....	A-1
B Comparison of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and WF1CC Participants .....	B-1
C Comparison of Community Partners Program and WF1CC Participants .....	C-1
D How Many Services are Necessary? .....	D-1
E An Examination of Individual Training Grants.....	E-1
F Cost Benefit Analysis .....	F-1

## Tables

2.1 Definitions of Independent Variable Measures .....	7
2.2 Definitions of Employment Outcome Measures .....	8
2.3 Definitions of Service Measures.....	9
2.4 Average Number of Services Received Before and After December 2008.....	12
3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Participants in Each Program .....	14
3.2a Outcome Measures for Participants in Each Program .....	16
3.2b Access to Benefits for Participants in Each Program .....	18
3.3 Services Received by Participants in Each Program.....	19
4.1a Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Advance at Work and Employed WF1CC Participants Earning Less Than \$14/Hour .....	21
4.1b Comparison of Service Receipt for Advance at Work and Employed WF1CC Participants Earning Less Than \$14/Hour.....	22
4.1c Relationship of Advance at Work vs.WF1CC Participation to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals Earning Less Than \$14/Hour .....	23

## Table of Contents (continued)

<u>Tables (continued)</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.1d	Relationship of Advance at Work vs.WF1CC Participation and Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals Earning Less Than \$14/Hour .....25
4.1e	Relationship of Advance at Work vs.WF1CC Participation and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals Earning Less Than \$14/Hour .....26
4.2a	Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Advance at Work and Employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center Clients .....28
4.2b	Comparison of Service Receipt for Advance at Work and Employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center Clients .....29
4.2c	Relationship of Advance at Work vs. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center Participation to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals.....30
4.2d	Relationship of Advance at Work vs. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center Participation and Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals .....32
4.2e	Relationship of Advance at Work vs. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center Participation and Number of Services to Employment Outcomes Received for Employed Individuals.....33
4.3a	Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Unemployed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and Workforce1 Career Center Participants .....35
4.3b	Comparison of Service Receipt for Unemployed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and Workforce1 Career Center Participants.....36
4.3c	Relationship of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce1 Career Center to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals.....37
4.3d	Relationship of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce1 Career Center and Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals.....38
4.3e	Relationship of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce1 Career Center and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals .....40



## Table of Contents (continued)

<u>Tables (continued)</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.4a	Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and Workforce1 Career Center Participants .....41
4.4b	Comparison of Service Receipt for Employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and Workforce1 Career Center Participants .....42
4.4c	Relationship of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals.....43
4.4d	Relationship of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation and Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals .....45
4.4e	Relationship of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals .....46
4.5a	Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Unemployed Community Partners Program and Workforce1 Career Center Participants .....47
4.5b	Comparison of Service Receipt for Unemployed Community Partners Program and Workforce1 Career Center Participants .....48
4.5c	Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals .....50
4.5d	Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation and Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals.....51
4.5e	Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals .....52
4.6a	Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Employed Community Partners Program and Workforce1 Career Center Participants .....53
4.6b	Comparison of Service Receipt for Employed Community Partners Program and Workforce1 Career Center Participants.....54

## Table of Contents (continued)

<u>Tables (continued)</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.6c	Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals.....56
4.6d	Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation and Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals .....57
4.6e	Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals.....58
A.1	Relationship of Advance at Work vs. WF1CC Participation and Number of Total Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals Earning Less Than \$14/Hour..... A-2
A.2	Relationship of Advance at Work vs. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center Participation and Number of Total Services to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals ..... A-3
A.3	Relationship of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce1 Career Center and Number of Total Services to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals..... A-4
A.4	Relationship of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation and Number of Total Services to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals ..... A-5
A.5	Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation and Number of Total Services to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals..... A-6
A.6	Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation and Number of Program Visits to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals ..... A-7
B.1	Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and Workforce1 Career Center Participants.....B-1
B.2	Comparison of Service Receipt for Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and Workforce1 Career Center Participants.....B-2

Table of Contents (continued)

<u>Tables (continued)</u>	<u>Page</u>
B.3 Relationship of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce1 Career Center to Employment Outcomes.....	B-3
B.4 Relationship of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce1 Career Center and Services Received to Employment Outcomes.....	B-4
B.5 Relationship of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce1 Career Center and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes.....	B-5
B.6 Relationship of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce1 Career Center and Number of Total Services Received to Employment Outcomes.....	B-6
C.1 Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Community Partners Program and Workforce1 Career Center Participants.....	C-1
C.2 Comparison of Service Receipt for Community Partners Program and Workforce1 Career Center Participants .....	C-2
C.3 Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation to Employment Outcomes .....	C-3
C.4 Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation and Services Received to Employment Outcomes .....	C-4
C.5 Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes .....	C-5
C.6 Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce1 Career Center Participation and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes .....	C-6
D.1 Relationship of Participant Characteristics and Different Numbers of Benefits to Job Placement by Program .....	D-2
E.1 Receipt and Completion Rates of Individualized Training Grants, by Program.....	E-1
E.2 Relationship of Participant Characteristics on ITG Receipt and Completion.....	E-2

Table of Contents (continued)

<u>Tables (continued)</u>	<u>Page</u>
F.1 Advance at Work vs. Employed WF1CC (<\$14/hr), Five year net cost-benefit analysis, FY 2009 (Taxpayer perspective).....	F-5
F.2 Sector vs. WF1CC, Five year net cost-benefit analysis, FY 2009 (Taxpayer perspective).....	F-6
F.3 Community Partners Program vs. WF1CC, Five year net cost-benefit analysis, FY 2009 (Taxpayer perspective) .....	F-7

## Executive Summary

This report examines three SBS-CEO initiatives sponsored and managed by the New York City Department of Small Business Services. These are Advance at Work, the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center, and the Community Partners Program. The purpose of the report is to compare the employment outcomes of participants in these three programs with those of similar populations served by the Workforce1 Career Centers (WF1CCs). Analyses were conducted using data provided by NYC Department of Small Business Services (SBS) from their electronic record system.

The three programs evaluated in this report operate with different program models, different outcome goals, and target diverse populations. The goal of Advance at Work is to help low-income workers advance out of poverty by providing them with career advancement services, facilitated access to benefits and work supports, training and education, and financial literacy and asset-building activities. It is one of the few SBS programs that has set a goal to not only place participants in jobs, but help a portion of them get benefits and work supports. Advance at Work serves employed adults who earn less than \$14 per hour and are motivated to advance in their careers. The program model is service-intense and prioritizes long-term engagement with clients.

The Workforce1 Transportation Career Center targets low-income individuals who are interested in accessing higher-wage occupations with career advancement potential within the transportation sector. Examples of such occupations include baggage handlers, mechanics, drivers, and customer service representatives. The focus of the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center is both to provide new jobs to jobseekers and to provide training and support to help incumbent workers advance. They achieve this by

providing a range of services centered on job placement, job training, education, career advancement, and support services. More than other programs, the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center has set a goal to help a large percent (75% in 2009) of the placed or promoted jobseekers earn a high wage (\$10 or more).

The Community Partners Program is designed to serve an underemployed population in New York's most disadvantaged neighborhoods by giving them facilitated access to job placement services through the WF1CCs. The Community Partners Program works in collaboration with community-based organizations to identify individuals who are ready for immediate placement and provides them with job search services available through the WF1CCs. The Community Partners Program is measured on its ability to place a large portion of participants. In 2009, for example, the program aimed to ensure that for every three participants sent by a CBO to a WF1CC, at least one of the referred participants got a job.

As intended, these three programs serve different populations of workers. Individuals self-select and are referred into the different programs based on their personal preferences, their "work readiness", and their geographic proximity to various Career Center locations within the City. Moreover, the programs also have specific eligibility criteria that shapes the populations served. Because of these differences caution must be used in interpreting the findings. With the data available it is impossible to know if differences in employment outcomes are attributable to differences in the programs or to differences in the individuals served by these programs. Although we have controlled for some participant characteristics, it is possible that other participant characteristics not included in the models, such as prior

work history, neighborhood, and family support, also influence these outcomes.

The three SBS-CEO programs also provide different mixes of services to their participants, with Advance at Work participants receiving the greatest number of services, followed by Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and Community Partners Program respectively.

In order to compare the employment outcomes of participants in the three SBS-CEO programs, we conduct a series of analytic comparisons to look at differences in the outcomes for participants in the three SBS programs and the WF1CCs, controlling for participant characteristics and differences in service receipt.

After controlling for differences in participant characteristics and services received, we find that participants in all three SBS-CEO programs have higher placement rates than participants served by the traditional WF1CC model.

Participants in Advance at Work have higher rates of placement, higher hourly wages and more weekly hours than comparable participants served by the WF1CCs. However, Advance at Work participants also spend significantly longer in the program prior to being placed. This is consistent with the program model of long-term engagement.

Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants are placed at higher rates, have higher hourly wages and more weekly hours at placement than participants served by the WF1CC.

Participants in Community Partners Program are placed at higher rates than comparable WF1CC participants. Yet they are placed in jobs that, on average, have lower hourly wages than the jobs secured by WF1CC participants. Further, participants in

the Community Partners Program take longer to be placed than their WF1CC counterparts.

In the comparison of Advance at Work and employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants, we found no difference in placement rates for participants served by the two programs but Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants had higher hourly wages and more hours worked, after controlling for previous wages. Advance at Work participants took longer to be placed than those served by the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center.

Across the regression models, a few participant characteristics were consistently associated with lower weekly hours worked, though not necessarily lower placement rates or lower wages. Female workers and workers with disabilities were consistently more likely to work fewer hours. Whether this was by choice (e.g., wanting to work fewer hours to be able to care for children), by necessity (e.g., being unable to work full time due to physical limitations), or discrimination is unknown. In some regression models we also found that age is negatively correlated with placement, such that older workers are less likely to be placed than younger workers.

Different services were associated with different job outcomes depending on the other independent variables included in the regression models. A few services, however, appeared to be consistently associated with positive outcomes. Individual Training Grant (ITG) receipt is positively related to higher placement, higher hourly wages, and greater weekly hours after placement. In addition, job search and referrals were consistently associated with higher rates of placement. Interview skills and computer skills are associated with higher rates of placement. Other services were negatively correlated with placement. Resume preparation has a negative relationship with placement in all six

comparisons and Workshops/Education services have a negative relationship with placement in four of the six models. It is likely that these findings reflect a greater use of these specific services by program participants who are harder to place than a negative effect of resume preparation or training on participants' employability.

Further analyses use a cost-benefit approach to estimate savings associated with the three SBS-CEO employment programs examined here. The findings reveal that each of these programs provides a significant savings to tax-payers over a five year period. Specifically, the 5-year net benefit associated with the Advance at Work program is estimated to be over \$180,000 and the net return-on-investment is estimated to be 110 percent (range of 80 percent to 130 percent). In other words, every dollar invested in this program in 2009 will result in \$1.10 return to taxpayers over the five years. The 5-year net benefit associated with the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center program is estimated to be

over \$37 million and net return-on-investment is estimated to be 910 percent (range of 850 percent to 1,110 percent). That is, every dollar invested in this program in 2009 will result in \$9.10 return to taxpayers over the five years. Finally, the 5-year net benefit associated with the Community Partners Program is estimated to be over \$37 million and net return-on-investment is estimated to be 1,790 percent (range of 1,410 percent to 2,590 percent). Every dollar invested in this program in 2009 will result in \$17.90 return to taxpayers over the five years.

Overall, these findings suggest that the more targeted approach of employment services offered by the SBS-CEO workforce development programs may be successful in connecting job seekers to necessary services and placing them in jobs in a cost efficient manner. There is a need for more controlled studies that would allow us to disentangle program effects from participant characteristics and service receipt.



## I. Introduction

The Center for Economic Opportunity (CEO) has funded approximately 40 initiatives across some 20 sponsoring city agencies aimed at reducing the number of working poor, young adults, and children living in poverty in New York City. CEO is committed to assessing the impact of its programs through rigorous evaluation and close program monitoring.

This report considers three CEO initiatives sponsored and managed by the New York City Department of Small Business Services. These are Advance at Work, the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center, and the Community Partners Program. The purpose of the report is to compare the employment outcomes of participants in these three programs with those of similar populations served by the Workforce1 Career Centers (WF1CC). WF1CCs provide employment services for a diverse population of New York residents, including job seekers, dislocated workers, incumbent workers, new entrants to the workforce, and persons with disabilities, among others. The CEO workforce development programs examined in this report offer more targeted approaches to job training and placement for more specific populations. The aim of this report is to understand how these targeted approaches to job placement services compare to services as usual.

First we discuss the various program models for the three SBS-CEO workforce development programs and the WF1CCs. Next, we outline the research design, including the research questions, the data, and the analytic framework. Then we provide a description of the program participants, including the demographic characteristics, benefit access, and descriptive statistics of outcome measures. Next, we conduct bivariate and multivariate analyses for six group comparisons between the workforce development programs and the WF1CCs. We

summarize the key findings of the evaluation and discuss conclusions and implications of the findings.

### Advance at Work

The goal of Advance at Work is to help low-income workers advance out of poverty by providing them with career advancement services, facilitated access to benefits and work supports, training and education, and financial literacy and asset-building activities. Provided and managed by the NYC Department of Small Business Services (SBS), Advance at Work operates out of the City's Workforce1 Career Centers in Upper Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens. A fifth program site launched in July 2009—after this evaluation—in Long Island City, Queens. The Upper Manhattan program started in July 2007, while the other sites became operational in 2008. CEO funded the program exclusively through June 2009, after which Advance at Work received a combination of CEO and WIA funding.

Advance at Work is designed to provide services to NYC's working poor by targeting New Yorkers ages 18 years and older who have been continuously employed for the past six months, earn \$14 or less an hour, work a minimum of 14 hours per week, do not receive cash public assistance, and are motivated to advance in their careers.

Advance at Work offers the following services:

*Career coaching.* Job coaches work individually with participants to develop a career advancement plan. Coaches meet in person with each participant every month and maintain telephone or email communication at least twice a month to check on client progress toward meeting career goals. Based on the career plan, the coaches may refer par-



participants to a variety of services and/or programs, including resume writing, workshops, specialized job development, education programs, and/or skills training.

*Education, training, and employment services.* Education and training are crucial components of the program, designed to help participants improve their skills and become better qualified for advanced positions. Pre-vocational training services include basic education, referrals to GED, specialized ESL programs, and tutoring. Through subcontracts with for-profit, nonprofit, trade associations, and educational institutions, Advance at Work provides skills training in a variety of growth industries. A senior job developer also works on job placements and referrals. Monthly workshops are provided by the job coaches to cover four rotating topics: earning promotions and negotiating a pay raise, changing careers, long-term career planning, and gaining transferable skills. The workshops are open to the public and also serve as a recruitment strategy for Advance at Work.

*Access to work supports.* Aligned with the goal of helping workers gain economic stability, a core component of Advance at Work is to screen participants for work supports. These work supports include: tax credits (e.g., Earned Income Tax Credit, Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit); subsidized child care; housing vouchers; food stamps; Medicaid; Child Health Plus; NYS Home Energy Assistance; School Lunch Program; Women, Infants and Children (WIC); free checking accounts; free tax preparation; and community resources for homeownership, credit, and legal help.

*Peer support and financial literacy and asset building.* Peer support groups are included in the program model as an additional venue for participants to share their experiences and receive informal support. Through financial counseling, participants are expected to gain

knowledge of, and engage in, healthy financial behaviors (e.g., opening checking and/or savings accounts, repairing credit), which ultimately is expected to contribute to economic self-sufficiency.

*Long-term engagement.* Advance at Work is the only one of the SBS-CEO workforce development programs that offers—and encourages—a year-long engagement. Participants make monthly visits for career coaching, workshops, and other services to reach career goals and increase income. At program enrollment, the participant signs a customer commitment to interact with his/her coach monthly for a year and gets incentives to attend workshops, coaching, and other activities.

## Workforce1 Transportation Career Center

Sector-based career centers serve the employment needs of businesses within a single economic sector, helping businesses meet their staffing needs for qualified workers and seek to provide higher-wage jobs with career potential to low-income individuals. To enroll, participants must earn less than \$19.23 an hour, or less than 200 percent of the federal poverty line.

The transportation sector provides thousands of jobs for entry- and mid-level workers in NYC with NYC ranking first among U.S. cities in passenger miles flown, transit passenger miles, and truck freight volume.<sup>1</sup> In 2008, NYC launched the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center which is located adjacent to the Queens WF1CC. The program is managed by SBS and funded by CEO. The

<sup>1</sup> Labor Market Information Services (2008). Employment in New York City's Transportation Sector. [http://www.urbanresearch.org/about/news/docs/lmis\\_pubs/NYCLMIS%20Transportation%20Report%20Technical.pdf](http://www.urbanresearch.org/about/news/docs/lmis_pubs/NYCLMIS%20Transportation%20Report%20Technical.pdf)

goal of the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center is to place or promote low-wage workers in quality transportation sector jobs that pay \$10 or more per hour with benefits. Examples of such occupations include baggage handlers, mechanics, drivers, and customer service representatives.

The Workforce1 Transportation Career Center focuses on four transportation subsectors: aviation, truck transportation, ground passenger transit, and support for air transportation. Within these subsectors, the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center works closely with companies to assess their hiring and training needs, and design job preparation and training services to meet the employer's specific needs. For example, in response to employers' concerns about an aging workforce and the need to bring in and advance new workers, the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center worked with two employers to develop a customized supervisory training program. The goal of this supervisory training program was both to attract new workers and provide advancement opportunities to line staff.

The Workforce1 Transportation Career Center focuses on both providing new jobs to jobseekers and providing training and support to help incumbent workers advance. This strategy is designed to help create a pipeline of highly qualified and trained transportation workers, thereby saving companies time and money in staffing, increasing productivity, and making businesses in the transportation sector more competitive. A business advisory council composed of transportation employers, training providers, industry associations, and economic development organizations provide market intelligence and feedback on the strategic direction of the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center.

Services provided to workers include job placement, job training, education, career

advancement, and support services. Services to employers include recruitment assistance, industry-specific training for workers, and retention services.

## Community Partners Program

The Community Partners Program is designed to reach out to the City's community-based organizations (CBOs)—particularly those that provide job-readiness training and skills training—and facilitate their participants' access to the WF1CCs for job placement. The overall goal is to expand the pipeline of job-ready candidates into the WF1CCs. The guiding assumption is that unemployed, low-income City residents will be placed in jobs more quickly when there is facilitated access to the WF1CC's extensive job placement services by CBOs. The partnership between the CBOs and the WF1CCs is designed to allow the WF1CCs to leverage CBO job-readiness and skills training and increase the reach of the WF1CCs into poor communities where the need for job placement is highest.

All WF1CCs have a Community Partners Program. Select WF1CCs received CEO funding in 2007-2009; those programs focused on outreach to CBOs serving poor communities especially while non-CEO funded Community Partners Programs did not have such a focus. In this report, the Community Partners Program refers to CEO-funded programs only. CEO funds the outreach program staff, SBS manages and provides technical assistance to the program, and the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) provides funding for services. The Community Partners Program was first implemented in July 2007 in the Brooklyn, Queens, and Bronx WF1CCs. The CEO-funded program ended in June 2009, and at that time CEO was funding the Brooklyn, LaGuardia, Queens, and Hunts Point pro-

grams. Starting in July 2009, the Community Partners Program was fully funded by WIA.

While the WF1CCs have always worked with CBOs, in the past it was less systematic and sporadic. Under the Community Partners Program, designated WF1CC staff recruits CBOs and ensure that they provide job-ready candidates for specific employment opportunities.

The CBO partners range from small organizations to large, citywide groups. Some partners are WIA-mandated partners, while others are churches, cultural groups, housing, or educational organizations. Some CBOs send inbound referrals to WF1CCs, while the WF1CCs send outbound referrals to other CBOs which can provide services such as education and skills training or other needed services.

Announcements about job orders are sent weekly to CBOs through general “job blasts” or through a segmented strategy targeted to CBOs with participants most likely to meet specific job requirements. Community Partners Program staff meet monthly with partner CBO representatives to discuss workforce development issues, the latest job orders at the centers, and how to screen candidates for jobs. Through the partnership and meetings, CBOs have begun to better understand what job-readiness means and how to select the right candidates to refer to jobs. This allows WF1CCs to fast-track referrals from partners, offering a quicker orientation, assessment and registration process for partner referrals. The job candidates are unemployed or low-wage workers in New York, ages 18 and older, whose skills match the skill sets stated in job orders. The program targets individuals residing in specific high-poverty areas. The majority of participants (over 90 percent) are unemployed at the time they are referred to the WF1CC.

The Community Partners Program outreach team acts as a liaison between the WF1CC account executives—who manage relationships with employers—and the CBOs. This ensures that the partners are informed about job orders that come into the WF1CCs. The outreach team also builds CBO capacity by providing substantial technical assistance and feedback regarding the outcome of the CBO’s participants’ job interviews.

## Workforce1 Career Centers

The Workforce1 Career Centers (WF1CCs) are a critical part of the City’s workforce development system that connects employers to skilled workers, and provide training and placement services to the City’s adult workforce. Through the WF1CCs, SBS provides jobseekers with a full array of employment services, including job placement, career advisement, job search counseling, and skills training. The WF1CCs are located in each of the five boroughs with two in Queens and two in the Bronx, and are operated by contracted providers in coordination with the New York State Department of Labor. Most WF1CCs are co-located with the NYC Business Solutions Centers, which provide businesses with access to skilled labor through customized recruitment and training initiatives.

The WF1CCs are open to all NYC residents looking to find a job, increase their skills, or advance in their careers. They provide access and services to all jobseekers, regardless of income. To assist NYC residents in finding a job, the WF1CCs offer:

- Job search resource rooms
- Personalized career counseling
- Advice on how to interview for a job
- Assistance creating resumes and cover letters

- Job placement services

They also provide career workshops, GED and ESL classes off-site, and vouchers for job training. The WF1CCs are open weekdays with some evening and weekend hours.

WF1CCs are part of the Workforce Investment Act. WIA is a federally funded, demand driven training and job placement program that provides workforce investment activities through statewide and local systems called Workforce Investment Boards. Authorized workforce investment activities provided at the local level benefit job seekers,

dislocated workers, youth, foster care participants, incumbent workers, new entrants to the workforce, veterans, persons with disabilities, and employers. These activities promote an increase in employment, job retention, earnings, and occupational skill attainment by participants. SBS offers WIA services to adults while the Department of Youth and Community Development provides WIA services to youth.

The City's seven WF1CCs helped place 17,239 New Yorkers in jobs or promotions in 2008, and more than 25,000 in 2009.

## 2. Research Design

### 2.1 Research Questions

This report addresses the following questions:

- a) Do Advance at Work, Workforce1 Transportation Career Center, and Community Partners Program serve populations similar to those served by the Workforce1 Career Centers?
- b) Do program participants in Advance at Work, Workforce1 Transportation Career Center, and Community Partners Program receive similar types and numbers of services as Career Center participants?
- c) Are employment outcomes (placement, hours, and wages) for Advance at Work, Workforce 1 Transportation Career Center, and Community Partners Program participants different from those of Career Center participants?
- d) Are Advance at Work, Workforce1 Transportation Career Center, and Community Partners Program participants placed into jobs sooner than Career Center participants?
- e) What is the relationship of services received to employment outcomes?

### 2.2 Data

Data for these analyses were provided by SBS from their electronic record system. The system tracks participants' program participation; demographic and work history information; service receipt; and employment outcomes, including placement or promotion, wages, and average hours worked. The system also tracks job retention; however, those data are not relevant to the analyses summarized in this report and thus are not included here. Demographic characteristics come from the Workforce1 Career Center Customer Information Form and are self-reported by the

client. No personally identifiable information about participants was shared with the evaluators. The data include all participants who enrolled in one of the four programs of interest between July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2009. Advance at Work occasionally serves participants who were previously enrolled in a WF1CC. They are included in this analysis as Advance at Work participants if their enrollment in that program falls within the study period.

### 2.3 Variables

#### Independent Variables

Table 2.1 provides a description of the independent variables used in the analyses. They include program enrollment, demographic characteristics, and work history variables. *Program enrollment* is represented by four dichotomous variables equal to 1 if the client was enrolled in that program and 0 if s/he was not. Participants who are enrolled in Workforce1 Career Centers are often referred to a specialized employment program if the program is believed to offer more suitable services. Participants with an Advance at Work, Workforce1 Transportation Career Center, or Community Partners Program enrollment and a Workforce1 Career Center enrollment were classified as having attended the specialized employment program only, and all services received were attributed to that program, per the advice of SBS staff. *Year of enrollment* is included to control for temporal influences on the employment outcomes, such as changes in the economy.

Demographic characteristics include: *age*, in years; *gender*, such that females are coded 1 and males are coded 0; and five mutually exclusive dichotomous *racial/ethnic categories*, including white non-Hispanic, African American, Hispanic, other/multi-racial, and



**Table 2.1. Definitions of Independent Variable Measures**

Measure	Definition/Operationalization
Program	Mutually exclusive program enrollment categories (Career Advancement Program; Workforce I Transportation Career Center; Community Partners Program; Workforce I Career Centers)
Year of enrollment	Year of first cohort enrollment (2007; 2008; 2009)
Age	Age, in years (Range: 16-80 years)
Female	Female=1; Male=0
Race	Mutually exclusive racial/ethnic categories (White, non-Hispanic; African American; Hispanic; Other/Multi-racial; No race designation)
Disability	Client self-reported a disability=1; Did not report a disability=0
Education level	Mutually exclusive education level categories (Less than high school; High school diploma or GED; Associates or Vocational degree; 4-year College degree; Graduate degree)
Enrolled in school	Enrolled in school at program entry=1; Not enrolled=0
Employed at program entry	Employed at program entry=1; Not employed=0
Wage at program entry/most recent job	Hourly wage at program entry or at most recent job (Range: \$0-\$150 per hour)
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	Average weekly hours worked at program entry or at most recent job (Range: 1-84 hours)

no race designation. *Disability* is a dichotomous indicator of whether the client self-reported a disability. The intake form does not define disability and therefore allows participants to define it for themselves. *Education level* is represented by five mutually exclusive dichotomous variables indicating whether the client's highest level of education received was less than a high school degree, a high school diploma or GED, an associates or vocational degree, a 4-year college degree, or a graduate degree. *Enrolled in school* is a dichotomous variable indicating whether the client is currently enrolled in school.

Work history variables include a dichotomous variable indicating whether the client is *employed at program entry*, and continuous measures of *hourly wage*, and *average hours worked per week*. If the client is not employed at program entry, hourly wage and average hours

worked per week refer to his/her most recent job. Participants who had no work history information recorded were coded as 0 for both hourly wages and average hours worked per week.

There were minimal missing data on most of the independent variables included in this analysis, except in the case of racial/ethnic category. In order to cases with missing racial/ethnic information in the analysis, a separate category was created to indicate the client had no race designation. For other independent variables, mean substitution was used to account for missing responses.

### Employment Outcome Variables

Table 2.2 provides a description of the employment outcome variables included in this analysis. *Placement* is a dichotomous

**Table 2.2. Definitions of Employment Outcome Measures**

Measure	Definition/Operationalization
Placement	Received a new placement or promotion during program enrollment=1; Did not receive a new placement or promotion=0
Wage	Hourly wage in new placement or promotion (Range: \$0-\$71/hour)
Avg. hours worked per week	Average weekly hours in new placement or promotion (Range: 1-84 hours)
Benefits	
Health care	Receives access to health care in new position=1; Does not receive=0
401K plan	Receives access to a 401K plan in new position=1; Does not receive=0
Child care	Receives access to child care in new position=1; Does not receive=0
Paid sick/vacation days	Receives paid sick or vacation days in new position=1; Does not receive=0
Days in program before placement	Number of days between first enrollment date within the study period and date of placement or promotion (Range: 1-760 days)

variable that indicates whether the program participant received a new job placement or promotion from his/her current employer during the 2-year period considered in these analyses. *Hourly wage* and *average hours worked per week* are continuous measures of the wage and hours in the new placement or promotion. Also included are four dichotomous variables indicating whether the client receives access to various workplace benefits in the new placement: health care, a 401K plan, child care, and paid sick or vacation days. The final employment outcome measure is a continuous variable that indicates the number of *days in the program before placement*. This was derived from the first date of enrollment following July 1, 2007, and the start date of the new job placement.

### Service Variables

Table 2.3 shows the various services participants could receive from the Workforce1 Career Centers or from one of the CEO initiatives. These include: orientation to the program and services available; assessment of basic skills and work readiness; assistance with resume preparation; counseling, job recruit-

ment, and job readiness services; use of the facilities for fax, copier, or internet access; computer skills training; workshops and education services; and financial counseling services.

Participants could also receive educational services, such as ESL classes, and referrals to other providers and organizations, if necessary.<sup>2</sup> ITG services indicate the client received an Individual Training Grant, which is a voucher intended to cover the cost of specialized occupational training, such as a commercial driver's license training course. Receipt of each of these services is indicated by a dichotomous variable equal to one if the client received the service and 0 if s/he did not.

<sup>2</sup> It was impossible to distinguish referrals to employers and referrals to non-employers in the data provided. It is important to note that customers are referred to other service providers if they are not considered to be "job ready" and need more intensive engagement. Jobseekers are referred to employers when they are ready to be placed in jobs. We could not distinguish these two distinct types of referrals, so the relationship between referral receipt and the employment outcomes may be somewhat mitigated.

**Table 2.3. Definitions of Service Measures**

Measure	Definition/Operationalization
Assessment	Any type of assessment or screening used to evaluate a jobseeker's skills (basic and job-specific) and employment readiness
Computer skills	Training that is specific to computer-related skills, ranging from basic computer skills and typing lessons to MS Office, internet, and e-mail training
Counseling	Individual and group counseling sessions that focus on career development, career coaching, goal setting, and retention services
Facilities	Physical resources that are made available to jobseekers to assist with their search, including access to: computers, phones, copiers, e-mail, internet, fax machines, media, study/workspaces, and resource rooms
Financial services	Services that help jobseekers with their personal finances, such as account set-up and management, debt management counseling, credit report access, and financial goal-setting
Interview skills	Services that help jobseekers develop interview skills and prepare for specific interviews
ITG receipt	Receipt of an Individual Training Grant
Job readiness	Services that help prepare jobseekers for daily life in the workplace, such as workplace professionalism training, training on proper workplace attire and attitudes and time management skills
Job search	Resources and services that help jobseekers find available jobs, such as job fairs, staff-assisted (and self-service) job searches, job banks, and other recruiting events
Orientation	Services that acquaint jobseekers to the program and all of the services the program offers, including standard center orientation, recruitment event orientation, and introductory sessions
Referrals	Outside referrals made to other service providers, employers, counselors, and programs
Resume preparation	Services that help jobseekers develop, write, and review resumes, cover letters, and other job application materials
Workshops/Education services	General and job-specific training and skill building that is not related to computers, occupational skills training, customer service training, tutorials, and employer training; education services, including GED and ESL training, adult education classes, and specialized business certifications; workshops, including labor market information workshops, general advancement workshops, and career strategies workshops
Number of services	The total number of different types of services received by participant (Range 0-13)
Number of total services	The total number of services received by participant, including multiple numbers of the same type of services (Range 0-25)

Some WF1CC customers are enrolled but receive their services with co-located New York State Department of Labor staff. Those

services are not recorded in SBS's database of record from which this data was pulled.



These categories were prepared to consolidate lists of more than 25 different services for each program. Moreover, each program has a different list of services unique to its program model. For the purpose of being able to compare a manageable number of services, all services were re-categorized into the groups above. In the re-categorization, some information may be lost.

Participants of these employment programs could receive different types of services and they could receive a single type of service multiple times. Therefore, in addition to types of service, two additional service variables are included in the analyses. These are *number of services*, which indicates the total number of different types of service the client received between enrollment and placement, and *number of total services*, which indicates the total number of services of any type that the client received between enrollment and placement<sup>3</sup>.

## 2.4 Analytic Framework

We computed descriptive statistics about characteristics of participants in the four employment programs, including their demographics, work history, placement, and service receipt, using frequency cross-tabulations. Participant characteristics are reported for the full cohort of participants in Tables 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 below. We report additional descriptive statistics later in the report for select subsets of participants in the various employment programs.

We used multivariate regression analysis to examine the relationships between various independent variables, services variables, and employment outcomes. These analyses

provide information about the relationship between each independent variable included in the model (e.g., age, employment status at program entry, number of services received) and the outcome of interest, controlling for the potential influence of every other variable in the model. We used event history analysis to examine which participant characteristics were related to receiving a placement or promotion. This approach models (1) the probability of an event occurring, such as a job placement, and (2) the duration of an episode. Moreover, unlike ordinary least squares and logistic regression, event history methods allow for right-censored cases, namely those for whom events occur after the period of observation ends. The analyses reported here include individuals who enrolled at various dates in the two year period of observation. Later enrollees have less time in which to achieve a placement than earlier enrollees. Logistic regression would treat placement status at the end of the study period as the realized outcome, while event history methods allow that individuals may still achieve a placement after the period of observation ends.

We used ordinary least squares regression to estimate the relationships between the independent variables, service variables, and other employment outcomes, namely hourly wages, average weekly hours worked, and number of days to placement. These models were fitted based on the data of participants who achieved a placement or promotion.

## 2.5 Limitations and Challenges

The goal of the following analyses is to compare the employment outcomes of participants in three different employment programs with those of similar populations served by the WF1CCs.

<sup>3</sup> The total number of services received ranged from 0 to 393. However, less than 2% of respondents indicated they received more than 25 services. Therefore, the variables was truncated at 25 total services.

To do so, the following comparisons were made.

1. Advance at Work participants and employed WF1CC participants earning less than \$14/hour.
2. Advance at Work participants and employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants.
3. Unemployed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants and unemployed WF1CC participants.
4. Employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants and employed WF1CC participants.
5. Unemployed Community Partners Program participants and unemployed WF1CC participants.
6. Employed Community Partners Program participants and employed WF1CC participants.

Participants both self-select and are referred into the different programs based on their personal preferences, their “work readiness”, their geographic proximity to various Career Center locations within the City, the programs’ intended populations, and their eligibility criteria. Moreover, some participants are served by multiple programs. For example, the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center is co-located with a WF1CC. Occasionally, jobseekers visit the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center but decide they are not interested in jobs in the transportation sector. In those cases, the center will refer the jobseekers to the co-located Queens Workforce1 Career Center for job placement services. The Workforce1 Transportation Career Center staff will also refer jobseekers to the Queens Workforce1 Career Center if they need to receive social services to make them “work ready” because the Queens Career Center has established relationships with organization that provide those services.

For the purpose of these analyses, such participants were categorized as participants in the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and services received by the WF1CC were attributed to the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center. These issues provide threats to internal and external validity, and preclude using the results to make causal claims. Moreover, the results reported here are correlation-based in that they show which factors relate to placement, wages, hours, and time to placement; it is not possible to conclude that these factors are the cause of employment outcomes.

Another concern involves missing data on several of the key employment outcomes and service variables. The SBS electronic record system only records positive placements for those participants with whom they are able to maintain contact. Participants who have left the program are recorded as not yet having achieved a placement or promotion. It is impossible to distinguish between those who remain in the program and have not achieved a placement and those who have left the program. Absent this distinction, all cases without a recorded placement were assumed to have experienced a negative outcome, although it is likely that a nontrivial number of these cases represent participants who exited the program (and for whom the true employment outcomes are unknown). If some programs do a better job of tracking participants we may be seeing differences in placement between programs that may or may not reflect real findings. Caution must be used in interpreting these differences.

Additionally, the SBS service recording policy significantly changed in the fall of 2008, as did the names of services and the accuracy of service records. All centers were using the new names and following the new policy effective December 3, 2008. Prior to this date, there was greater variability between the centers in how services were recorded and

how many services were recorded per visit to a Career Center. SBS staff believes the records of services used after December 3, 2008 to be more reliable and accurate. In order to test whether this change in policy regarding the recording of services affected the relationship between program participation and service receipt or the relationship between service receipt and employment outcomes we conducted separate analyses for those individuals who were enrolled prior to December 2008 and during or after December 2008. Table 2.4 indicates the average number of services received by participants in each program before and after December 2008. We found that there was not a significant difference in the average number of different services received by participants in any of the four

programs. There are slight variations in the total number of services received before and after December 2008, such that participants who enrolled during or after December 2008 tended to receive fewer total services than those who enrolled prior to December 2008. Additionally, we found that the relationship between number of services received and placement was consistent both before and after December 2008.

This is mostly likely attributable to the broad categorization of services used in this analysis. More refined service measures may have revealed different findings. Appendix A examines the relationship of alternate measures of quantity of services received.

**Table 2.4. Average Number of Services Received Before and After December 2008**

Program	Before December 2008		During/After December 2008	
	Number of different services	Number of total services	Number of different services	Number of total services
Advance at Work	6.7 (2.6)	19.7 (6.6)	6.4 (2.0)	18.2 (6.2)
	N=1,630		N=647	
Workforce1 Transportation Career Center	5.3 (2.4)	10.8 (7.3)	5.7 (2.0)	9.9 (5.6)
	N=1,970		N=2,043	
Community Partners Program	3.5 (2.2)	7.5 (7.5)	3.5 (1.9)	5.9 (5.7)
	N=6,316		N=2,141	
Workforce1 Career Centers	3.1 (1.8)	6.2 (6.4)	3.0 (1.7)	4.5 (5.0)
	N=89,848		N=58,955	

### 3. Description of Program Participants

In this section we provide a general description of the similarities and differences among participants in the three SBS programs and the WF1CC population with respect to demographics, employment outcomes, and services.

#### 3.1 Demographic Characteristics of Program Participants

Table 3.1 provides a description of the demographic characteristics of the participants in Advance at Work, Workforce1 Transportation Career Center, Community Partners Program, and the WF1CCs. Not surprisingly, the WF1CCs clearly outweigh the three SBS programs with respect to the number of individuals served<sup>4</sup>. Data for the analyses come from the period of July 2007–June 2009. About half of the available data on

participants from the employment programs are from 2008. The three SBS programs were just being implemented in 2007 and data from 2009 represent a partial year as data were downloaded only through June 2009.

The average age of participants was similar across Advance at Work, Workforce1 Transportation Career Centers, and the WF1CCs (36.2–36.9 years of age) while the Community Partners Program participants were a somewhat younger population (average age of 33.1 years). A little more than half of the participants were female in Advance at Work (58%), Community Partners Program (56%), and the WF1CC (56.8%), but only 18.9 percent of participants in the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center were female, suggesting that transportation is still an occupational field dominated by male workers.

There are some striking differences in race/ethnicity categories reported among the populations served by the three programs and the WF1CCs. The majority of participants served by Advance at Work and Community Partners Program report being African American (52.0% and 56.7%) while close to 40 percent of the WF1CCs and Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants report being African American. About 30 percent of participants at the WF1CCs indicate they are Hispanic while the three programs have only about one-quarter of participants indicating they are Hispanic. About 10 percent of participants in the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and WF1CCs programs report being white but just 3.8 percent of participants from Community Partners Program and 5.4 percent of Advance at Work report being white. Some of these differences may be explained away by those with no race designation, which account for between 8 and 13 percent of participants in the various programs.

<sup>4</sup> Residents of New York City who are applying for unemployment insurance do so at the WF1CCs. It is possible that some of the participants accessed the WF1CCs for this benefit only and not for job placement services. Including these individuals in the analyses may artificially depress placement rate for the WF1CCs. However, it was difficult to determine which participants were should be excluded for this reason. Less than 2% of WF1CC participants (N=2,883) recorded unemployment insurance as a service they accessed. If this was the only service participants accessed there were excluded from the analyses. Unemployment insurance is not one of the services considered in this report. It is likely that some customers who accessed the WF1CCs solely for unemployment insurance were recorded as having received assessment or orientation services instead of unemployment insurance. Of those participants who received only one service 32.6% received an orientation and 3.8% received an assessment. Therefore, we conducted additional analyses that excluded the WF1CC participants who received a single service if that service was assessment or orientation (N=6,999). There was no difference in the positive relationships between program participation and placement for any of the five comparisons that include WF1CC participants when these individuals were excluded. Further, we conducted analyses that excluded all individuals from the WF1CCs who received only one service regardless of what that service was (N=19,225). Once again, there was no difference in the positive relationships between program participation and placement for any of the five comparisons.

**Table 3.1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants in Each Program**

	Advance at Work	Workforce 1 Transportation Career Center	Community Partners Program	Workforce 1 Career Centers
Sample size	2,277	4,013	8,457	148,803
Year of enrollment				
2007	19.1%	4.0%	17.2%	17.6%
2008	59.4%	52.6%	59.6%	48.4%
2009	21.5%	43.4%	23.3%	34.1%
Age <sup>1</sup>	36.7 (12.0)	36.2 (11.9)	33.1 (12.6)	36.9 (13.0)
Female	58.0%	18.9%	56.0%	56.8%
Race				
White, non-Hispanic	5.4%	9.8%	3.8%	9.9%
African American	52.0%	42.5%	56.7%	39.9%
Hispanic	26.3%	26.1%	22.8%	30.2%
Other/Multi-racial	8.3%	8.8%	6.8%	8.1%
No race designation	8.0%	12.9%	9.8%	11.9%
Disability	2.8%	1.3%	3.9%	3.4%
Education level				
Less than high school	13.9%	6.1%	22.1%	18.3%
High school diploma/GED	36.9%	44.4%	39.1%	33.3%
Associates/Vocational degree	36.5%	38.7%	30.2%	32.0%
College degree, 4 year	11.0%	9.3%	7.4%	12.9%
Graduate degree	1.7%	1.5%	1.2%	3.4%
Enrolled in school	17.6%	13.3%	22.5%	15.9%
Employed at program entry	100.0%	28.5%	14.8%	13.1%
Wage at program entry/most recent job	\$9.94 (2.90)	\$13.11 (7.43)	\$10.48 (5.70)	\$13.70 (9.67)
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	31.9 (10.5)	38.2 (11.8)	33.9 (10.8)	35.7 (10.6)

<sup>1</sup>Statistics presented for age, wage at program entry/most recent job and average hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

Relatively few of the participants (less than 4 percent) in any of the programs or served by the WF1CCs had a self-reported disability.

With respect to educational attainment, the WF1CCs had the highest proportion of participants with a 4-year college or graduate degree (16.3%), followed by Advance at Work (12.7%). Participants served by Community Partners Program had the lowest level of education achievement, with 22.1 percent lacking a high school diploma or GED. A

greater percentage of participants from Community Partners Program were currently enrolled in school (22.5%), however. School enrollment was lowest among Workforce 1 Transportation Career Center participants (13.3%).

Advance at Work participants are required to be employed as a condition of program enrollment. Rates of employment at program entry were much lower for the two other SBS programs and the WF1CCs. After Advance at Work, the highest pre-enrollment employ-



ment rate was found among the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants. More than one-quarter of the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants were employed, which is not surprising given the program’s focus on helping incumbent transportation workers advance as well as providing jobs for the unemployed. Participants at the WF1CCs had the highest levels of unemployment (86.9%) at program entry, followed closely by the participants of Community Partners Program (85.2%).

Hourly wages at the participant’s current or most recent job were highest for those served by the WF1CCs (\$13.70), perhaps reflecting their higher educational attainment and the centers’ policy to serve all jobseekers, regardless of wage at program entry. Those served by the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center were a close second with an average hourly wage of \$13.10; the only Workforce1 Transportation Career Center wage requirement is that participants make no more than \$19.23 at enrollment. Eligibility requirements limit the maximum program-entry wage for workers participating in Advance at Work to \$13.99 an hour, so these workers, on average, had the lowest hourly wage (\$9.90). Participants served by Workforce1 Transportation Career Center worked the most hours per week at program entry or at their most recent job (38.2), followed by those of the WF1CCs (35.7). Workers in Advance at Work had the lowest number of weekly hours at program entry (31.9).

In summary, we do see some notable differences between participants in the three SBS programs and those who participate in the WF1CCs. Advance at Work participants are more likely to be employed (a programmatic requirement) but with lower wages than

other groups (wages also being restricted by the program requirements). Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants are predominantly male with a higher number of weekly hours worked at program entry or most recent job. Community Partners Program participants tend to be younger, more likely to be in school, and less likely to be employed. WF1CC participants have higher levels of education and the highest pre-program wages, due, in part, to the lack of eligibility criteria for participation

### 3.2 Descriptive Statistics of Outcome Measures

Table 3.2a describes the outcomes achieved for participants in the three SBS programs and the WF1CCs. Participants in Advance at Work and Community Partners Program had higher rates of success in finding new jobs or receiving promotions (*placement*) than participants in Workforce1 Transportation Career Center or the WF1CCs. Only 11.2 percent of WF1CC participants obtained a new job or received a promotion after visiting the WF1CCs and within the timeframe of this study. Advance at Work had the largest percentage of participants with a wage increase (67.1%) while similar percentages (52% to 56%) of participants in the two other SBS programs and in the WF1CCs experienced a wage increase. Similar percentages of participants in Advance at Work, Community Partners Program, and the WF1CCs (about 44%) worked a greater number of hours after placement or promotion than at program entry, while a smaller percentage of participants in Workforce1 Transportation Career Center increased their hours after placement (31%).

**Table 3.2a. Outcome Measures for Participants in Each Program**

	Advance At Work	Workforce1 Transportation Career Center	Community Partners Program	Workforce1 Career Centers
Placement	43.3% (N=985)	26.7% (N=1,073)	42.1% (N=3,556)	11.2% (N=16,598)
Wage <sup>1</sup>	\$10.50 (4.29)	\$12.10 (3.96)	\$9.13 (3.85)	\$9.86 (5.26)
Wage increased	67.1%	56.0%	52.2%	53.5%
Wage decreased	23.4%	38.9%	42.3%	40.8%
Wage remained the same	9.5%	5.1%	5.5%	5.6%
Avg. hours worked per week	34.3 (8.5)	38.5 (4.3)	33.2 (7.7)	33.6 (7.5)
Hours increased	44.1%	31.1%	44.3%	44.1%
Hours decreased	19.4%	25.4%	33.1%	33.0%
Hours remained the same	36.6%	43.5%	22.6%	22.9%
Benefits <sup>2</sup>				
Health care	18.7%	0.6%	3.4%	3.6%
401K plan	11.8%	0.2%	1.2%	1.0%
Child care	0.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Paid sick/vacation days	19.8%	1.1%	4.4%	4.5%
Days in program before placement	190.7 (154.1)	94.5 (124.4)	117.7 (134.7)	105.2 (119.1)

<sup>1</sup>Statistics presented for wage, average hours worked per week and days in program before placement are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

<sup>2</sup>These variables have significant missing data, the rates of which vary across programs. This issue is discussed further below.

The average hours worked per week was higher for Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants (38.5) but fairly comparable for Advance at Work, Community Partners Program, and WF1CC participants (33.2 to 34.3). Increases in hours worked were consistent across Advance at Work, Community Partners Program, and WF1CC participants with 44 percent of participants in each program experiencing an increase in hours. While fewer Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants (31.1%) experienced an increase in hours, Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants had the highest number of hours worked at program entry (38.2) so there was little room for increase.

Participants in Advance at Work spent the longest period of time enrolled in the program prior to placement in a new job or promotion: an average of 190.7 days, compared to 94.5 for Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants, 117.7 for Community Partners Program, and 105.2 for the WF1CCs. This is not surprising because the Advance at Work program model encourages long-term engagement; participants are asked to commit to interacting with their coach monthly for 12 months.

According to the descriptive statistics, Advance at Work participants appear to have made the greatest gains in obtaining new job placements/promotions, increased wages, and benefits compared to the two other SBS programs and the WF1CCs. However,

Advance at Work participants differ dramatically from the participants in the other programs in that all are employed at program entry, as required by enrollment prerequisites. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants had the highest hourly wage and the highest number of weekly hours in their new positions. We conduct regression analyses in Section 4 of the report to untangle some of the relationships between pre-enrollment participant characteristics and program outcomes.

The SBS electronic record system also tracks receipt of workplace benefits. However, Advance at Work is the only program required to track benefit receipt because it is the only program that has a target outcome of connecting participants to such benefits. For other programs these data elements are optional. Among those for whom benefit data are available, very few participants in any of the programs received benefits. Advance at Work participants were more likely to report access to benefits than those customers who participated in the other two CEO programs or the WF1CCs, which is consistent with the Advance at Work program model. 18.7 percent of Advance at Work participants having a health care plan, 11.8 percent having access to a 401K plan, and 19.8 percent having paid sick and/or vacation days. Of those participants who report benefit information, only 3.6 percent of WF1CC participants indicate that they have access to health care and only 4.5 percent report receiving paid sick/vacation days.

Yet, there are a couple of caveats that must be discussed. The difference in access to benefits across programs may be the result of a number of different factors. First, the majority of Advance at Work participants are employed at program entry, unlike participants in Workforce1 Transportation Career

Center, Community Partners Program, or the WF1CCs. Many workplace benefits are given to employees only after a period of employment. Advance at Work participants, as a whole, have longer employment histories and are therefore more likely to have reached the necessary tenure to receive such benefits. However, Table 3.2b suggests that Advance at Work customers also have greater access to benefits than customers in the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center, Community Partners Program, and WF1CCs who enter the program employed. Second, the focus of the Advance at Work program is placing workers into better jobs than they currently hold. Advance at Work staff and participants are able to focus their efforts on obtaining jobs that offer benefits. Finally, there is a significant amount of missing data for these variables. Access to benefits was not recorded for between 50 and 89 percent of participants across the four employment programs. It is impossible to know if the subset of participants for whom there are missing data has access to these benefits or not. Nor is it known whether these data are missing at random or whether some participants are less likely to report such information.

An important component of Advance at Work is connecting participants with work supports, such as tax credits (e.g., Earned Income Tax Credit, Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit); subsidized child care; housing vouchers; food stamps; Medicaid; Child Health Plus; NYS Home Energy Assistance; School Lunch Program; and Women, Infants and Children (WIC). Among Advance at Work participants 78.6 percent report receiving assistance with such work supports, including screenings and enrollments.



**Table 3.2b. Access to Benefits for Participants in Each Program**

	Advance At Work	Workforce1 Transportation Career Center	Community Partners Program	Workforce1 Career Centers
Total cohort	2,277	4,013	8,457	148,803
% Missing Benefits Data	56.7% (N=1,292)	73.3% (N=2,940)	58.0% (N=4,901)	88.8% (N=132,205)
Health care	18.7%	0.6%	3.4%	3.6%
401K plan	11.8%	0.2%	1.2%	1.0%
Child care	0.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Paid sick/vacation days	19.8%	1.1%	4.4%	4.5%
Employed at enrollment	2,277	1,102	1,258	21,641
% Missing Benefits Data	56.7% (N=1,292)	65.8% (N=725)	50.2% (N=631)	74.5% (N=16,116)
Health care	18.7%	1.1%	4.0%	3.3%
401K plan	11.8%	0.3%	1.4%	0.9%
Child care	0.1%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%
Paid sick/vacation days	19.8%	1.6%	5.6%	4.2%

### 3.3 Descriptive Statistics of Services Received

Table 3.3 shows the types of service provided by the three SBS programs and the WF1CCs with the percentage of participants who received each service at least one time.

The majority of participants across all four programs received some type of orientation and assessment. Advance at Work is clearly the most service-intensive program, providing participants with an average of 6.6 different services, compared with 5.5 for Workforce1 Transportation Career Center, 3.5 for Community Partners Program, and 3.0 for the WF1CCs. Advance at Work participants also had nearly twice as many program visits as the other programs with an average of 19.3 visits. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center exceeded Advance at Work in the percentage of participants who received interview skills (60.8% versus 16.0%), job search services (63.6% versus 54.3%), and referrals (56.4% versus 24.1%), likely because Advance at Work participants were already working at program entry and had less need for these

services. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants were also more likely to participate in workshops and education services than Advance at Work participants (74.2% versus 58.5%).

Following orientation and assessment, the most common services provided were those related to job search and job counseling. Higher percentages of participants in the three SBS programs received job search services (more than 50% at each) than did participants at the WF1CCs (only about one-third). These three programs were also more likely to provide counseling to participants than were the WF1CCs.

One half or more of participants in Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and Advance at Work received workshops and education services while only 14.2 percent of Community Partners Program participants received these services and 10.7 percent of WF1CC participants. These percentages likely reflect differences in the populations served and the purpose of the programs. Community Partners Program deliberately targets job-

ready individuals who should not need additional training before being placed in jobs. The WF1CCs serve a wide variety of individuals, many of who may not be in need of or interested in workshops or education services but rather are coming to the WF1CCs to address other employment needs.

ITGs are received by less than 18% of participants in any program. Advance at Work participants are the most likely to receive ITGs and Community Partners Program participants are the least likely to receive them. Appendix E further examines ITG receipt by program and participant characteristics.

**Table 3.3. Services Received by Participants in Each Program**

	Advance At Work	Workforce I Transportation Career Center	Community Partners Program	Workforce I Career Centers
Total sample	2,277	4,013	8,457	148,803
Type of service				
Assessment	78.4%	59.5%	71.3%	72.8%
Computer skills	25.3%	9.0%	16.3%	13.6%
Counseling	99.2%	70.4%	29.9%	23.0%
Facilities	28.6%	13.1%	24.4%	17.2%
Financial services	73.2%	0.5%	1.1%	0.3%
Interview skills	16.0%	60.8%	12.6%	3.9%
ITG receipt	17.4%	9.1%	3.8%	6.7%
Job readiness	22.8%	3.3%	5.5%	2.8%
Job search	54.3%	63.6%	57.1%	32.1%
Orientation	96.9%	97.6%	78.7%	87.0%
Referrals	24.1%	56.4%	17.6%	13.7%
Resume preparation	66.1%	35.8%	16.5%	12.9%
Workshops/Education services	58.5%	74.2%	14.2%	10.7%
Number of services <sup>1</sup>	6.6	5.5	3.5	3.0
	(2.4)	(2.2)	(2.1)	(1.7)
Number of total services	19.3	10.3	7.1	5.5
	(6.6)	(6.5)	(7.1)	(6.0)

<sup>1</sup>Statistics presented for number of services and number of total services are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

## 4. Analysis

In this section, we conduct a series of analytic comparisons to look at differences in the outcomes for participants in the three SBS programs and the WF1CCs, controlling for participant characteristics and differences in service receipt. We first compare Advance at Work participants to a similar population of participants who come to the WF1CCs for services. We then compare Advance at Work participants to similar Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants. The third and fourth sets of comparisons are between Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants and WF1CC participants matched on employment status at program entry. Finally, in the fifth and sixth comparisons we look at differences in outcomes for Community Partners Program participants compared to the WF1CC participants matched on employment status at program entry.

Each of the analytical comparisons is designed to address the following questions about the two programs being compared:

- Are the populations different?
- Do they receive different services?
- Are the rates of placement or promotion different?
- Is the timing of placement or promotion different?
- Among those who are placed or promoted, are wages different?
- Among those who are placed or promoted, are there differences in the number of hours worked?
- What is the effect of services received on placement, wages, and hours?

### 4.1 Comparison of Advance at Work and Similar WF1CC Participants

Our first comparison is between Advance at Work participants and a similar population of WF1CC participants—employed workers earning less than \$14 an hour at program entry. Table 4.1 examines the demographic differences between Advance at Work participants and the employed WF1CC population.

We find that there are some significant differences between the population served by Advance at Work and the employed WF1CC participants earning less than \$14/hour.

Advance at Work participants are, on average, a little older; slightly more likely to have a disability; have higher educational attainment; and less likely to be enrolled in school. A greater percentage of Advance at Work participants are male. A larger percentage of Advance at Work participants report being African American while the WF1CC has a larger percentage of participants identify as white, another race or multi-racial. At program intake, Advance at Work participants are, on average, earning a higher hourly wage but working fewer hours per week than employed WF1CC participants.

Table 4.1b shows that Advance at Work participants received more services than employed WF1CC participants earning less than \$14/hour. The average number of services received by Advance at Work participants was 6.6, compared to 2.9 for employed WF1CC participants. The percentage of Advance at Work participants who received a given service was higher in every service category than the WF1CC participants.

**Table 4.1a. Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Advance at Work and Employed WFICC Participants Earning Less Than \$14/Hour**

	Advance At Work	Workforce I Career Centers	Chi-Square/ T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	2,277	15,483	
Year of enrollment			
2007	19.1%	22.2%	***
2008	59.4%	49.4%	***
2009	21.5%	28.4%	***
Age <sup>2</sup>	36.6 (11.9)	34.7 (12.5)	***
Female	58.0%	63.3%	***
Race			
White, non-Hispanic	5.4%	7.3%	***
African American	52.0%	46.7%	***
Hispanic	26.3%	25.8%	
Other/Multi-racial	8.3%	9.8%	*
No race designation	8.0%	10.4%	***
Disability	2.8%	2.1%	*
Education level			
Less than high school	13.9%	17.1%	***
High school diploma/GED	36.9%	35.9%	
Associates/Vocational degree	36.5%	33.8%	**
College degree, 4 year	11.0%	10.8%	
Graduate degree	1.7%	2.4%	
Enrolled in school	17.6%	22.1%	***
Wage at program entry/most recent job	\$9.93 (2.90)	\$8.98 (2.59)	***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	31.9 (10.5)	32.4 (11.5)	*

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing age, wage at program entry, and average hours worked per week are t-tests. All other characteristics are compared using chi-square statistics.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for age, wage at program entry/most recent job and average hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

**Table 4.1b. Comparison of Service Receipt for Advance at Work and Employed WFICC Participants Earning Less Than \$14/Hour**

	Advance At Work	Workforce Career Centers	Chi-Square/ T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	2,277	15,483	
Type of service			
Assessment	78.4%	71.1%	***
Computer skills	25.2%	12.6%	***
Counseling	99.2%	26.4%	***
Facilities	28.6%	17.3%	***
Financial services	73.2%	0.3%	***
Interview skills	16.0%	4.2%	***
ITG receipt	17.4%	10.4%	***
Job readiness	22.7%	3.3%	***
Job search	54.3%	42.8%	***
Orientation	96.9%	77.9%	***
Referrals	24.1%	7.8%	***
Resume preparation	66.1%	12.5%	***
Workshops/Education services	58.4%	10.8%	***
Number of services <sup>2</sup>	6.6	2.9	***
	(2.4)	(1.8)	
Number of total services	19.3	5.5	***
	(6.6)	(5.8)	

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing type of service received are chi-square. Tests comparing number of services and number of total services are t-tests.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for number of services and number of total services are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

The biggest difference in service receipt between the programs are for counseling, financial services, resume preparation, and workshops.

The regression models documented in Table 4.1c examine difference between Advance at Work and comparable WFICC participants in placement in a new job or promotion, hourly wages and weekly hours for those placed, and the timing of placement.

After statistically controlling for differences in demographic characteristics, work history, and year of enrollment among Advance at Work participants and employed

WFICC participants, we find that Advance at Work participants are significantly different on all four employment outcomes. Advance at Work participants are 3.6<sup>5</sup> times as likely to be placed in a job or receive a promotion (*placement*). They earn higher hourly wages in these new jobs, controlling for previous wages, and work more hours a week, on average, than their similar WFICC counter-parts. Time to placement is longer for Advance at Work participants than similar WFICC participants. That is, Advance at Work participants spend a longer time in the program before placement

<sup>5</sup> The statistic is the hazard ratio. It is calculated as follows:  
 $HR = e^{(coefficient)} / (e^{(coefficient)} + 1)$ .

**Table 4.1c. Relationship of Advance at Work vs. WF1CC Participation to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals Earning Less Than \$14/Hour**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	8.32***	30.51***	48.30**
Advance at Work	1.27***	0.50**	1.07**	68.35***
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	-0.05	0.01	0.33	67.62***
2009	-0.42***	-0.74**	-1.38*	-69.13***
Age	-0.01***	-0.01	0.01	0.72**
Female	-0.03	-0.21	-2.20***	-6.46
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	0.01	-0.57	-0.00	1.35
Hispanic	-0.00	-0.38	0.63	-1.99
Other/Multi-racial	-0.05	0.18	0.72	-12.01
No race designation	-0.00	-0.36	0.42	-1.86
Disability	-0.27	-0.45	-3.39**	29.79
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.37***	-0.64*	-0.67	-2.24
High school diploma/GED	-0.01	-0.36	-0.16	-0.91
College degree, 4 year	0.00	0.30	0.41	-2.60
Graduate degree	-0.04	-0.22	-0.32	23.26
Enrolled in school	0.00	0.08	-0.46	-10.03
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01	0.25***	0.02	1.32
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.01	0.11***	0.33
N =	17,760	3,248	3,248	3,248

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

in a new job or promotion, which is consistent with the Advance at Work program model of long-term engagement.<sup>6</sup>

Participants who enrolled in 2009 are significantly less likely to receive a placement than participants who enrolled in 2008. There are two possible explanations for this finding. First, because we stopped collecting data after June 30, 2009 participants in the first cohort had a much longer time period in which to find a placement. Specifically, jobseekers who

<sup>6</sup> For the first 12 of the 24 months considered in this analysis Advance at Work was offered by a single site. Additional sites became operational in the second year included in this study. Additional analyses were conducted between the limited sample of Advance at Work participants and comparable WF1CC participants who enrolled during or after July 2008 (N=9,438). The results for those analyses reflect the results for the full sample, such that Advance at Work participants are 3.6 times more

likely to be placed than their WF1CC counterparts. Results for the other employment outcomes are also consistent with those presented here.



enrolled in 2008 had between 6 and 18 months to achieve a placement while those who enrolled in 2009 only had between 1 and 6 months to achieve a placement. Second, the difference in cohort placement rates may also reflect changes in the economy between 2008 and 2009.

Among those who are placed, participants who enrolled in 2007 spend significantly longer in the program before placement than those who enrolled in 2008. Participants who enrolled in 2009 spend significantly shorter periods to time in the program before placement. Because this analysis is limited to those who received a placement, this is most likely the result of the different amounts of time jobseekers had to receive a placement before data collection stopped.

With respect to correlations between demographic variables and program outcomes, we find that age is related to placement with younger workers being more likely to be placed and placed more quickly than older workers. Female workers work fewer average weekly hours than males and workers with a disability work fewer hours than workers without a disability. We found no differences based on race/ethnicity in placement, hourly wages, average hours worked, or time to placement.

There were a few differences based on education. Those with less than a high school diploma were less likely to be placed in a new job or promoted than those participants with an associates or vocational degree. Interestingly, those participants who had a graduate degree took longer to be placed than those with an associates or vocational degree. This may be because those with an advanced degree were more particular about what type of job they took and job opportunities developed through Advance at Work or the WF1CCs may be less appropriate for individuals with this level of education.

Not surprisingly, hourly wage at program entry is positively correlated with hourly wage at placement. Likewise, average weekly hours worked at program entry or most recent job is positively correlated with hours worked at the new job.

When we include services received in the models (see Table 4.1d), we find that the positive associations between Advance at Work participation and placement, wages, hours worked, and time to placement still hold.

When we look at the relationship of specific services to job outcomes, we find that ITG receipt had the most consistent impact across all outcomes such that receiving an ITG is positively correlated with placement, hourly wages, and weekly hours worked. Those who received in ITG are 2.1 times as likely to receive a placement as their WF1CC counterparts. However, they also took a longer time to be placed, possibly due to the hours required for training. Other services positively correlated with one or more positive outcomes (placement, hourly wages, or weekly hours) were computer skills, counseling, interview skills, job search services, orientation, and referrals.<sup>7</sup> No relationship was found between job outcomes and assessment, access to facilities, job readiness, or workshops. Services with a negative relationship to one or more job outcomes include financial services, orientation, and resume preparation.

The data models in Table 4.1e include the same covariates as Table 4.1d but look at the relationship between the number of services received and employment outcomes. We find

<sup>7</sup> Participants who receive referrals are 1.7 times as likely to receive a placement, but among those placed, spend about 49 days longer in the program. This may be because referrals to employers for job ready candidates and referrals to non-employers for those who need more intensive engagement are considered together.

**Table 4.Id. Relationship of Advance at Work vs.WFICC Participation and Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals Earning Less Than \$14/Hour**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	8.39***	30.77***	11.33
Advance at Work	0.84***	0.90*	2.77***	38.12***
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	-0.02	0.01	0.38	74.72***
2009	-0.25***	-0.49	-1.18*	-67.15***
Age	-0.01***	-0.01	-0.01	0.23
Female	0.01	-0.18	-2.11***	-2.26
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.01	-0.39	0.29	-0.88
Hispanic	0.01	-0.35	0.67	-2.13
Other/Multi-racial	-0.03	0.12	0.56	-13.92
No race designation	-0.05	-0.18	0.71	2.37
Disability	-0.32*	-0.35	-3.09*	24.42
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.23**	-0.67*	-0.72	-3.66
High school diploma/GED	0.02	-0.35	-0.26	-4.40
College degree, 4 year	-0.06	0.37	0.58	-6.11
Graduate degree	-0.05	-0.17	-0.58	23.80
Enrolled in school	-0.02	0.10	-0.26	-2.90
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01	0.24***	0.01	1.23
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.01**	0.10***	0.24
Service received				
Assessment	0.23***	0.25	-1.16*	20.14**
Computer skills	0.20***	0.33	-0.95*	21.13**
Counseling	0.18**	0.61**	-0.39	7.48
Facilities	-0.08	-0.44	0.27	5.64
Financial services	0.10	-0.38	-1.38*	17.87
Interview skills	0.61***	0.09	0.69	-12.19
ITG receipt	0.73***	0.85***	2.42***	42.56***
Job readiness	-0.04	-0.62*	0.08	3.36
Job search	0.78***	0.13	-0.51	-9.49
Orientation	0.27**	-0.88**	0.65	22.04**
Referrals	0.52***	-0.10	-0.32	49.05***
Resume preparation	-0.32***	-0.27	-0.74	7.44*
Workshops/Education services	-0.17**	-0.04	0.43	-7.38
N =	17,760	3,248	3,248	3,248

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table 4.1e. Relationship of Advance at Work vs. WF1CC Participation and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals Earning Less Than \$14/Hour**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	8.36***	30.71***	10.02
Advance at Work	0.54***	0.54*	1.30**	25.96***
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.02	0.01	0.32	70.15***
2009	-0.36***	-0.75**	-1.40*	-64.01***
Age	-0.01***	-0.01	0.01	0.42
Female	-0.01	-0.22	-2.21***	-5.19
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.04	-0.56	0.02	-3.06
Hispanic	0.00	-0.38	0.63	-1.29
Other/Multi-racial	0.01	0.18	0.72	-11.26
No race designation	-0.04	-0.36	0.42	-2.06
Disability	-0.34*	-0.44	-3.35**	22.21
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.29***	-0.64*	-0.68	-0.08
High school diploma/GED	-0.02	-0.36	-0.16	-1.10
College degree, 4 year	-0.07	0.31	0.43	-7.38
Graduate degree	-0.11	-0.22	-0.31	20.04
Enrolled in school	-0.00	0.07	-0.46	-9.31
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01	0.25***	0.02	1.38
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00*	0.01	0.11***	0.26
Number of services	0.19***	-0.12	-0.07	12.93***
N =	17,760	3,248	3,248	3,248

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

that the positive relationships between the outcomes of placement, higher hourly wages, more weekly hours, and longer time to placement for Advance at Work participants still remain. The number of different services is positively related to both placement and time to placement. Again, it is not surprising that those in the program longer received more and a wider variety of services.

In summary, we draw the following conclusions about Advance at Work participants compared to employed WF1CC participants earning less than \$14/hour. The populations are different. They receive different services. The rate of placement is higher for Advance at Work participants, even after controlling for demographic characteristics and services received. Advance at Work

participants take longer to be placed, which is consistent with the program model. Among those who are placed or promoted, Advance at Work participants have higher hourly wages and work more hours per week than employed WF1CC participants. For participants in both programs services have a positive effect on placement but, with the exception of ITG receipt and counseling, are not related to higher wages or more weekly hours.

Further analyses use a cost-benefit approach to estimate savings associated with the three SBS-CEO employment programs examined here. Appendix F provides additional information about these analyses, including the key assumptions upon which the approach is based. The 5-year net benefit associated with the Advance at Work program is estimated to be over \$180,000 and net return-on-investment is estimated to be 110 percent (range of 80 percent to 130 percent). In other words, every dollar invested in this program in 2009 will result in \$1.1 return to taxpayers over the five years.

## 4.2 Comparison of Advance at Work and Employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center Participants

Our next set of analyses examines the differences between Advance at Work and employed Workforce Transportation Career Center participants.

As shown in Table 4.2a, there are numerous significant differences between Advance at Work and employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants. A much higher proportion of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants are male and a higher proportion are white or lacking a race designation. Fewer Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants

have low levels of education (e.g. less than a high school degree) and they are less likely to be enrolled in school. Employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants, on average, earn higher wages and work more hours than Advance at Work participants at program entry.

There are significant differences in the proportion of Advance at Work and Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants who received different services from their respective programs (see Table 4.2b). Higher proportions of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants received interview skills, referrals, and workshops or education services. Higher proportions of Advance at Work participants received all other services, except job search, which the majority of participants received, and orientation, which nearly all participants experienced in both programs. Advance at Work participants received a greater number of different services and a greater number of repeated services than employed Transportation Career Center participants.

Table 4.2c examines the relationship between participant characteristics and outcomes for Advance at Work and employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants.

Controlling for demographic characteristics, work history, and year of program enrollment, there are no significant differences in placement rates between Advance at Work participants and Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants who were employed at program entry. Among those placed in jobs, Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants earn higher hourly wages, controlling for previous wages, and work more weekly hours, on average, than their Advance at Work counterparts. Advance at Work participants spend a significantly longer period of time in the

**Table 4.2a. Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Advance at Work and Employed Workforce I Transportation Career Center Clients**

	Advance At Work	Workforce I Transportation Career Center	Chi-Square/T-Test I
Sample size	2,277	1,102	
Year of enrollment			
2007	19.1%	3.6%	***
2008	59.4%	58.5%	
2009	21.5%	37.9%	***
Age <sup>2</sup>	36.7 (11.9)	35.9 (11.6)	
Female	58.0%	20.7%	***
Race			
White, non-Hispanic	5.4%	10.6%	***
African American	52.0%	42.5%	***
Hispanic	26.3%	23.2%	
Other/Multi-racial	67.7%	9.1%	
No race designation	8.0%	14.6%	***
Disability	2.8%	1.6%	*
Education level			
Less than high school	13.9%	5.6%	***
High school diploma/GED	36.9%	43.9%	***
Associates/Vocational degree	36.5%	37.9%	
College degree, 4 year	11.0%	10.7%	
Graduate degree	1.7%	1.8%	
Enrolled in school	17.6%	14.0%	*
Wage at program entry/most recent job	\$9.94 (2.90)	\$12.16 (6.68)	***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	31.9 (10.5)	35.3 (11.7)	***

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing age, wage at program entry, and average hours worked per week are t-tests. All other characteristics are compared using chi-square statistics.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for age, wage at program entry/most recent job and average hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

**Table 4.2b. Comparison of Service Receipt for Advance at Work and Employed Workforce I Transportation Career Center Clients**

	Advance At Work	Workforce I Transportation Career Center	Chi-Square/ T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	2,277	1,086	
Type of service			
Assessment	78.4%	48.7%	***
Computer skills	25.3%	7.1%	***
Counseling	99.2%	68.1%	***
Facilities	28.6%	9.2%	***
Financial services	73.2%	0.2%	***
Interview skills	16.0%	48.6%	***
ITG receipt	17.4%	10.1%	***
Job readiness	22.8%	3.2%	***
Job search	54.3%	57.5%	
Orientation	96.9%	96.9%	
Referrals	24.1%	51.6%	***
Resume preparation	66.1%	26.2%	***
Workshops/Education services	58.5%	65.3%	***
Number of services <sup>2</sup>	6.6	4.9	***
	(2.4)	(2.3)	
Number of total services	19.3	8.8	***
	(6.6)	(6.3)	

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing type of service received are chi-square. Tests comparing number of services and number of total services are t-tests.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for number of services and number of total services are means with standard deviation in parentheses.



**Table 4.2c. Relationship of Advance at Work vs. Workforce I Transportation Career Center Participation to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	11.21***	29.69***	49.57
Advance at Work	-0.05	-1.72***	-3.12***	61.42***
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	-0.12	-0.24	1.05	151.09***
2009	-0.00	-0.79*	0.07	-62.42***
Age	0.00	-0.01	0.02	0.15
Female	-0.13*	-0.40	-1.70***	2.54
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	0.19	-0.33	1.74	15.28
Hispanic	0.07	0.11	2.47*	5.35
Other/Multi-racial	-0.18	-0.19	2.74*	-2.44
No race designation	0.31	-0.56	2.78*	5.93
Disability	-0.13	0.20	-4.23**	-12.73
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.15	-1.24**	-0.41	7.31
High school diploma/GED	0.03	-0.56	-0.10	-10.98
College degree, 4 year	0.11	-0.10	0.42	5.13
Graduate degree	0.31	-2.10*	-2.02	1.19
Enrolled in school	0.02	-0.30	-0.02	3.79
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.02*	0.26***	0.02	-0.43
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	-0.01	0.18***	0.46
N =	3,363	1,351	1,351	1,351

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

program before placement than Transportation Sector Center participants.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Additional analyses were conducted between Advance at Work participants and employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants who enrolled during or after July 2008 (N=2,243). The results for those analyses reflect with the results for the full sample. There is no relationship between program participation and placement. Among those who are placed Advance at Work participants earn significantly less per hour, work fewer hours, and stay in the program longer before placement than their Workforce1 Transportation Career Center counterparts.

Among those who are placed, participants who enrolled in 2007 spend significantly longer in the program before placement than those who enrolled in 2008. Participants who enrolled in 2009 spend significantly shorter periods of time in the program before placement. Because this analysis is limited to those who received a placement, this is most likely the result of the different amounts of time jobseekers had to receive a placement before data collection stopped.

Beyond the difference in the programs, a significant relationship was noted between race and average weekly hours worked with Hispanic, other/multi-racial, and participants with no race designation working more hours on average than white participants. However, there was no relationship between race/ethnicity and other job outcomes or time to placement. Similar to the relationships shown in Table 4.1c, female workers and workers with a disability worked fewer weekly hours. Females are also less likely to be placed into jobs or promoted than their male counterparts but there were not relationship between gender on wages or time to placement. Participants with less than a high school degree and those with a graduate degree had lower hourly wages than participants with an associates or vocational degree.

The regression models presented in Table 4.2d control not only for demographic characteristics, work history, and year of program enrollment but also receipt of services in examining differences in employment outcomes for Advance at Work and employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants.

Controlling on service receipt, Advance at Work participants are less likely to be placed than Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants, however, there is no longer a significant difference between the two programs in the length of time between program entry and placement. There remains a significant difference between Advance at Work and Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants in hourly wages and

weekly hours worked, controlling for other factors.

A number of services are also found to be positively related to placement or promotion, namely computer skills, counseling, financial services, job search, and referrals. Because some of these services are disproportionately used by Advance at Work participants, the inclusion of these variables in the model likely explains why time to placement is no longer significantly longer for Advance at Work participants. Assistance with interview skills and resume preparation are negatively correlated with placement. This may be because workers who have the greatest barriers to employment are also the ones who use such services.

The models in Table 4.2e include the number of services received. After controlling for the number of services, we find that Advance at Work participants are 15 percent less likely to be placed in jobs and among those who are placed, they have lower wages and fewer weekly hours than Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants and they have a longer time to placement. The number of services is positively related to placement and time to placement but negatively related to hourly wage and hours worked per week. It appears that while additional services may help participants get a job, those who need additional services may be less job-ready which translates into a longer time to placement and a job with a lower hourly wage and fewer hours.

**Table 4.2d. Relationship of Advance at Work vs. Workforce I Transportation Career Center Participation and Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	10.34***	29.59***	6.47
Advance at Work	-0.29*	-1.77***	-2.03*	22.55
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	-0.13	-0.24	1.03	150.07***
2009	0.06	-0.52	-0.04	-55.92***
Age	0.00	-0.01	0.03	0.07
Female	-0.11	-0.37	-1.66***	2.86
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	0.11	-0.27	1.97*	8.30
Hispanic	0.09	-0.03	2.28*	6.92
Other/Multi-racial	-0.09	-0.31	2.40	-1.24
No race designation	0.28	-0.57	2.92*	8.23
Disability	-0.13	0.37	-4.07**	-18.65
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.08	-1.27**	-0.47	6.53
High school diploma/GED	0.07	-0.52	-0.11	-11.14
College degree, 4 year	0.10	0.15	0.72	-3.87
Graduate degree	0.28	-2.12*	-2.07	-2.99
Enrolled in school	0.03	-0.27	0.12	3.42
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01	0.26***	0.00	-0.53
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	-0.01	0.17***	0.42
Service received				
Assessment	-0.11	-0.15	-0.18	28.75**
Computer skills	0.21*	0.08	-1.34*	18.88
Counseling	0.30*	2.09***	0.54	1.52
Facilities	-0.14	-0.38	-0.18	5.80
Financial services	0.42***	-0.29	-1.07	34.73**
Interview skills	-0.16*	-0.20	0.84	7.75
ITG receipt	0.14	0.71*	1.10	20.61*
Job readiness	0.05	-0.62	-0.54	3.98
Job search	0.47***	0.48	-1.01	3.95
Orientation	-0.05	-0.26	0.71	18.94
Referrals	0.36***	-0.56	-0.41	15.13
Resume preparation	-0.25**	-0.50	-0.22	0.99
Workshops/Education services	0.02	-0.21	-0.32	-5.65
N =	3,363	1,351	1,351	1,351

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.0010.

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table 4.2e. Relationship of Advance at Work vs. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center Participation and Number of Services to Employment Outcomes Received for Employed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	11.73***	30.92***	4.21
Advance at Work	-0.16*	-1.49***	-2.57*	42.01***
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	-0.15	-0.24	1.06	158.99***
2009	0.01	-0.84*	-0.06	-57.81***
Age	-0.00	-0.00	0.02	0.06
Female	-0.12	-0.40	-1.69***	2.02
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	0.16	-0.28	1.87	10.52
Hispanic	0.10	0.07	2.38*	8.69
Other/Multi-racial	-0.11	-0.23	2.63*	1.39
No race designation	0.32	-0.60	2.69*	9.32
Disability	-0.15	0.27	-4.06**	-19.06
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.07	-1.25**	-0.45	8.56
High school diploma/GED	0.05	-0.56	-0.10	-10.88
College degree, 4 year	0.06	-0.00	0.64	-3.27
Graduate degree	0.18	-2.02*	-1.82	-6.14
Enrolled in school	0.01	-0.31	-0.04	4.32
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01	0.26***	0.02	-0.30
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	-0.01	0.18***	0.40
Number of services	0.09***	-0.11*	-0.27**	9.84***
N =	3,363	1,351	1,351	1,351

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001\*\*\*

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

In summary, we find that the Advance at Work and employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center populations are different. When the type and number of services are considered, Advance at Work participants are placed at slightly lower rates than employed Transportation Career Center participants. Among those who are placed, Advance at Work participants have lower hourly wages

and work fewer hours than Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants. The time to placement is longer for Advance at Work participants in some models but not in others. Again, the reason for the longer time to placement may be the result of Advance at Work’s program model which calls for long-term participation. Many services offered appear to be positively related

to placement and the number of services received is positively correlated with placement. However, there is a negative relationship between number of services and hourly wage and weekly hours worked, suggesting that those who needed more services obtained lower-paying jobs with fewer hours.

### 4.3 Comparison of Unemployed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and WF1CC Participants

The next set of research questions to be addressed concerns the differences between the characteristics and employment outcomes of unemployed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants and WF1CC participants.

Table 4.3a shows the differences in participant characteristics between unemployed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and WF1CC participants. A higher proportion of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants are male and a higher proportion report being African American while a higher proportion of WF1CC participants indicate they are Hispanic. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants tend to be slightly younger than WF1CC participants. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants are less likely to have a disability (though the number of participants with a disability is very small for both populations). Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants are more likely to have a high school degree or an associates or vocational degree, and are less likely to have a 4-year college or graduate degree. They are less likely than WF1CC participants to be enrolled in school.

In Table 4.3b we see that the rate of service uptake is different for unemployed Transportation Sector Center and WF1CC

participants. The rate of enrollment is roughly the same for financial services and job readiness services, both of which are relatively rare among participants. A greater percentage of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants access the services offered with the exception of assessment, computer skills, and facilities which are used by a greater percentage of WF1CC participants. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants also use a significantly higher number of different services and have a higher number of repeated services than WF1CC participants.

Table 4.3c examines the differences between unemployed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and WF1CC participants on employment outcomes and time to placement. Controlling for demographic characteristics, work history, and year of enrollment, Transportation Sector Center participants are 2.7 times more likely to be placed in jobs than WF1CC participants. Additionally, they earn higher hourly wages in those jobs, controlling for previous wages, and they work more hours per week, on average, than their WF1CC counterparts.

Participants who enrolled in 2007 are more likely to be placed and participants who enrolled in 2009 are less likely to be placed. Again, this is likely to be the result of the period of data collection that allowed 2007 enrollees more time to find a job than their 2008 counterparts and 2009 enrollees less time to find a job than their 2008 counterparts.

Among those who are placed, participants who enrolled in 2009 earn lower wages and work fewer hours. Because these outcomes are independent of how quickly participants are placed in jobs, it is likely that these findings reflect larger changes in the economic climate between 2008 and 2009.

**Table 4.3a. Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Unemployed Workforce I Transportation Career Center and Workforce I Career Center Participants**

	Workforce I Transportation Career Center	Workforce I Career Centers	Chi-Square/ T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	2,743	124,957	
Year of enrollment			
2007	4.1%	17.2%	***
2008	50.7%	48.1%	**
2009	45.2%	34.8%	***
Age <sup>2</sup>	36.2 (11.9)	37.0 (13.0)	**
Female	18.5%	56.1%	***
Race			
White, non-Hispanic	9.8%	10.3%	
African American	42.7%	39.3%	***
Hispanic	22.3%	31.0%	***
Other/Multi-racial	8.8%	7.8%	
No race designation	11.5%	11.6%	
Disability	1.1%	3.6%	***
Education level			
Less than high school	6.0%	18.4%	***
High school diploma/GED	44.4%	33.2%	***
Associates/Vocational degree	39.2%	31.9%	***
College degree, 4 year	8.9%	13.0%	***
Graduate degree	1.4%	3.5%	***
Enrolled in school	12.9%	15.3%	**
Wage at program entry/most recent job	\$13.52 (7.72)	\$14.31 (10.21)	**
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	39.1 (11.8)	36.3 (10.4)	***

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing age, wage at program entry, and average hours worked per week are t-tests. All other characteristics are compared using chi-square statistics.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for age, wage at program entry/most recent job and average hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job are means with standard deviation in parentheses.



**Table 4.3b. Comparison of Service Receipt for Unemployed Workforce I Transportation Career Center and Workforce I Career Center Participants**

	Workforce I Transportation Career Center	Workforce I Career Centers	Chi-Square/ T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	2,743	124,957	
Type of service			
Assessment	64.6%	73.2%	***
Computer skills	9.7%	13.9%	***
Counseling	71.1%	22.5%	***
Facilities	14.3%	17.4%	***
Financial services	0.2%	0.3%	
Interview skills	66.6%	4.0%	***
ITG receipt	8.6%	6.1%	***
Job readiness	3.3%	2.7%	
Job search	66.0%	30.7%	***
Orientation	98.0%	88.4%	***
Referrals	58.2%	14.6%	***
Resume preparation	39.8%	13.1%	***
Workshops/Education services	78.4%	10.8%	***
Number of services <sup>2</sup>	5.8	3.0	***
	(2.1)	(1.7)	
Number of total services	11.0	5.5	***
	(6.4)	(6.0)	

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing type of service received are chi-square. Tests comparing number of services and number of total services are t-tests.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for number of services and number of total services are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

**Table 4.3c. Relationship of Workforce I Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce I Career Center to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	8.88***	32.53***	59.32***
Workforce I Transportation Career Center	1.00***	1.73***	3.88***	5.50
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.34***	0.19	0.13	26.08***
2009	-0.29***	-0.35*	-1.26***	-58.81***
Age	-0.01***	0.01**	-0.01	0.66***
Female	-0.00	-0.26*	-1.75***	-1.63
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.03	-0.93***	-0.30	9.47*
Hispanic	-0.06	-0.75***	0.21	4.32
Other/Multi-racial	0.11*	-0.84***	-0.26	1.55
No race designation	-0.28***	-0.88***	-0.09	8.64
Disability	-0.35***	-0.59	-1.18*	1.29
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.35***	-0.73***	-0.07	2.16
High school diploma/GED	-0.05*	-0.35**	-0.10	0.39
College degree, 4 year	-0.05	0.40*	0.31	-6.31
Graduate degree	-0.11	0.42	-0.71	-7.80
Enrolled in school	0.05	0.15	-1.12***	-4.73
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.02***	0.12***	0.06***	0.78***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00***	0.01	0.06***	0.02
N =	127,700	13,299	13,299	13,299

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

We also see that older participants, participants with a disability, and those with less than an associates degree are less likely to be placed. For those who are placed in jobs or promoted, higher hourly wages are positively related to being male, white, and having a college degree. Higher average hours worked per week for those placed is related to being male, not having a disability, not being enrolled in school, and having higher hourly

wages at program entry. Male workers, younger workers, and those who had lower wage jobs at program entry are placed more quickly than other workers.

The regression models in Table 4.3d control for service receipt as well as participant characteristics in examining the relationship between program participation and job outcomes. We find that there is no

**Table 4.3d. Relationship of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce1 Career Center and Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	9.03***	33.45***	35.98***
Workforce1 Transportation Career Center	-0.08	1.21**	2.76***	-8.09
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.28***	0.12	-0.09	30.08***
2009	-0.46***	-0.99*	-0.21	-60.75***
Age	-0.01***	0.02**	-0.02*	0.33***
Female	0.17	-0.30**	-1.75***	-0.19
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.14**	-0.72**	-0.32	6.35
Hispanic	-0.13*	-0.67*	-0.11	0.47
Other/Multi-racial	-0.06	-0.96**	-0.61	-2.44
No race designation	-0.37***	-0.52	-0.03	6.09
Disability	-0.23**	-0.79*	-0.97	0.98
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.05	-0.69**	0.07	3.79
High school diploma/GED	0.05	-0.47**	0.02	-0.12
College degree, 4 year	-0.04	0.05	0.30	-7.05*
Graduate degree	-0.18	0.22	-0.12	-11.88
Enrolled in school	0.01	0.28	-1.23***	0.10
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.11***	0.05***	0.64***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	0-00	0.01	0.06***	-0.01
Service received				
Assessment	0.04	-0.47*	-0.17	13.76***
Computer skills	0.08	-0.07	-0.08	14.12***
Counseling	0.14***	0.20	0.10	7.32**
Facilities	0.05	-0.06	0.37	5.04
Financial services	0.07	-0.79	0.71	42.98**
Interview skills	0.73***	-0.18	0.67*	-10.81**
ITG receipt	1.16***	1.53***	0.55*	52.99***
Job readiness	0.03	-0.50	0.14	-1.64
Job search	0.93***	0.30	-0.23	-3.55
Orientation	0.24***	-0.36	0.14	3.59
Referrals	0.36***	0.14	-0.36	43.27***
Resume preparation	-0.16***	-0.12	-0.28	7.41*
Workshops/Education services	0.30***	-0.15*	0.02	1.65
N =	127,700	13,299	13,299	13,299

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

relationship between participation in Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and higher placement rates or time to

placement, but participants in Workforce1 Transportation Career Center earn higher wages and work a greater number of weekly

hours. In addition, after controlling for services, we find that Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants are placed in jobs or receive promotions sooner than WF1CC participants.

Participant characteristics generally exhibit the same significant relationships to job outcomes in Table 4.3d as in Table 4.3c. ITG receipt has a positive relationship on all of the job outcomes and on the time to placement. Participants who received an ITG are more than 3 times as likely to be placed in a job. Counseling, interview skills, job search, orientation, referrals, and workshops also have a positive relationship with job placement. Assessment and training are negatively related to hourly wages. Aside from ITG receipt only interview skills have a positive relationship with weekly hours worked. Participants who receive assessments, computer skills, counseling, financial services, referrals,<sup>9</sup> and resume preparation spend a longer time in the program before placement. This correlation may be because these participants have a greater amount of time to access services than do participants who are placed quickly.

Table 4.3e includes the number of services received. After controlling for these additional variables, we still find that Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants have higher placement rates, higher wages, higher average weekly hours, and shorter time to placement than WF1CC participants. Higher numbers of services and are correlated with higher placement rates and longer time to placement but are not significantly related to hourly wage or weekly hours worked.

<sup>9</sup> Participants who received referrals are 1.7 times as likely to receive a placement, but among those placed, spend about 43 days longer in the program. This may be because referrals to employers for job ready candidates and referrals to non-employers for those who need more intensive engagement are considered together.

In summary, we find that the Transportation Sector Center and WF1CC serve somewhat different populations of participants, with Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants being younger, more likely to be male, more likely to indicate they are African American, less likely to indicate they are Hispanic, more likely to have at least a high school diploma but less likely to have a college degree, less likely to be enrolled in school, and more likely to be employed at program entry. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants tend to receive more services than WF1CC participants. We find a positive relationship between Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participation and placement, hourly wage, and weekly hours worked compared with participants participating at the WF1CCs, after controlling for participant characteristics, prior employment, and services received. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants also tend to experience a shorter time to placement than WF1CC participants.

#### 4.4 Comparison of Employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and WF1CC Participants

The next set of research questions to be addressed concerns the differences between the characteristics and employment outcomes of employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants and WF1CC participants.

Table 4.4a shows the differences in participant characteristics between employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and WF1CC participants. A higher proportion of Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants are male and a higher proportion report being white or have no race designa-

tion, while a higher proportion of WF1CC participants indicate they are African American, or other/multiracial. WF1CC participants are more likely to have less than a high school degree and more likely to have a 4-year college degree or a graduate degree.

They are also more likely to be enrolled in school. At program entry, Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants earn higher hourly wages and work a greater number of weekly hours.

**Table 4.3e. Relationship of Workforce I Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce I Career Center and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	8.84***	32.37***	26.15***
Workforce I Transportation Career Center	0.33***	1.71***	3.76***	-18.02***
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.36***	0.19	0.13	25.93***
2009	-0.38***	-0.34*	-1.24***	-54.94***
Age	-0.02***	0.12**	-0.01	0.38***
Female	0.01	-0.26*	-1.74***	-0.25
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.12***	-0.93***	-0.32	5.04
Hispanic	-0.12***	-0.75***	0.19	0.98
Other/Multi-racial	0.05	-0.85***	-0.28	-2.01
No race designation	-0.33***	-0.89***	-0.12	3.40
Disability	-0.40***	-0.60	-1.19*	-0.80
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.23***	-0.73***	-0.06	5.27
High school diploma/GED	-0.01	-0.35**	-0.09	1.41
College degree, 4 year	-0.09**	0.40*	0.30	-8.27*
Graduate degree	-0.15*	0.42	-0.72	-9.32
Enrolled in school	0.05	0.15	-1.11***	-3.74
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.12***	0.06***	0.79***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00**	0.01	0.07***	0.03
Number of services	0.24***	0.01	0.06	11.01***
N =	127,700	13,299	13,299	13,299

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table 4.4a. Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and Workforce1 Career Center Participants**

	Workforce 1 Transportation Career Center	Workforce 1 Career Centers	Chi-Square/ T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	1,102	18,791	
Year of enrollment			
2007	3.5%	21.7%	***
2008	58.6%	49.9%	***
2009	37.8%	28.4%	***
Age <sup>2</sup>	35.9 (11.7)	35.4 (12.4)	
Female	20.7%	61.9%	***
Race			
White, non-Hispanic	10.6%	8.4%	*
African American	42.6%	45.6%	*
Hispanic	23.2%	25.3%	
Other/Multi-racial	9.1%	10.1%	
No race designation	14.5%	10.5%	***
Disability	1.6%	2.1%	
Education level			
Less than high school	5.7%	15.3%	***
High school diploma/GED	44.1%	34.0%	***
Associates/Vocational degree	37.8%	34.2%	*
College degree, 4 year	10.7%	13.3%	*
Graduate degree	1.7%	3.3%	**
Enrolled in school	13.9%	20.7%	***
Employed at program entry	100.0%	100.0%	
Wage at program entry/most recent job	\$12.14 (6.64)	\$11.41 (6.57)	***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	36.0 (11.6)	32.5 (11.5)	***

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing age, wage at program entry, and average hours worked per week are t-tests. All other characteristics are compared using chi-square statistics.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for age, wage at program entry/most recent job and average hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

Table 4.4b shows the rate of service receipt for Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and WF1CC participants who are employed at program entry. There is no difference in the percent of participants in the two programs who receive ITGs or job

readiness services. However, Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants are more likely to receive the majority of services with the exception of assessment, computer skills, and access to facilities (i.e. use of internet, copier, fax machines, etc.).



Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants also receive a higher number of

different services, on average, and a higher number of repeated services.

**Table 4.4b. Comparison of Service Receipt for Employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and Workforce1 Career Center Participants**

	Workforce1 Transportation Career Center	Workforce1 Career Centers	Chi-Square/ T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	1,102	18,791	
Type of service			
Assessment	49.3%	71.1%	***
Computer skills	7.5%	12.7%	***
Counseling	68.5%	26.9%	***
Facilities	9.8%	17.1%	***
Financial services	1.4%	0.3%	***
Interview skills	48.9%	4.1%	***
ITG receipt	10.3%	11.0%	
Job readiness	3.5%	3.1%	
Job search	58.0%	42.6%	***
Orientation	96.9%	77.9%	***
Referrals	52.1%	7.7%	***
Resume preparation	27.1%	12.4%	***
Training/Other preparation	65.8%	11.0%	***
Number of services <sup>2</sup>	5.0 (2.4)	3.0 (1.8)	***
Number of total services	8.6 (6.5)	5.5 (5.8)	***

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing type of service received are chi-square. Tests comparing number of services and number of total services are t-tests.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for number of services and number of total services are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

Table 4.4c examines the differences between employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and WF1CC participants on employment outcomes and time to placement. Controlling for demographic characteristics, work history, and year of enrollment, Transportation Sector Center participants are 3.5 times more likely to be placed in jobs than WF1CC participants. Additionally, they earn higher hourly wages in those jobs, controlling for previous wages, and they work more hours per week, on

average, than their WF1CC counterparts. Moreover, Transportation Sector Center participants are placed in jobs faster than WF1CC participants.

Participants who enrolled in 2009 are significantly less likely to receive a placement than participants who enrolled in 2008. Among those who are placed, participants who enrolled in 2007 spend significantly longer in the program before placement than those who enrolled in 2008. Participants who

enrolled in 2009 spend significantly shorter periods of time in the program before placement. Additionally, participants who enrolled in 2009 earn less and work fewer hours than those who enrolled in 2008.

Older participants and those with less than a high school degree are less likely to be placed. For those who are placed in jobs or promoted, those who earn higher wages tend to be male, indicate they are white as opposed

to African American or Hispanic, have an associates or vocational degree and earn more at program entry. Males, those who were not enrolled in school, and those who worked more hours at program entry work greater number of hours after placement. Older workers and those with a disability take a longer time to be placed in jobs or promoted.

**Table 4.4c. Relationship of Workforce I Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce I Career Center Participation to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	11.33***	33.59***	74.95***
Workforce I Transportation Career Center	1.24***	2.21***	4.89***	-21.39**
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.13*	-0.24	0.15	30.43***
2009	-0.34***	-0.70*	-1.10*	-62.57***
Age	-0.01***	-0.02	-0.00	0.68**
Female	-0.02	-0.65**	-1.80***	-5.47
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.07	-1.35***	-0.79	4.27
Hispanic	-0.06	-1.36**	-0.14	-1.79
Other/Multi-racial	-0.01	-0.39	0.16	-3.89
No race designation	-0.06	1.50**	-1.00	-3.94
Disability	-0.27	-0.10	-0.46	35.09*
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.37***	-0.99**	-0.89	-4.42
High school diploma/GED	-0.06	-0.58*	-0.57	-0.15
College degree, 4 year	-0.06	0.60	-0.23	0.23
Graduate degree	-0.06	-1.56*	1.48	8.47
Enrolled in school	0.02	-0.20	-0.79*	-9.89
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01	0.08***	-0.02	0.12
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.02*	0.06***	0.12
N =	19,893	3,052	3,052	3,052

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

The regression models in Table 4.4d control for service receipt as well as participant characteristics in examining the relationship between program participation and job outcomes. Similar to the findings in the previous models, Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants are 3.5 times as likely to be placed in jobs as their WF1CC counterparts. Further, among those who are placed, Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants earn higher hourly wages, work greater hours, and are placed more quickly than WF1CC participants.

Once again, ITG receipt has a positive relationship on all of the job outcomes and on the time to placement. Customers who receive an ITG are 2.6 times as likely to be placed in jobs. Receipt of computer skills, interview skills, job search, orientation, referrals and workshops or education services are positively correlated with placement, while resume preparation is negatively related to placement. Those participants who receive counseling earn higher hourly wages; however, there are no other services that lead to increases in wages or hours. Assessment, referrals,<sup>10</sup> and resume preparation services are associated with longer time to placement while interview skills and job search skills are associated with shorter time to placement.

The models in Table 4.4e include the number of services received. After controlling for the number of services, we find that Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants are 2.1 times more likely to be placed in jobs, and among those who are placed, they have higher hourly wages and greater weekly hours than WF1CC participants and they are placed in job faster. The number of services is positively related to

placement and time to placement but not related to hourly wage and hours worked per week.

In summary, we find that rate of placement is higher for employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants, even after controlling for demographic characteristics and services received. They earn higher hourly wages and work a greater number of hours. Further, they are placed into jobs at a faster rate. For participants in both programs, services have a positive effect on placement but, with the exception of ITG receipt and counseling, are not related to higher wages or more weekly hours.

These findings are true both for participants who are employed at program entry and for those who are not. When the combined sample of employed and unemployed participants in the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and the Workforce1 Career Centers are compared, we find that Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants are 3.0 times more likely to be placed in jobs than the comparison group, and on average earn almost \$2.00 more per hour in those jobs. Appendix B presents the tables for the analysis of the combined sample of employed and unemployed.

The cost-benefit analysis presented in Appendix F indicates that the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center is cost effective in the long run. The 5-year net benefit associated with this program is estimated to be over \$30 million and net return-on-investment is estimated to be 910 percent (range of 850 percent to 1,110 percent). That is, every dollar invested in this program in 2009 will result in \$9.10 return to taxpayers over the five years.

<sup>10</sup> That is likely because referrals to non-employers for customers who need more intensive engagement before they are ready for employment are combined with referrals to employers for work ready customers.

**Table 4.4d. Relationship of Workforce I Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce I Career Center Participation and Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	11.37***	33.71***	52.61***
Workforce I Transportation Career Center	0.56***	2.10***	4.88***	-30.07***
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	-0.05	-0.27	0.21	39.97***
2009	0.19**	-0.53	-0.76	-58.17***
Age	-0.01***	-0.02	-0.01	0.16
Female	0.03	-0.55*	-1.69***	-0.28
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.07	-1.20**	-0.56	0.15
Hispanic	-0.07	-1.38**	-0.09	-8.05
Other/Multi-racial	-0.10	-0.67	-0.09	-19.34*
No race designation	-0.08	-1.36**	-0.65	0.22
Disability	-0.23	-0.09	-0.50	21.04
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.19*	-1.10**	-0.97	-6.73
High school diploma/GED	-0.05	-0.59*	-0.73*	-4.73
College degree, 4 year	-0.11	0.54	-0.22	-3.13
Graduate degree	-0.09	-1.46*	1.25	11.04
Enrolled in school	0.02	-0.02	-0.61	-1.61
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01	0.08***	-0.02	0.14
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.02	0.06***	-0.05
Service received				
Assessment	0.12	0.04	-1.15**	14.96*
Computer skills	0.18*	0.03	-0.65	7.10
Counseling	0.01	1.01***	-0.36	4.34
Facilities	0.06	-0.19	0.31	8.45
Financial services	0.24	-2.28	0.79	20.11
Interview skills	0.69***	-0.57	0.55	-13.19*
ITG receipt	0.95***	0.90**	2.82***	62.14***
Job readiness	-0.02	-1.06*	0.11	3.17
Job search	0.96***	0.11	-0.22	-11.99*
Orientation	0.36***	-0.68*	0.65	11.30
Referrals	0.79***	0.28	-0.65	47.13***
Resume preparation	-0.23***	-0.45	-0.39	16.13*
Workshops/Education services	-0.62***	0.16	0.62	8.64
N =	19,893	3,052	3,052	3,052

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table 4.4e. Relationship of Workforce I Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce I Career Center Participation and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	11.19***	33.34***	31.53*
Workforce I Transportation Career Center	0.74***	2.15***	4.78***	-41.10***
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.08	-0.23	0.16	32.17***
2009	-0.33***	-0.67*	-1.05*	-54.19***
Age	-0.01***	-0.02	-0.00	0.39
Female	0.02	-0.65**	-1.79***	-4.22
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.12	-1.36***	-0.81	0.51
Hispanic	-0.11	-1.36**	-0.15	-4.00
Other/Multi-racial	-0.05	-0.41	0.13	-9.74
No race designation	-0.10	-1.49**	-0.99	1.80
Disability	-0.31	-0.13	-0.53	23.34
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.33***	-0.98**	-0.87	-1.50
High school diploma/GED	-0.07	-0.58*	-0.57	0.23
College degree, 4 year	-0.10	0.59	-0.24	-2.00
Graduate degree	-0.07	-1.55*	1.50	11.74
Enrolled in school	0.03	-0.20	-0.79*	-10.39
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.08***	-0.02	0.25
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.02	0.06***	0.01
Number of services	0.20***	0.05	0.09	14.61***
N =	19,893	3,052	3,052	3,052

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

### 4.5 Comparison of Unemployed Community Partners Program and WF1CC Participants

Our fifth set of comparisons is between the Community Partners Program and WF1CC participants who are not employed at program entry. The Community Partners

Program was designed to bring under-served, low-income, job-ready candidates into the WF1CCs for job placement. By partnering with CBOs, the WF1CCs are trying to extend their reach into low-income communities to recruit job candidates ready for immediate placement. Table 4.5a shows that the unemployed Community Partners Program participants are different from the participants traditionally served by the WF1CCs.

Community Partners Program participants tend to be younger, are slightly more likely to have a disability, and have significantly lower levels of education (e.g., less than a high school degree, a high school degree or GED) than WF1CC participants. However, they are more likely to be enrolled in school. A higher percentage of Community Partners Program participants reporting their racial ethnic

category are African American and a smaller percentage are white, Hispanic, another race or multi-racial, or lacking a race designation.

At their most recent job, Community Partners Program participants who are unemployed at program entry earned lower hourly wages and worked slightly fewer hours per week, on average.

**Table 4.5a. Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Unemployed Community Partners Program and Workforce Career Center Participants**

	Community Partners Program	Workforce Career Centers	Chi-Square/ T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	7,024	124,957	
Year of enrollment			
2007	17.1%	17.2%	
2008	59.3%	48.1%	***
2009	25.6%	34.8%	***
Age <sup>2</sup>	33.1 (12.7)	37.0 (13.0)	***
Female	55.2%	56.1%	
Race			
White, non-Hispanic	3.8%	10.3%	***
African American	56.6%	39.3%	***
Hispanic	23.5%	31.0%	***
Other/Multi-racial	6.7%	7.9%	***
No race designation	9.4%	11.6%	***
Disability	4.2%	3.6%	**
Education level			
Less than high school	22.5%	18.4%	***
High school diploma/GED	39.2%	33.2%	***
Associates/Vocational degree	29.9%	31.9%	***
College degree, 4 year	7.2%	13.0%	***
Graduate degree	1.3%	3.5%	***
Enrolled in school	22.0%	15.3%	***
Employed at program entry	0.0%	0.0%	
Wage at program entry/most recent job	\$10.60 (5.91)	\$14.12 (10.08)	***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	34.3 (10.7)	36.3 (10.4)	***

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing age, wage at program entry, and average hours worked per week are t-tests. All other characteristics are compared using chi-square statistics.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for age, wage at program entry/most recent job and average hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job are means with standard deviation in parentheses.



The Community Partners Program model dictates that CBOs screen participant customers prior to referral and send only job-ready participants to the WF1CCs in response to job announcements. Job-readiness training and skills training are the responsibility of the CBOs. CBOs are evaluated by Community Partners Program coordinators on their ability to send high-quality candidates to the WF1CCs. Those CBOs who send poor job candidates get less preferential treatment from the Community Partners Program and the WF1CCs; and the program may discontinue

working with those CBOs who consistently send job candidates who are not job-ready. Given this model, we would expect that Community Partners Program participants would need and receive fewer job-readiness and skills training services than traditional WF1CC participants. However, Table 4.5b shows that a larger percentage of Community Partners Program participants than WF1CC participants receive job readiness and training, although less than 15 percent of participants access these services in either group.

**Table 4.5b. Comparison of Service Receipt for Unemployed Community Partners Program and Workforce Career Center Participants**

	Community Partners Program	Workforce Career Centers	Chi-Square/T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	7,024	124,957	
Type of service			
Assessment	71.6%	73.2%	**
Computer skills	16.4%	13.9%	***
Counseling	29.4%	22.5%	***
Facilities	24.4%	17.4%	***
Financial services	0.3%	0.3%	
Interview skills	12.1%	4.0%	***
ITG receipt	3.7%	6.1%	***
Job readiness	5.3%	2.7%	***
Job search	56.2%	30.7%	***
Orientation	79.2%	88.4%	***
Referrals	17.1%	14.6%	***
Resume preparation	15.9%	13.1%	***
Workshops/Education services	14.1%	10.8%	***
Number of services <sup>2</sup>	3.5	3.0	***
	(2.1)	(1.7)	
Number of total services	7.0	5.5	***
	(7.0)	(6.0)	

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing type of service received are chi-square. Tests comparing number of services and number of total services are t-tests.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for number of services and number of total services are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

Overall, Community Partners Program participants are much more likely to get job search services than WF1CC participants,

which fits the program model of providing immediate job placement services to qualified job candidates referred by the CBOs.

Community Partners Program participants are more likely to receive computer skills, counseling, interview skills, referrals, and resume preparation services and to use the available facilities. Community Partners Program participants receive a significantly greater number of services than WF1CC participants.

Table 4.5c addresses the question of whether Community Partners Program participants have better job outcomes than traditional WF1CC participants. Controlling for demographic characteristics, work history, and year of enrollment, Community Partners Program participants are 4 times as likely to be placed in jobs as WF1CC participants. This is not surprising given the focus of the Community Partners Program is to serve those individuals who are “work ready” and therefore likely easier to place in jobs. However, among those who are placed, Community Partners Program participants tend to earn lower hourly wages in those jobs, controlling for previous wages. There are no significant differences between the two groups in their weekly hours worked or in the amount of time spent in the program before placement.

Participants who enrolled in 2007 are placed at a higher rate, but take longer to be placed than participants who enrolled in 2008. While participants who enrolled in 2009 are placed at a lower rate, but are placed faster than participants who enrolled in 2008. Again, this is likely a function of the data collection period that allowed less time for placement for participants who enrolled later. However, those who enrolled in 2009, earn less and work fewer hours than those who enrolled in 2008. This likely reflects changes in the economic climate between 2008 and 2009 that made jobs with high wages and lots of hours harder to find.

Younger participants are more likely to be placed and there appear to be some race differences with participants who consider themselves other or multi-racial being more likely to be placed, and those with no race designation less likely to be placed. There is also a significant effect of education with those having a high school diploma or less, being less likely to be placed than those with an associates or vocational degree. Those participants with higher wages and higher numbers of hours worked at their most recent job were less likely to be placed or promoted.

Among those who are placed, women earn lower wages and work fewer hours. Those who indicate their race is white and those with more than a high school diploma earn the highest hourly wages. Participants with a disability and those enrolled in school tend to work fewer weekly hours.

When we include service receipt in the models, we find that the relationships between Community Partners Program participation and placement and hourly wages still hold (see Table 4.5d). There is no relationship between Community Partners Program participation and hours worked or time to placement.

When we look at the relationship of specific services to job outcomes, we find that the majority of services are positively related to placement, except for financial services and job readiness which have no effect on placement. As with previous comparisons, those who receive ITGs do consistently better on all four outcomes. ITG receipt is associated with 3 times greater odds of placement. Job search services are positively correlated with hourly wages, but job readiness, orientation, and workshops or education services are negatively correlated with hourly wages. Two of these services, job

**Table 4.5c. Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce I Career Center Participation to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	8.90 **	32.45***	56.67***
Community Partners Program	1.38***	-0.62***	-0.03	1.20
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.40***	0.20*	0.09	26.79***
2009	-0.36***	-0.41**	-1.59***	-56.29***
Age	-0.01***	0.10*	-0.01*	0.80***
Female	-0.01	-0.22*	-1.78***	-0.49
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.00	-0.91***	-0.21	7.12
Hispanic	-0.07	-0.81***	0.25	2.85
Other/Multi-racial	0.14**	-0.76**	-0.08	0.07
No race designation	-0.24***	-0.86***	-0.01	5.54
Disability	-0.34***	-0.49	-1.31**	0.73
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.36***	-0.72***	-0.19	-0.74
High school diploma/GED	-0.07**	-0.34**	-0.20	-0.94
College degree, 4 year	-0.03	0.32	0.24	-6.97*
Graduate degree	-0.12	0.22	-0.65	-6.93
Enrolled in school	0.01	0.20	-1.05***	-2.66
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.12***	0.07***	0.76***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00*	0.01*	0.07***	-0.01
N =	131,981	16,497	16,497	16,497

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table 4.5d. Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce I Career Center Participation and Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	8.95***	31.90***	28.67***
Community Partners Program	1.06***	-0.44***	-0.00	4.51
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.36***	0.22*	0.07	30.64***
2009	-0.31***	-0.35*	-1.27***	-64.60***
Age	-0.01***	0.01*	-0.01*	0.48***
Female	0.02	-0.23*	-1.77***	0.96
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.10**	-0.84***	-0.16	4.30
Hispanic	-0.10**	-0.76***	0.28	-0.15
Other/Multi-racial	-0.02	-0.84***	-0.10	-4.60
No race designation	-0.31***	-0.77***	-0.00	2.60
Disability	-0.29***	-0.43	-1.27**	0.58
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.12***	-0.65***	-0.15	1.07
High school diploma/GED	0.00	-0.36**	-0.20	-0.91
College degree, 4 year	-0.05	0.31	0.22	-7.85*
Graduate degree	-0.11	0.16	-0.70	-10.15
Enrolled in school	0.01	0.22	-1.01***	1.25
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.12***	0.06***	0.64***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.01*	0.07***	-0.02
Service received				
Assessment	0.26***	-0.20	-0.21	11.10***
Computer skills	0.08**	-0.11	0.06	13.67***
Counseling	0.09***	0.04	-0.06	8.33***
Facilities	0.10***	0.11	0.10	5.08
Financial services	0.12	-0.96	1.25	25.52
Interview skills	0.73***	-0.15	0.77***	-10.62***
ITG receipt	1.10***	1.56***	0.93***	50.64***
Job readiness	0.06	-0.80***	0.59*	-0.92
Job search	0.92***	0.31**	0.24	0.31
Orientation	0.14***	-0.39**	0.49*	7.87*
Referrals	0.59***	-0.02	-0.49*	46.38***
Resume preparation	-0.19***	-0.05	-0.15	6.47*
Workshops/Education services	-0.36***	-0.37*	-0.15	3.62
N =	131,981	16,497	16,497	16,497

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

readiness and workshops, are used relatively rarely by participants in either program. Interview skills, job readiness, and orientation are positively related to hourly wages while referrals have a negative relationship with hourly wages. This findings is likely being driven by the referrals to non-employers for candidates who need additional services before they are ready to be placed in a job.

The data models in Table 4.5e examine the relationship between the number of services received and employment outcomes. As with the models that considered type of

services received, participation in the Community Partners Program has a positive effect on placement into a job, such that Community Partners Program participants are 3.4 times more likely to be placed than WF1CC participants. Community Partners Program participation is negatively correlated with hourly wages and has no relationship to weekly hours or time to placement. The number of different services is positively related to placement, weekly hours, and time to placement, but does not have an effect on hourly wages.

**Table 4.5e. Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce Center Participation and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	8.89***	32.11***	22.80***
Community Partners Program	1.23***	-0.62***	-0.06	-1.83
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.36***	0.20*	0.10	27.10***
2009	-0.35***	-0.41**	-1.76***	-53.53***
Age	-0.02***	0.01*	-0.02*	0.51***
Female	0.01	-0.22*	-1.76***	1.05
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.10**	-0.91***	-0.25	3.09
Hispanic	-0.12***	-0.81***	0.22	-0.03
Other/Multi-racial	0.07	-0.76**	-0.12	-3.57
No race designation	-0.30***	-0.86***	-0.07	0.14
Disability	-0.38***	-0.49	-1.32**	-0.59
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.25***	-0.72***	-0.16	2.68
High school diploma/GED	-0.02	-0.34**	-0.18	0.63
College degree, 4 year	-0.08*	0.32	0.22	-8.92**
Graduate degree	-0.14**	0.22	-0.68	-8.99
Enrolled in school	0.03	0.20	-1.04***	-1.84
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.12***	0.07***	0.78***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.01*	0.07***	-0.00
Number of services	0.22***	0.00	0.11***	11.13***
N =	131,981	16,497	16,497	16,497

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

### 4.6 Comparison of Employed Community Partners Program and WF1CC Participants

Our final set of comparisons is between Community Partners Program and WF1CC participants who were employed at program entry. Table 4.6a shows that Community Partners Program participants tend to be

younger and are more likely to have lower levels of education (e.g., less than a high school degree, a high school degree or GED) than WF1CC participants. However, they are more likely to be enrolled in school at program entry. A higher percentage of Community Partners Program participants reporting their racial ethnic category are African American and a smaller percentage are white, Hispanic, another race or multi-racial.

**Table 4.6a. Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Employed Community Partners Program and Workforce I Career Center Participants**

	Community Partners Program	Workforce I Career Center	Chi-Square/ T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	1,258	18,791	
Year of enrollment			
2007	17.8%	21.7%	**
2008	61.6%	49.9%	***
2009	20.6%	28.4%	***
Age <sup>2</sup>	33.1 (12.1)	35.4 (12.4)	***
Female	59.8%	61.9%	
Race			
White, non-Hispanic	3.6%	8.4%	***
African American	57.8%	45.6%	***
Hispanic	19.0%	25.3%	***
Other/Multi-racial	8.0%	10.1%	*
No race designation	11.6%	10.5%	
Disability	2.1%	2.1%	
Education level			
Less than high school	19.1%	15.3%	***
High school diploma/GED	39.2%	34.0%	***
Associates/Vocational degree	32.1%	34.2%	
College degree, 4 year	8.4%	13.3%	***
Graduate degree	1.2%	3.3%	***
Enrolled in school	25.7%	20.7%	***
Employed at program entry	100.0%	100.0%	
Wage at program entry/most recent job	\$9.94 (4.56)	\$11.41 (6.57)	***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	31.8 (10.8)	32.5 (11.5)	*

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing age, wage at program entry, and average hours worked per week are t-tests. All other characteristics are compared using chi-square statistics.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for age, wage at program entry/most recent job and average hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

At program entry employed Community Partners Program participants earn lower wages and work fewer weekly hours than traditional WF1CC participants. This is consistent with the Community Partners Program goal to target under-served, low-income candidates for job placement through the WF1CCs.

As with the previous models comparing unemployed Community Partners Program and WF1CC participants, Table 4.6b shows that participants in Community Partners

Program are more likely than WF1CC participants to receive most services, excluding assessment, ITG receipt, and orientation. That Community Partners Program customers are less likely to receive ITGs is consistent with the goal of the program to serve job-ready candidates. Community Partners Program participants receive slightly more different services than WF1CC participants and they received more repeated services than WF1CC participants.

**Table 4.6b. Comparison of Service Receipt for Employed Community Partners Program and Workforce Career Center Participants**

	Community Partners Program	Workforce Career Center	Chi-Square/T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	1,258	18,791	
Type of service			
Assessment	69.4%	71.1%	
Computer skills	16.5%	12.7%	***
Counseling	33.4%	26.9%	***
Facilities	24.8%	17.1%	***
Financial services	5.4%	0.3%	***
Interview skills	15.0%	4.1%	***
ITG receipt	4.3%	11.0%	***
Job readiness	6.5%	3.1%	***
Job search	62.5%	42.6%	***
Orientation	75.5%	77.9%	*
Referrals	20.2%	7.7%	***
Resume preparation	19.7%	12.4%	***
Workshops/Education services	15.3%	11.0%	***
Number of services <sup>2</sup>	3.7	3.0	***
	(2.3)	(1.8)	
Number of total services	7.7	5.5	***
	(7.7)	(5.8)	

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing type of service received are chi-square. Tests comparing number of services and number of total services are t-tests.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for number of services and number of total services are means with standard deviation in parentheses.



Table 4.6c examines the relationship between participant characteristics and out-comes for employed Community Partners Program and WF1CC participants.

Controlling for demographic characteristics, work history, and year of program enrollment, Community Partners Program participants are 4.5 more likely to be placed in jobs than traditional WF1CC participants. Among those who are placed Community Partners Program participants earn lower hourly wages, controlling for wages at program entry. However, there is no relationship between Community Partners Program participation and weekly hours or time to placement.

We see similar relationship between year of enrollment and the four employment outcomes as with previous comparisons. Younger workers, those with less than an associates or vocational degree, and those with a disability are less likely to be placed. Hourly wage is associated with race, such that white workers earn higher wages than non-white workers. Female workers have lower hourly wages than male workers. Educational level is also correlated with wage with less educated workers receiving lower wages than more educated workers. Age and race are not related to average weekly hours worked though being female, having less than an associates or vocational degree, and being enrolled in school were correlated with working fewer hours. Younger program participants and those enrolled school experienced slightly shorter time to placement than older participants and those not enrolled in school.

Table 4.6d includes services along with participant characteristics. When services are included in the model, participants in Community Partners Program are still more than three times as likely to be placed as their WF1CC counterparts. However, there is no longer a negative correlation between the Community Partners Program participation and hourly wages. ITG receipt is related to higher rates of placement, higher wages, greater weekly hours, and a longer time to placement. Participants who receive an ITG are 2.8 times more likely to be placed in a job. Other services positively correlated with higher placement rates include assessment, computer skills, interview skills, job search skills, orientation, and referrals. Resume preparation and workshops are associated with lower placement rates. Few services are positively related to wages or hours, except counseling and interview skills. Computer skills, financial services, orientation, referrals, and resume preparation are more commonly received among those who spend more time in the program before placement.

The models in Table 4.6e include the number of services received. After controlling for the number of services, we find that Community Partners Program participants are 3.5 times more likely to be placed in jobs than traditional WF1CC participants. Among those who are placed, Community Partners Program participation is associated with lower hourly wages but is not associated with hours or time to placement. Number of services received is positively related to placement, hours, and time to placement.

**Table 4.6c. Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce I Career Center Participation to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	10.99***	33.70***	69.17***
Community Partners Program	1.51***	-0.59*	0.05	2.81
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.17***	-0.13	-0.03	31.32***
2009	-0.32***	-0.71*	-1.87***	-65.13***
Age	-0.01***	-0.02	-0.01	1.01***
Female	0.00	-0.43*	-1.84***	-4.51
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.07	-1.23**	-0.57	2.87
Hispanic	-0.05	-1.34**	-0.15	-1.53
Other/Multi-racial	-0.03	-0.36	0.17	-8.62
No race designation	-0.17	-1.25*	-0.73	-4.42
Disability	-0.43*	-0.49	0.35	31.38
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.48***	-0.84*	-1.13*	-8.83
High school diploma/GED	-0.10*	-0.58**	-0.83*	0.52
College degree, 4 year	-0.04	0.50	-0.15	-5.57
Graduate degree	-0.11	-1.09	1.43	7.27
Enrolled in school	-0.00	-0.11	-0.90*	-13.64*
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.07***	-0.03	0.28
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.02*	0.07***	-0.02
N =	20,049	3,302	3,302	3,302

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table 4.6d. Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce Center Participation and Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	10.78***	33.39***	44.51**
Community Partners Program	1.14***	-0.32	0.33	1.62
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.09*	-0.05	-0.03	39.63***
2009	-0.19**	-0.70*	-1.34*	-70.30***
Age	-0.01***	-0.02	-0.01	0.29
Female	0.06	-0.32	-1.74***	1.22
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.07	-1.10**	-0.33	-0.99
Hispanic	-0.05	-1.33**	-0.08	-5.71
Other/Multi-racial	-0.05	-0.57	-0.01	-19.78*
No race designation	-0.20*	-1.10**	-0.49	-4.01
Disability	-0.40*	-0.46	0.43	24.59
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.26***	-0.85*	-1.11*	-6.09
High school diploma/GED	-0.05	-0.61**	-0.90*	-2.20
College degree, 4 year	-0.09	0.49	-0.11	-6.97
Graduate degree	-0.11	-1.03	1.26	14.13
Enrolled in school	0.02	-0.00	-0.74	-5.27
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.07***	-0.03	0.38
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.01*	0.06***	-0.12
Service received				
Assessment	0.30***	0.09	-1.29**	11.64
Computer skills	0.17*	0.05	-0.84	16.43*
Counseling	-0.07	0.54*	-0.22	7.88
Facilities	0.02	-0.24	0.60	5.93
Financial services	-0.26	-1.46*	1.26	43.57**
Interview skills	1.01***	-0.03	1.19*	-10.71
ITG receipt	1.04***	1.22***	2.84***	58.04***
Job readiness	-0.08	-1.08	1.18	8.73
Job search	0.88***	0.05	0.12	-7.52
Orientation	0.22***	-0.53	0.76	13.05*
Referrals	0.78***	0.54	-0.61	54.89***
Resume preparation	-0.17**	0.00	-0.92	16.57*
Workshops/Education services	-0.47***	-0.03	0.75	1.38
N =	20,049	3,302	3,302	3,302

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table 4.6e. Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce I Career Center Participation and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	10.81***	33.24***	23.33
Community Partners Program	1.24***	-0.63*	-0.06	-6.14
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.04	-0.12	-0.01	52.93***
2009	-0.18**	-0.68*	-1.78***	-66.34***
Age	-0.02***	-0.02	-0.01	0.33
Female	0.02	-0.42*	-1.82***	-2.16
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.13	-1.25**	-0.61	1.91
Hispanic	-0.10	-1.35**	-0.18	-5.46
Other/Multi-racial	-0.06	-0.37	0.12	-14.16
No race designation	-0.24*	-1.26*	-0.76	-4.99
Disability	-0.45*	-0.53	0.27	-0.30
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.39***	-0.82*	-1.07	0.80
High school diploma/GED	-0.08	-0.58*	-0.81*	-0.53
College degree, 4 year	-0.06	0.50	-0.16	-3.93
Graduate degree	-0.06	-1.06	1.51	18.66
Enrolled in school	-0.02	-0.10	-0.89*	-2.92
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.07***	-0.02	0.40
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.02*	0.07***	-0.06
Number of services	0.20***	0.06	0.16*	19.56***
N =	20,049	3,302	3,302	3,302

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

In summary, the Community Partners Program population is somewhat different from the WF1CC population. Community Partners Program participants tend to be placed at higher rates than the WF1CC population but take longer to be placed. Among those who are placed, Community Partners Program participants tend to have lower hourly wages than their WF1CC counterparts. No significant difference was found between the two groups in the average

weekly hours worked. Many services had a strong positive relationship with placement rates but little impact on hourly wage or hours worked per week with the exception of ITG receipt. Participants in both programs who received ITG services are more likely to be placed, to earn higher wages, and to work a greater number of hours. Those who receive ITGs spend a longer time in the program before placement. This relationship, in part,

---

may be due to the length of time required to complete the ITG training.

These findings are true both for participants who are employed at program entry and those who are not. When the combined sample of employed and unemployed participants in the Community Partners Program and the Workforce1 Career Centers are compared, we find that Community Partners program participants are 4.3 times as likely to be placed, however, on average, they earn about \$.60 less in those jobs than Workforce1 Career Center participants. See Appendix C for these analyses.

As the cost-benefit analysis presented in Appendix F shows that the 5-year net benefit associated with the Community Partners Program is estimated to be over \$37 million and net return-on-investment is estimated to be 1,790 percent (range of 1,410 percent to 2,590 percent). In other words, every dollar invested in this program in 2009 will result in \$17.90 return to taxpayers over the five years.

## 5. Summary of Findings

### Participant Characteristics

Our analyses show that the three SBS-CEO programs and the WF1CC serve different populations of workers. Individuals both self-select and are referred into the different programs based on their personal preferences, their “work readiness”, their geographic proximity to various Career Center locations within the City, and the programs’ intended populations. Moreover, the programs also have specific eligibility criteria that shapes the populations served. Because of these differences caution must be used in interpreting the findings. When possible we included controls for participant characteristics that may influence such a bias. However, there are likely a number of characteristics (e.g. work history; job search motivation; “work readiness”; etc.) that we cannot measure that also influence the outcomes. With the data available it is impossible to know the extent to which differences in employment outcomes are attributable to differences in the programs themselves or to differences in the individuals served by these programs.

The Advance at Work program is unique among these employment programs in that it serves people who are employed at program entry. However, these participants earn the lowest hourly wages and work the fewest weekly hours at their current jobs compared to the wages and hours of the current or most recent jobs of participants in other programs. A smaller percentage of Advance at Work participants than their Workforce1 Transportation Career Center or WF1CC counterparts say that they are white and a higher percentage of Advance at Work participants indicate that they are African American, Hispanic, or another race/multi-racial than in any other program, though the difference between Advance at Work and Community Partners Program is not significant.

The Workforce1 Transportation Career Center program is noteworthy because it serves a much higher proportion of men than any other program. Participants in Workforce1 Transportation Career Center have comparable levels of education to participants in Advance at Work and the WF1CCS. However, among the programs that accept both employed and unemployed individuals the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center serves the highest proportion of participants who are employed at program entry. At their current or most recent jobs, Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants earn higher average wages than Advance at Work or Community Partners Program participants, but less than traditional WF1CC participants. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants work the greatest number of hours at their current or most recent jobs.

The Community Partners Program tends to serve a lower-income and less-educated population. A higher proportion indicate that they are African American and a lower proportion indicate that they are white than in any of the other programs. They have the youngest average age and they are more likely to have a disability than other participants. Further-more, higher percentages of Community Partners Program participants have the lowest levels of education but they are the most likely to be enrolled in school at program entry. Community Partners participants have the highest level of unemployment, with 90 percent out of work at the time of program entry. However, at program entry or at their most recent jobs, Community Partners Program participants earn higher average wages and work greater average hours than Advance at Work participants, but they earn lower average wages and work fewer average hours than Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and WF1CC participants.

## Service Receipt

The programs also provide different mixes of services to their participants. Advance at Work offers the highest number of services, with participants receiving, 6.6 services on average. Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants receive 5.5 services, on average, and Community Partners Programs participants receive an average 3.5 services. This is just slightly more than traditional WF1CC participants who receive an average of 3.0 services. The most common services received across all of the programs are assessment, job search, and orientation services. Participants in Advance at Work and Transportation Sector Center are disproportionately likely to receive counseling, resume preparation, and training. Financial services are almost exclusively used by Advance at Work customers. Advance at Work is one of the few programs which a goal to help jobseekers open bank accounts and manage their finances. Interview skills are most commonly received by those served by the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center. There are no services that are disproportionately used by the Community Partners Program or by the WF1CCs.

## Employment Outcomes

After controlling for differences in participant characteristics and services received, we find that participants in all three SBS-CEO programs have higher placement rates than participants served by the traditional WF1CC model.

Participants in Advance at Work have higher rates of placement, higher hourly wages and more weekly hours than comparable participants served by the WF1CCs. However, Advance at Work participants also spend significantly longer in the program

prior to being placed. This is consistent with the program model of long-term engagement.

Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants are placed at higher rates, have higher hourly wages and more weekly hours at placement than participants served by the WF1CC.

Participants in the Community Partners Program are placed at higher rates than comparable WF1CC participants. This is in line with the program's goal to place a large proportion of participants send to the program by CBOs. Yet they are placed in jobs that, on average, have lower hourly wages than the jobs secured by WF1CC participants. Further, participants in the Community Partners Program have a longer time to placement than their WF1CC counterparts.

In the comparison of Advance at Work and employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants, we found no difference in placement rates for participants served by the two programs but Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants had higher hourly wages and more hours worked, after controlling for previous wages. Advance at Work participants took longer to be placed than Workforce1 Transportation Career Center.

Across the regression models, a few participant characteristics were consistently associated with lower weekly hours worked, though not necessarily lower placement rates or lower wages. Female workers and those workers with disabilities were consistently more likely to work fewer hours. Whether this was by choice (e.g., wanting to work fewer hours to be able to care for children), necessity (e.g., being unable to work full time due to physical limitations), or discrimination is unknown. In some regression models we also found that older workers had lower placement rates than younger workers.



The three SBS-CEO programs and WF1CC provide an array of services for participants and different services were associated with different job outcomes depending on the other independent variables included in the regression models. A few services, however, appeared to be consistently associated with positive outcomes. In five of the six comparisons ITG receipt is positively related to higher placement and greater weekly hours after placement. In all six of the comparisons ITG receipt is associated with higher hourly wages after placement. In addition, job search and referrals were consistently associated with higher rates of placement across all six models. Interview skills and computer skills are associated with higher rates of placement across five models and four models, respectively. Other services were negatively correlated with placement. Resume preparation has a negative relationship with placement in all six models and other forms

of training has a negative relationship with placement in four of the six models; it is likely that these findings reflect a greater use of these specific services by program participants who are harder to place than a negative effect of resume preparation or training on participants' employability.

### Cost Benefit Analysis

According to the cost-benefit analyses each of these programs provides a significant savings to taxpayers over a five year period. Every dollar invested in the Advance at Work program in 2009 will result in \$1.10 return to taxpayers over the following five years. The projected 5-year net return-on-investment for taxpayers for the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center program is 910 percent over the five years. Finally, the 5-year net return-on-investment for the Community Partners Program is estimated to be 1,790 percent.

## 6. Conclusions and Implications

This report has presented a large and varied amount of information about the three CEO employment initiatives to this point. A few conclusions and policy recommendations can be drawn from the analyses presented.

The three programs are serving different target populations and participants who come to them appear to be faring better than similar participants who are served by the WF1CC. It may be that participants who are referred to one of the three SBS-CEO programs are more “work ready” than are similar participants who are served only by the WF1CC.

Because the participants in Advance at Work are already employed, it may take longer to see a placement change or a promotion than it does to get an unemployed person a job. Workers may need training in order to move from an entry-level job to one that offers opportunities for career investment. Advance at Work provides a wealth of services and it may take time for these services to pay off. Additionally, participants in Advance at Work appear to have greater access to benefits, such as health insurance and paid sick/vacation days, which is in line with the goal of the program to connect participants with such benefits. Caution must be used, however, in attributing this access to Advance at Work participation. The difference in access to benefits across programs may be because Advance at Work participants have longer employment histories and are therefore more likely to have reached a necessary tenure to receive such benefits. Additionally, Advance at Work is the only program that is required to track these data elements. For the other programs, these data are optional reporting elements.

The segmented approach of the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center appears particularly promising to get workers higher paid jobs with more hours per week in a

shorter length of time than seen in other programs. This may be because jobs in the transportation sector tend to offer higher wages or it may be because the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center tends to serve a more skilled, easier to place population. Unlike Advance at Work, Community Partners Program, or the WF1CCs, the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center predominantly serves men. Further, Workforce1 Transportation Career Center is less likely to serve the customers with the lowest level of education and participants who, on average, earned relatively higher wages and worked a greater number of hours than did participants in the Advance at Work or Community Partners Program programs at program entry. It may be that women or less skilled workers would not benefit as much from a sector focused approach. Future research on the Workforce1 Healthcare Career Center, which will likely serve more women, will shed some light on this.

These findings also suggest that the Community Partners Program is effective at serving less-skilled workers. This program has demonstrated that it is able to obtain placements for a higher percentage of program participants than Workforce1 Transportation Career Center or the WF1CC. Although the jobs provided through Community Partners Program may be lower-paying, they provide workers with work experience and may pave the way for future advancement and higher earnings.

It is beneficial for programs to offer an array of services that can be customized to the needs of particular participants. ITG services appear to be particularly promising in increasing placements, wages, and hours worked. This makes intuitive sense as Individual Training Grants (ITGs) lead to a concrete increase in skills and credentials for workers who receive and complete them. However, the strong positive effects of ITGs may be

compounded with other unmeasured characteristics. ITGs are reserved for “work ready” participants because a certain level of education or work experience is required to qualify for the training course or for the jobs the training will lead to.

The concern over missing data on several of the key employment outcomes and service variables requires that we use caution in interpreting these findings. The conflation of missing data and negative outcomes on placement limits our ability to distinguish program

effects with certainty. Caution must be used in interpreting these differences. If some programs do a better job of tracking participants we may be seeing differences in placement between programs that may or may not reflect real findings. Adding an additional data field for not having a placement or having lost contact with participants would greatly improve the validity of the data for making causal claims about the effects of different programs and services on the employment outcomes of interest.

## Appendix A. Using an Alternative Measure of Quantity of Services Received

---

There were multiple ways to measure the quantity of services participants received in each of the four programs. Some career centers would record a single service per visit to the career center (e.g. assessment) without distinguishing between the multiple services participants may have received during that visit (e.g. assessment, resume preparation, and facilities). Others would record multiple services for a single visit to the career center. Additionally, some participants received a particular service one time while others received the same service numerous times. Therefore, it is impossible to precisely distinguish between respondents who are repeatedly accessing the same service and respondents who access different services during every visit to the career centers. For this reason, we conducted the analysis in two ways. In the text of the report, we presented the findings for number of different services a participant received. *Number of services* indicates the total number of different types of services the client received between enrollment and placement. It ranges from 0-13. Below we present the findings for the number of repeated services a participant received. This measure, called *number of total services*, indicates the total number of services of any type that the client received between enrollment and placement including multiple counts for the same service. It ranges from 0-25.

The findings presented in Table A.1 through Table A.6 below indicate that the relationship between service receipt and job outcomes (i.e. placement, hourly wages, weekly hours, and time to placement) is robust to changes in the measure of service receipt. That is, the relationships between program participation and employment outcomes and the relationships between services and employment outcomes are consistent across the two different measures of service receipt for every model, with two minor exceptions.

For the comparison of Advance at Work participants and employed WF1CC participants earning less than \$14 per hour, participation in Advance at Work is significantly correlated with hourly wages in the model that includes number of different services received (see Table 4.1e), but not significant in the model that includes number of total services (see Table A.1). Similarly, for the comparison of Advance at Work participants to employed Workforce1 Transportation Career Center participants (see Table A.2), Advance at Work participants spend significantly more time in the program before placement in the model that includes number of different services. This finding is not significant in the model that includes number of total services.

The high degree of consistency between these models suggests that our inability to precisely distinguish between respondents who are repeatedly accessing the same service and respondents who accessing different services with every visit to the career centers is not problematic for any conclusions drawn about the effects of the quantity of service receipt.

**Table A.1. Relationship of Advance at Work vs. WFICC Participation and Number of Total Services Received to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals Earning Less Than \$14/Hour**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	8.30***	30.52***	27.15
Advance at Work	0.47***	0.44	1.10*	17.73*
Year of Enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	-0.00	0.01	0.33	66.71***
2009	-0.33***	-0.73*	-1.38*	-61.78***
Age	-0.01***	-0.01	0.01	0.47*
Female	-0.00	-0.21	-2.20***	-4.64
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.03	-0.57	-0.00	-2.59
Hispanic	-0.00	-0.38	0.63	-2.43
Other/Multi-racial	0.03	0.18	0.72	-10.45
No race designation	-0.02	-0.36	0.42	-2.95
Disability	-0.33*	-0.45	-3.39**	22.72
Education Level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.30***	-0.63*	-0.67	0.16
High school diploma/GED	-0.01	-0.36	-0.16	-0.44
College degree, 4 year	-0.05	0.30	0.41	-6.97
Graduate degree	-0.08	-0.22	-0.32	22.54
Enrolled in school	-0.00	0.07	-0.46	-10.19
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01	0.25***	0.02	1.33
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.01	0.11***	0.28
Number of total services	0.06***	0.00	-0.00	3.88***
N =	17,760	3,248	3,248	3,248

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table A.2. Relationship of Advance at Work vs. Workforce I Transportation Career Center Participation and Number of Total Services to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	11.48***	31.01***	12.75
Advance at Work	-0.43***	-1.42***	-1.62*	19.73
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	-0.17*	-0.23	1.12*	149.27***
2009	0.07	-0.85*	-0.23	-54.23***
Age	-0.00	-0.01	0.02	0.13
Female	-0.12	-0.41	-1.73***	3.30
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	0.15	-0.31	1.88	11.34
Hispanic	0.09	0.10	2.42*	6.75
Other/Multi-racial	-0.06	-0.23	2.51*	4.02
No race designation	0.30	-0.58	2.68*	8.66
Disability	-0.13	0.21	-4.18**	-14.13
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.06	-1.23**	-0.38	6.38
High school diploma/GED	0.05	-0.56	-0.10	-10.92
College degree, 4 year	0.06	-0.05	0.69	-2.36
Graduate degree	0.18	-2.06*	-1.83	-4.17
Enrolled in school	0.02	-0.31	-0.06	4.85
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01	0.26***	0.02	-0.35
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	-0.01	0.18***	0.43
Number of total services	0.04***	-0.03*	-0.14***	3.76***
N =	3.363	1.351	1.351	1.351

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001\*\*\*

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table A.3. Relationship of Workforce I Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce I Career Center and Number of Total Services to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	8.94***	32.51***	43.87***
Workforce I Transportation Career Center	0.69***	1.78***	3.86***	-6.31
Year of Enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.35***	0.19	0.13	25.18***
2009	-0.31***	-0.37**	-1.25***	-51.79***
Age	-0.02***	0.01**	-0.01	0.40***
Female	0.00	-0.26*	-1.75***	-0.50
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.11**	-0.91***	-0.30	5.35
Hispanic	-0.11**	-0.74***	0.20	1.97
Other/Multi-racial	0.08	-0.84***	-0.26	0.28
No race designation	-0.33***	-0.86***	-0.10	3.19
Disability	-0.38***	-0.59	-1.18*	0.02
Education Level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.25***	-0.75***	-0.07	5.57
High school diploma/GED	-0.02	-0.35**	-0.10	1.84
College degree, 4 year	-0.08*	0.41*	0.31	-7.83*
Graduate degree	-0.13*	0.42	-0.72	-8.77
Enrolled in school	0.04	0.14	-1.11***	-3.83
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.12***	0.06***	0.79***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00**	0.01	0.07***	0.01
Number of total services	0.05***	-0.01	0.00	2.85***
N =	127,700	13,299	13,299	13,299

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.



**Table A.4. Relationship of Workforce I Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce I Career Center Participation and Number of Total Services to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	11.28***	33.46***	54.52***
Workforce I Transportation Career Center	0.99***	2.18***	4.82***	-32.77**
Year of Enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.07	-0.24	0.14	28.77***
2009	-0.27***	-0.67*	-1.04*	-52.23***
Age	-0.01***	-0.02	-0.00	0.39
Female	0.02	-0.64**	-1.79***	-3.65
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.12	-1.36***	-0.82	0.23
Hispanic	-0.10	-1.36**	-0.16	-4.59
Other/Multi-racial	-0.03	-0.40	0.13	-8.71
No race designation	-0.10	-1.50**	-1.00	-4.46
Disability	-0.34*	-0.13	-0.56	19.35
Education Level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.32***	-0.98**	-0.86	-0.17
High school diploma/GED	-0.05	-0.58*	-0.56	1.20
College degree, 4 year	-0.10	0.59	-0.25	-2.95
Graduate degree	-0.08	-1.55**	1.52	13.73
Enrolled in school	0.01	-0.20	-0.80*	-11.29*
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.08***	-0.02	0.23
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.02	0.06***	0.03
Number of total services	0.05***	0.01	0.03	4.19***
N =	19,893	3,052	3,052	3,052

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table A.5. Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce Center Participation and Number of Total Services to Employment Outcomes for Unemployed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	8.95***	32.34***	41.22***
Community Partners Program	1.29***	-0.62***	-0.04	-0.58
Year of Enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.35***	0.21*	0.09	26.15***
2009	-0.29***	-0.43**	-1.54***	-50.40***
Age	-0.02***	0.01**	-0.01*	0.53***
Female	0.00	-0.23*	-1.77***	0.81
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.07*	-0.90***	-0.24	3.56
Hispanic	-0.11**	-0.80***	0.24	0.80
Other/Multi-racial	0.10*	-0.76**	-0.10	-1.52
No race designation	-0.31***	-0.84***	-0.05	0.16
Disability	-0.38***	-0.49	-1.31*	0.04
Education Level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.26***	-0.73***	-0.16	3.02
High school diploma/GED	-0.03	-0.35**	-0.19	0.82
College degree, 4 year	-0.07*	0.32*	0.23	-8.34*
Graduate degree	-0.13*	0.23	-0.66	-8.35
Enrolled in school	0.01	0.20	-1.04***	-1.84
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.12***	0.07***	0.78***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.01*	0.07***	-0.02
Number of total services	0.05***	-0.01	0.02*	2.84***
N =	131,981	16,497	16,497	16,497

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table A.6. Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce Center Participation and Number of Program Visits to Employment Outcomes for Employed Individuals**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	10.94***	33.44***	52.58***
Community Partners Program	1.31***	-0.61*	-0.06	-4.75
Year of Enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.04	-0.13	-0.05	48.04***
2009	-0.15*	-0.68*	-1.73***	-63.32***
Age	-0.02***	-0.02	-0.01	0.34
Female	0.03	-0.42*	-1.81***	-1.61
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.13	-1.24**	-0.62	1.35
Hispanic	-0.10	-1.35**	-0.18	-5.23
Other/Multi-racial	-0.04	-0.37	0.13	-12.43
No race designation	-0.23*	-1.26*	-0.78	-5.82
Disability	-0.50**	-0.52	0.21	16.14
Education Level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.40***	-0.82**	-1.05	1.86
High school diploma/GED	-0.07	-0.58**	-0.80*	0.44
College degree, 4 year	-0.07	0.50	-0.19	-6.46
Graduate degree	-0.10	-1.07	1.54	20.50
Enrolled in school	-0.00	-0.11	-0.91*	-4.84
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.07***	-0.02	0.42
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00	0.02*	0.07***	-0.02
Number of total services	0.05***	0.01	0.05*	5.65***
N =	20,049	3,302	3,302	3,302

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

## Appendix B. Comparison of Workforce I Transportation Career Center and WFICC Participants

**Table B.1. Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Workforce I Transportation Career Center and Workforce I Career Center Participants**

	Workforce I Transportation Career Center	Workforce I Career Centers	Chi-Square/ T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	4,013	148,803	
Year of enrollment			
2007	4.0%	17.6%	***
2008	52.6%	48.4%	**
2009	43.4%	34.1%	***
Age <sup>2</sup>	36.2 (11.9)	36.9 (13.0)	***
Female	18.9%	56.8%	***
Race			
White, non-Hispanic	9.8%	9.9%	
African American	42.5%	39.9%	***
Hispanic	26.1%	30.2%	***
Other/Multi-racial	8.8%	8.1%	
No race designation	12.9%	11.9%	
Disability	1.3%	3.4%	***
Education level			
Less than high school	6.1%	18.3%	***
High school diploma/GED	44.4%	33.3%	***
Associates/Vocational degree	38.7%	32.0%	***
College degree, 4 year	9.3%	12.9%	***
Graduate degree	1.5%	3.4%	***
Enrolled in school	13.3%	15.9%	***
Employed at program entry	28.7%	13.1%	***
Wage at program entry/most recent job	\$13.11 (7.43)	\$13.70 (9.97)	***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	38.2 (11.8)	35.7 (10.6)	***

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing age, wage at program entry, and average hours worked per week are t-tests. All other characteristics are compared using chi-square statistics.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for age, wage at program entry/most recent job and average hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

COMPARISON OF WORKFORCE I TRANSPORTATION CAREER CENTER AND WFICC PARTICIPANTS

**Table B.2. Comparison of Service Receipt for Workforce I Transportation Career Center and Workforce I Career Center Participants**

	Workforce I Transportation Career Center	Workforce I Career Centers	Chi-Square/ T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	4,013	148,803	
Type of service			
Assessment	59.5%	72.8%	***
Computer skills	9.0%	13.6%	***
Counseling	70.4%	23.0%	***
Facilities	13.1%	17.2%	***
Financial services	0.5%	0.3%	*
Interview skills	60.8%	3.9%	***
ITG receipt	9.1%	6.7%	***
Job readiness	3.3%	2.8%	*
Job search	63.6%	32.1%	***
Orientation	97.6%	87.0%	***
Referrals	56.4%	13.7%	***
Resume preparation	35.8%	12.9%	***
Workshops/Education services	74.2%	10.7%	***
Number of services <sup>2</sup>	5.5	3.0	***
	(2.2)	(1.7)	
Number of total services	10.3	5.5	***
	(6.5)	(6.0)	

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing type of service received are chi-square. Tests comparing number of services and number of total services are t-tests.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for number of services and number of total services are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

**Table B.3. Relationship of Workforce I Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce I Career Center to Employment Outcomes**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	9.19***	32.72***	61.63***
Workforce I Transportation Career Center	1.09***	1.90***	4.19***	-3.34
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.34***	0.11	0.13	26.77***
2009	-0.38***	-0.42**	-1.24***	-59.63***
Age	-0.01***	0.01	-0.01	0.66***
Female	-0.01	-0.33***	-1.76***	-2.14
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.03	-1.02***	-0.39	8.47*
Hispanic	-0.06	-0.86***	0.14	3.30
Other/Multi-racial	0.09*	-0.76***	-0.18	0.64
No race designation	-0.24***	-1.01***	-0.25	5.74
Disability	-0.33***	-0.53	-1.10*	5.02
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.35***	-0.77***	-0.20	0.97
High school diploma/GED	-0.05*	-0.39**	-0.18	0.27
College degree, 4 year	-0.06	0.43**	0.20	-5.21
Graduate degree	-0.10	0.01	-0.23	-4.21
Enrolled in school	0.04	0.08	-1.06***	-5.79*
Employed at program entry	0.07**	0.42***	-0.19	2.37
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.02***	0.11***	0.05***	0.68***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00***	0.01*	0.06***	0.03
N =	152,816	17,671	17,671	17,671

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table B.4. Relationship of Workforce I Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce I Career Center and Services Received to Employment Outcomes**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	9.45***	32.55***	37.72***
Workforce I Transportation Career Center	0.20***	2.06***	4.16***	-16.01***
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.29***	0.12	0.10	31.82***
2009	-0.31***	-0.35*	-0.98***	-60.09***
Age	-0.01***	0.01	-0.01*	0.30***
Female	0.03	-0.32***	-1.77***	-0.24
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.11***	-0.96***	-0.30	5.49
Hispanic	-0.10**	-0.86***	0.18	-0.77
Other/Multi-racial	-0.05	-0.90***	-0.17	-5.26
No race designation	-0.28***	-0.93***	-0.19	4.81
Disability	-0.29***	-0.48	-1.10*	3.35
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.11***	-0.73***	-0.21	1.87
High school diploma/GED	0.00	-0.42***	-0.22	-0.98
College degree, 4 year	-0.07*	0.41**	0.22	-6.36*
Graduate degree	-0.11	-0.05	-0.29	-6.96
Enrolled in school	0.01	0.12	-0.98***	0.11
Employed at program entry	-0.00	0.25*	-0.27	1.14
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.11***	0.05***	0.55***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00**	0.01*	0.06***	-0.03
Service received				
Assessment	0.19***	-0.25	-0.54**	134.59***
Computer skills	0.13***	-0.14	-0.21	12.68***
Counseling	0.09***	0.29**	-0.13	6.94**
Facilities	0.05*	-0.02	0.33	5.55*
Financial services	0.14	-1.15	0.86	36.78**
Interview skills	0.68***	-0.33*	0.47*	-10.79***
ITG receipt	1.09***	1.45***	1.19***	54.93***
Job readiness	0.03	-0.77***	0.21	-0.79
Job search	1.03***	0.21	0.02	-4.93*
Orientation	0.27***	-0.47**	0.61**	5.50
Referrals	0.65***	0.08	-0.57**	43.93***
Resume preparation	-0.20***	-0.06	-0.42*	8.87***
Workshops/Education services	-0.41***	-0.17	0.18	3.34
N =	152,816	17,671	17,671	17,671

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.



**Table B.5. Relationship of Workforce I Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce I Career Center and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	9.13***	32.54***	26.13***
Workforce I Transportation Career Center	0.45***	1.86***	4.08***	-25.23***
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.30***	0.11	0.13	26.91***
2009	-0.37***	-0.41**	-1.22***	-54.92***
Age	-0.02***	0.01	-0.01	0.38***
Female	0.01	-0.33***	-1.75***	-0.79
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.12***	-1.02***	-0.41	4.04
Hispanic	-0.11**	-0.87***	0.13	0.05
Other/Multi-racial	0.03	-0.76***	-0.20	-3.39
No race designation	-0.29***	-1.01***	-0.28	1.73
Disability	-0.38***	-0.54	-1.11*	1.97
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.25***	-0.77***	-0.19	4.19
High school diploma/GED	-0.02	-0.39***	-0.18	1.19
College degree, 4 year	-0.10**	0.43**	0.19	-7.23*
Graduate degree	-0.13*	0.01	-0.23	-4.96
Enrolled in school	0.04	0.08	-1.05***	-5.06*
Employed at program entry	0.11***	0.43***	-0.18	5.23*
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.11***	0.05***	0.70***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00**	0.01*	0.06***	0.02
Number of services	0.23***	0.02	0.06	11.73***
N =	152,816	17,671	17,671	17,671

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table B.6. Relationship of Workforce I Transportation Career Center vs. Workforce I Career Center and Number of Total Services Received to Employment Outcomes**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	9.22***	32.67***	44.89***
Workforce I Transportation Career Center	0.80***	1.92***	4.16***	-14.38***
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.30***	0.11	0.13	25.78***
2009	-0.30***	-0.44**	-1.22***	-51.99***
Age	-0.02***	0.01	-0.01	0.39***
Female	0.00	-0.33***	-1.76***	-0.93
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.11**	-1.01***	-0.40	4.24
Hispanic	-0.10**	-0.86***	0.14	0.87
Other/Multi-racial	0.06	-0.75***	-0.18	-1.16
No race designation	-0.29***	-1.00***	-0.27	1.02
Disability	-0.37***	-0.53	-1.10*	2.41
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.26***	-0.78***	-0.19	4.60
High school diploma/GED	-0.02	-0.39***	-0.18	1.72
College degree, 4 year	-0.09**	0.43**	0.20	-6.97*
Graduate degree	-0.12*	0.01	-0.23	-4.28
Enrolled in school	0.03	0.07	-1.06***	-5.24*
Employed at program entry	0.12***	0.41***	-0.19	5.59*
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.11***	0.05***	0.70***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00**	0.01*	0.06***	0.01
Number of total services	0.05***	-0.01	0.01	6.07***
N =	152,816	17,671	17,671	17,671

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

## Appendix C. Comparison of Community Partners Program and WFICC Participants

**Table C.1. Comparison of Participant Characteristic for Community Partners Program and Workforce Career Center Participants**

	Community Partners Program	Workforce Career Centers	Chi-Square/T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	8,457	148,803	
Year of enrollment			
2007	17.2%	17.6%	
2008	59.6%	48.4%	***
2009	23.3%	34.1%	***
Age <sup>2</sup>	33.1 (12.6)	36.9 (13.0)	***
Female	56.0%	56.8%	
Race			
White, non-Hispanic	3.8%	9.9%	***
African American	56.7%	39.9%	***
Hispanic	22.8%	30.2%	***
Other/Multi-racial	6.8%	8.1%	***
No race designation	9.8%	11.9%	***
Disability	3.9%	3.4%	**
Education level			
Less than high school	22.1%	18.3%	***
High school diploma/GED	39.1%	33.3%	***
Associates/Vocational degree	30.2%	32.0%	***
College degree, 4 year	7.4%	12.9%	***
Graduate degree	1.2%	3.4%	***
Enrolled in school	22.5%	15.9%	***
Employed at program entry	15.2%	13.1%	
Wage at program entry/most recent job	\$10.48 (5.70)	\$13.70 (9.67)	***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	35.72 (10.6)	33.9 (10.8)	***

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing age, wage at program entry, and average hours worked per week are t-tests. All other characteristics are compared using chi-square statistics.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for age, wage at program entry/most recent job and average hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

**Table C.2. Comparison of Service Receipt for Community Partners Program and Workforce Career Center Participants**

	Community Partners Program	Workforce Career Centers	Chi-Square/ T-Test <sup>1</sup>
Sample size	8,457	148,803	
Type of service			
Assessment	71.3%	72.8%	**
Computer skills	16.3%	13.6%	***
Counseling	29.9%	23.0%	***
Facilities	24.4%	17.2%	***
Financial services	1.1%	0.3%	***
Interview skills	12.6%	3.9%	***
ITG receipt	3.8%	6.7%	***
Job readiness	5.5%	2.8%	***
Job search	57.1%	32.1%	***
Orientation	78.7%	87.0%	***
Referrals	17.6%	13.7%	***
Resume preparation	16.5%	12.9%	***
Workshops/Education services	14.2%	10.7%	***
Number of services <sup>2</sup>	3.5	3.0	***
	(2.1)	(1.7)	
Number of total services	7.1	5.5	***
	(7.1)	(6.0)	

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup>Tests comparing type of service received are chi-square. Tests comparing number of services and number of total services are t-tests.

<sup>2</sup>Statistics presented for number of services and number of total services are means with standard deviation in parentheses.

**Table C.3. Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce Center Participation to Employment Outcomes**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	9.13***	32.67***	58.24***
Community Partners Program	1.40***	-0.62***	-0.02	1.41
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.36***	0.15	0.07	27.46***
2009	-0.36***	-0.46***	-1.64***	-57.79***
Age	-0.01***	0.01	-0.01	0.84***
Female	-0.01	-0.26**	-1.79***	-1.11
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.01	-0.97***	-0.28	6.35
Hispanic	-0.06	-0.90***	0.18	2.07
Other/Multi-racial	0.11**	-0.69***	-0.03	-1.52
No race designation	-0.23***	-0.94***	-0.14	3.72
Disability	-0.35***	-0.50	-1.18**	3.44
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.38***	-0.74***	-0.34	-1.90
High school diploma/GED	-0.07***	-0.38**	-0.31*	-0.71
College degree, 4 year	-0.03	0.34	0.15	-6.75*
Graduate degree	-0.12*	-0.02	-0.23	-4.00
Enrolled in school	0.01	0.15	-1.02***	-4.95*
Employed at program entry	0.06**	0.37**	-0.28	5.20*
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.11***	0.05***	0.68***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00*	0.01**	0.07***	-0.01
N =	157,260	20,154	20,154	20,154

\* p&lt;.05 \*\*p&lt;.01 \*\*\*p&lt;.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table C.4. Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce Center Participation and Services Received to Employment Outcomes**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	9.16***	32.18***	30.48***
Community Partners Program	1.07***	-0.42***	0.03	4.20
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.31***	0.18	0.05	32.03***
2009	-0.30***	-0.40**	-1.29***	-65.66***
Age	-0.01***	0.01	-0.01*	0.45***
Female	0.03	-0.25**	-1.78***	0.99
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.10**	-0.89***	-0.20	3.50
Hispanic	-0.09**	-0.85***	0.23	-1.14
Other/Multi-racial	-0.03	-0.80***	-0.05	-7.20
No race designation	-0.29***	-0.84***	-0.09	1.36
Disability	-0.30***	-0.43	-1.13**	2.90
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.14***	-0.68***	-0.30	-0.20
High school diploma/GED	-0.01	-0.40***	-0.32*	-1.14
College degree, 4 year	-0.05	0.33*	0.15	-7.71**
Graduate degree	-0.10	-0.07	-0.28	-5.86
Enrolled in school	0.01	0.18	-0.97***	-0.01
Employed at program entry	-0.02	0.23*	-0.38*	2.80
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.11***	0.05***	0.59***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00*	0.01**	0.07***	-0.05
Service received				
Assessment	0.28***	-0.14	-0.38*	11.30***
Computer skills	0.09***	-0.08	-0.09	13.88***
Counseling	0.06**	0.13	-0.09	8.56***
Facilities	0.09***	0.06	0.18	5.26*
Financial services	-0.02	-0.93	1.24	37.41***
Interview skills	0.78***	-0.13	0.82***	-10.99***
ITG receipt	1.08***	1.51***	1.28***	52.07***
Job readiness	0.03	-0.84***	0.68*	0.13
Job search	0.91***	0.26**	0.20	-0.95
Orientation	0.15***	-0.42**	0.55**	9.28***
Referrals	0.62***	0.06	-0.50**	48.07***
Resume preparation	-0.19***	-0.04	-0.27	7.98**
Workshops/Education services	-0.37***	-0.33*	-0.03	3.42
N =	157,260	20,154	20,154	20,154

\* p&lt;.05 \*\*p&lt;.01 \*\*\*p&lt;.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

**Table C.5. Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce I Career Center Participation and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	9.09***	32.30***	22.21**
Community Partners Program	1.23***	-0.63***	-0.06	-2.61
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.31***	0.15	0.08	28.06***
2009	-0.34***	-0.46***	-1.60***	-54.22***
Age	-0.02***	0.01	-0.01*	0.52***
Female	0.01	-0.26**	-1.77***	0.52
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.10**	-0.98***	-0.32	2.26
Hispanic	-0.12***	-0.91***	0.16	-0.79
Other/Multi-racial	0.05	-0.70***	-0.07	-5.28
No race designation	-0.29***	-0.94***	-0.19	1.51
Disability	-0.39***	-0.50	-1.20**	1.65
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.27***	-0.74***	-0.30	1.93
High school diploma/GED	-0.03	-0.38***	-0.29*	0.94
College degree, 4 year	-0.07*	0.34*	0.13	-8.61**
Graduate degree	-0.13**	-0.02	-0.24	-4.73
Enrolled in school	0.03	0.15	-1.02***	-4.08
Employed at program entry	0.07**	0.37**	-0.27	6.26**
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.11***	0.05***	0.72***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00 *	0.01**	0.07***	-0.02
Number of services	0.22***	0.01	0.12***	11.96***
N =	157,260	20,154	20,154	20,154

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.



**Table C.6. Relationship of Community Partners Program vs. Workforce I Career Center Participation and Number of Services Received to Employment Outcomes**

	Placement <sup>1</sup>	Hourly Wages	Avg. Weekly Hours	Time to Placement
Intercept	---	9.16***	32.53***	41.67***
Community Partners Program	1.29***	-0.62***	-0.04	-1.24
Year of enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	0.30***	0.15	0.07	26.72***
2009	-0.28***	-0.48***	-1.59***	-51.22***
Age	-0.02***	0.01	-0.01*	0.54***
Female	0.00	-0.27**	-1.78***	0.33
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	-0.08*	-0.97***	-0.31	2.68
Hispanic	-0.11**	-0.90***	0.17	0.02
Other/Multi-racial	0.08	-0.69***	-0.05	-3.23
No race designation	-0.29***	-0.93***	-0.18	-1.55
Disability	-0.39***	-0.49	-1.19**	2.07
Education level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.28***	-0.75***	-0.30	2.29
High school diploma/GED	-0.04	-0.39***	-0.29*	1.20
College degree, 4 year	-0.07*	0.35*	0.14	-8.34**
Graduate degree	-0.12*	-0.02	-0.23	-4.09
Enrolled in school	0.01	0.15	-1.02***	-4.29
Employed at program entry	0.09***	0.36**	-0.27	7.12**
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.11***	0.05***	0.783**
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00*	0.01**	0.07***	-0.03
Number of total services	0.05***	-0.00	0.03**	3.08***
N =	157,260	20,154	20,154	20,154

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

## Appendix D. How Many Services are Necessary?

---

Previous analyses indicate that increases in the number of services participants received are associated with increases in likelihood of placement, in hourly wages, and in weekly hours worked. This raises the question of whether or not there is a minimum number of services necessary to achieve these benefits or a maximum number of services beyond which there are diminishing returns. The following analysis examines the relationship of receiving different numbers of benefits on the likelihood of placement for participants in each of the four employment programs.

For participants in the Advance at Work program it appears that the minimum number of services one must receive in order to have a positive relationship with placement is seven. Receiving fewer than seven services is not related to placement. Receiving any number of services between 7 and 13 is positively associated with placement.

In the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center there is not a relationship between the number of services and placement. Nor is there a maximum number of services beyond which there are diminishing returns.

For participants in the Community Partners Program receiving any number of services beyond one, there is a positive correlation with placement. Receiving 12 services is significant at a 0.05 level while receiving any number of services between 2 and 11 is significant at a 0.001 level. This suggests that there may be diminishing returns after 11 services, however, it is impossible to determine if this is, in fact, true because the maximum number of services received by any participant in Community Partners Program was 12.

Finally, it appears necessary for traditional WF1CC participants to receive at least three services in order for services to be positively associated with placement and no more than 11 services before there are diminishing returns.

Overall, there is no evidence of a specific number of services that are necessary to receive positive employment outcomes.

**Table D.1. Relationship of Participant Characteristics and Different Numbers of Benefits to Job Placement by Program**

	Advance At Work	Transportation Sector Center	Community Partners Program	Workforce Career Centers
Sample Size	2,277	4,013	8,457	148,803
Year of Enrollment <sup>2</sup>				
2007	-0.14	-0.13	0.35***	0.32***
2009	-0.25*	0.11	0.05	-0.42***
Age	-0.00	0.01**	-0.01***	-0.02***
Female	-0.14	-0.04	-0.01	0.01
Race <sup>3</sup>				
African American	0.17	0.28*	0.09	-0.15***
Hispanic	0.21	0.19	-0.06	-0.13***
Other/Multi-racial	0.12	-0.19	0.09	0.02
No race designation	0.27	0.18	-0.12	-0.30***
Disability	-0.16	-0.16	-0.37**	-0.40***
Education Level <sup>4</sup>				
Less than high school	-0.13***	0.08	-0.34***	-0.25***
High school diploma/GED	0.06	-0.05	-0.13**	-0.03
College degree, 4 year	0.12	-0.03	0.13	-0.10**
Graduate degree	0.01	0.29	0.07	-0.14*
Enrolled in school	-0.03	0.15	-0.03	0.04
Employed at program entry	---	0.43***	0.17***	0.05*
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.02	-0.01*	0.00	-0.01***
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.01*	0.00	0.01**	-0.00***
Number of services received <sup>5</sup>				
2 services	-0.06	0.13	0.45***	0.06
3 services	0.17	0.13	0.89***	1.02***
4 services	0.82	0.33	1.12***	1.40***
5 services	0.88	0.09	1.11***	1.28***
6 services	1.08	-0.05	1.17***	1.45***
7 services	1.27*	0.31	1.08***	1.49***
8 services	1.38*	0.19	1.17***	1.56***
9 services	1.33*	0.32	1.42***	1.80***
10 services	1.35*	0.51	1.29***	1.82***
11 services	1.44*	0.46	1.53***	1.76***
12 services	1.60*	0.95	1.19*	1.27
13 services	1.65*	---	---	---

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a proportional hazard model; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

<sup>5</sup> 1 service is the omitted category.

## Appendix E. An Examination of Individual Training Grants

Individual Training Grants (ITGs) are vouchers issued to participants in all four employment programs intended to cover the cost of specialized occupational training, such as a commercial driver's license training course. ITGs are the local area name for the Workforce Investment Act Individual Training Accounts (ITA). The SBS electronic record system tracks both ITG receipt and ITG completion.

Table E.1 indicates the percent of participants in each program that received and completed occupational training through ITGs. Advance at Work had the highest percentage of participants receiving ITGs (17.4%) and the highest percentage of participants completing ITGs (14.2%). These higher rates are consistent with the Advance at Work program model to place underemployed workers into better jobs that may require additional training and/or certifications. However, because the rate of ITG receipt is so much higher among Advance at Work participants, this program also has the lowest percentage of those who receive ITGs completing them.

**Table E.1. Receipt and Completion Rates of Individualized Training Grants, by Program**

	Sample Size	ITG Received	ITG Completed	% of Received that Completed
Advance at Work	2,277	17.4%	14.2%	81.8%
Workforce1 Transportation Career Center	4,013	9.1%	8.3%	90.7%
Community Partners Program	8,457	3.8%	3.2%	84.4%
Workforce1 Career Centers	148,803	6.7%	5.8%	85.6%

Although the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center and the WF1CCs have similar rates of completion of ITG among those who receive them, the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center provides these grants to a higher percentage of workers. The Workforce1 Transportation Career Center offers ITGs to 9.1% of their participants, with 8.3% completing an ITG before placement. These rates of receipt and completion are higher than those among traditional WF1CC participants. 6.7% of WF1CC participants received an ITG and 5.8% completed an ITG.

Community Partners Program participants are the least likely to receive ITGs at 3.8% and to complete them at 3.2%. The Community Partners Program targets under-served, low-income, job-ready candidates. As these participants are considered ready for placement it makes sense that they would be among the least likely to receive vouchers for additional training that may delay placement into jobs.

Table E.2 shows the participant characteristics of those who receive and complete Individual Training Grants. After controlling for participant characteristics, Advance at Work participants are less likely to receive ITGs than WF1CC participants. Although a higher percentage of Advance at Work participants receive ITGs (as indicated in Table E.1) the populations served by these two programs are so different from one another, in part but not limited to the Advance at Work eligibility criteria of employment at program entry, that a higher proportion of Advance at Work participants may be good candidates for ITG receipt.

**Table E.2. Relationship of Participant Characteristics on ITG Receipt and Completion**

	ITG Received <sup>1</sup>	ITG Completed
Intercept	2.88***	1.74***
Advance at Work <sup>2</sup>	-0.59***	-0.37*
Workforce I Transportation Career Center	-0.12	0.47*
Community Partners Program	0.49***	-0.05
Year of enrollment <sup>3</sup>		
2007	-0.09**	-0.09
2009	0.07*	-0.24**
Age	-0.01***	0.00
Female	0.07**	0.04
Race <sup>4</sup>		
African American	0.23***	-0.31**
Hispanic	0.08	-0.26*
Other/Multi-racial	-0.22***	0.12
No race designation	0.29***	-0.26
Disability	0.26***	-0.43*
Education level <sup>5</sup>		
Less than high school	0.34***	0.39***
High school diploma/GED	-0.08**	0.27***
College degree, 4 year	-0.11**	0.15
Graduate degree	-0.14*	0.43*
Enrolled in school	0.27***	-0.16
Employed at program entry	-0.56***	0.14
Wage at program entry/most recent job	-0.01***	0.00
Avg. hours worked per week at program entry/most recent job	-0.00***	-0.00
N =	165,344	11,074

\* p<.05 \*\*p<.01 \*\*\*p<.001

<sup>1</sup> This analysis is a logistic regression; the regression coefficients are logits.

<sup>2</sup> Workforce I Career Centers is the omitted category.

<sup>3</sup> 2008 is the omitted category.

<sup>4</sup> White, non-Hispanic is the omitted category.

<sup>5</sup> Associates degree/Vocational degree is the omitted category.

Community Partners Program participants are more likely than WF1CC participants to receive an ITG.

The results presented in Table E.2 suggest that ITGs are more commonly received by more disadvantaged individuals. Those participants who are older, are female, and identify as African Americans or have no racial designation are more likely to receive ITGs. Individuals with less than a high school education are more likely to receive ITGs while individuals with higher levels of education are less likely to receive this service. Additionally, participants who are employed at program entry and those with higher hourly wages and weekly hours at program entry or their most recent job are less likely to receive ITGs.

The results for ITG completion, however, reveal a different pattern. Of those who receive ITGs, Advance at Work participants are less likely to complete an ITG than WF1CC participants, all else equal. Participants in the Workforce1 Transportation Career Center who receive ITGs are more likely to complete them than their Workforce1 Career Center counterparts. There is no difference in ITG completion between Community Partners Program participants and Workforce1 Career Center participants, when demographic characteristics and work history variables are controlled. Individuals with lower levels of education, are more likely to complete an ITG. Participants with a disability, although more likely to receive an ITG, are less likely to complete them.

These findings, coupled with those presented in the body of the report, suggest that ITGs are an important service offered to more disadvantaged program participant that have a strong positive correlation with placement, wages, and hours.

## Appendix F. Cost Benefit Analysis

---

This section discusses a cost-benefit approach to estimate savings associated with the following SBS programs:

- Advance at Work
- Workforce1 Transportation Career Center
- Community Partners Program

The approach taken in this analysis produces a reasonable first-approximation of the returns to taxpayers on an investment in one of these programs. It is a first-approximation because a number of benefits and costs associated with program investments have not been factored into our estimates. Excluded benefits include increased employer output, benefits associated with having health benefits and health coverage, potential reduction in criminal activity, maintaining family stability and mental well-being due to continued employment. Among the costs excluded are those associated with participant transportation and childcare costs that are not directly associated with the delivery of employment services. The list of potential benefits excluded clearly outweighs the list of potential costs associated with the program participation. Therefore, we believe that these exclusions lend our estimates a conservative bias. Reasonable first approximations of the net returns to taxpayers are estimated for 5-year periods following 2009.

The 5-year net benefit associated with the Sector program is estimated to be over \$37 million and net return-on-investment is estimated to be 910 percent (range of 850 percent to 1,110 percent). In other words, every dollar invested in this program in 2009 will result in \$9.10 return to taxpayers over the five years.

The 5-year net benefit associated with the Community Partners Program is estimated to be over \$37 million and net return-on-investment is estimated to be 1,790 percent (range of 1,410 percent to 2,590 percent). In other words, every dollar invested in this program in 2009 will result in \$17.90 return to taxpayers over the five years.

The 5-year net benefit associated with the Advance at Work program is estimated to be over \$180,000 and net return-on-investment is estimated to be 110 percent (range of 80 percent to 130 percent). In other words, every dollar invested in this program in 2009 will result in \$1.10 return to taxpayers over the five years.

### Key Assumptions

Our approach produces reasonable first-approximations of the net benefits to taxpayers from SBS programs. The estimates presented here address the question: *what is the taxpayers' net benefit on investments in these programs?*



Key assumptions in our approach are as follows:

- We focus on customers served in the City Fiscal Year 2009, i.e., July 2008 to June 2009.
- We project returns for 5-year period following the period of investment. Projections over longer periods may not be appropriate due to two reasons:
  - These workforce programs have limited scope and are unlikely to yield longer-lasting benefits.
  - Labor markets have become far more dynamic in recent years with skill sets becoming obsolete much sooner.
- We use detailed expenditure reports obtained from these programs to compute economic costs (including in-kind and donated resources when possible) associated with program services.
- We utilize the outcome data analyzed in this report to assess the effects on participant's employment and earnings. For the Advance at Work, benefits include change in earnings and change in tax revenue due to increased earnings. For the Sector and Community Partners program, additional benefits include savings from welfare and unemployment insurance benefits due to new placement in employment.
- Although we make a strong assumption that customers stay employed and receive associated benefits over the 5-years after program (such as increasing earnings), we also recognize that the portion of benefits that can be attributed to program participation would diminish over time because an increasing amount the benefits must be attributed to skills and experience earned within the period of employment. Thus, we discount the benefits associated with earnings change by 15 percent for each year following program participation.
- Customer earnings impact is the first-round effect of program investments. As these dollar impacts make their way through the NYC economy, they lead further effects in subsequent rounds. However, federal OMB guidelines state that employment multipliers that purport to measure the secondary effects of government expenditures on employment and output should not be included in measured social benefits or costs. Thus, we do not apply a spending multiplier to our estimated impacts on earnings.
- **Welfare benefits:** We account for reduction in welfare benefits such as, temporary cash assistance and food stamps, as a result of placement in employment (only for previously unemployed participants in Sector Center and Community Partners). We use the poverty rate of 18.2 percent - 2008 Census poverty statistic for NY City - for the number of people who would qualify for such benefits. Then, we apply a monthly benefit amount of \$200, which is a very conservative estimate for a single adult in the US (Legal Momentum, 2009). We also assume that 50% of these individuals would get off benefits in Year 2 and no savings associated with welfare benefits is projected beyond Year 2.
- **Unemployment insurance benefits:** One goal of the programs is to link people to employment, which in turn would have impact on Unemployment Insurance (UI) benefits. We estimate savings only for previously unemployed participants in Sector

Center and Community Partners who were placed in employment. We assume that 30% of unemployed would claim UI benefits (US national average is 41 percent, ILO, 2009). Recent statistics show that the average unemployment insurance benefit in 2009 is \$292 a week (DOL, 2009). We assume a conservative estimate for the average unemployment benefit of \$1,000 per month. No savings associated with UI benefits is projected beyond the first year.

- **Increased taxes:** We assume a flat rate of 15% of earnings increase as the benefits associated with tax payments including federal income, Social Security, and Medicare taxes, and state and local income, sales, and property taxes. Baum and Ma (2007) estimate a tax rate of between 20 to 24 percent for a working adult in the US.
- Discounting is necessary to render future benefits into present values. We utilize a 3 percent real (inflation adjusted) discount rate as prescribed by the federal OMB.
- We conduct sensitivity analysis in net benefit estimates. We vary key assumptions to demonstrate how sensitive net benefit results are to the changes in the assumptions.

Lower bound estimate assumes that the only benefit of the program is the changes in earnings and does not account for other benefits. We also assume a 7 percent real discount rate. Higher bound estimate assumes:

- 10 percent discount rate in the impact of program participation,
- 30 percent of participants with welfare benefits if unemployed, and,
- 20 percent tax revenue increase due to earnings increase, and
- 2 percent real discount rate.
- Average earnings change for City FY 2009 was computed for each program by using the outcome data. In computing average values, we exclude those participants who reported earnings change greater than \$200,000 per year since it is more likely to be a reporting error.
- One can argue that only a portion of observed labor market outcomes constitute true benefits resulting from program participation due to the fact that many customers would have become employed or advanced in their careers without any intervention. Therefore, we reduce earnings impact for each program by earnings change in the respective comparison group. During the same time frame, average change in annual earnings for a Workforce1 Career Center (comparison group for Community Partners and Sector Center) participant was \$965. Average change in annual earnings for a Workforce Career Center participant with an hourly wage rate less than or equal to \$14 (comparison group for Advance at Work) was \$1,081.

## Benefit Calculations

1. *Average earnings change* for 2009 was computed for each program by using the outcome data. In computing average values, we exclude those participants who reported earnings change greater than \$200,000 per year since it is more likely to be a reporting error.

- Number of participants and average earnings change for the three programs were as follows:
- (a) Community Partners Program: 4,380 participants with average earnings change of \$3,834 per year.
  - (b) Sector Center: 3,504 participants with average earnings change of \$4,177 per year.
  - (c) Advance at Work: 1,238 participants with average earnings change of \$1,645 per year.
2. We reduce average earnings for each program by the average earnings of a participant in the comparison group. During the same time frame, average change in annual earnings for a Workforce1 Career Center (comparison group for Community Partners and Sector Center) participant was \$965. Average change in annual earnings for a Workforce Career Center participant with an hourly wage rate less than or equal to \$14 (comparison group for Advance at Work) was \$1,081.
  3. *Welfare benefits* calculations assume 18.2 percent of participants receiving welfare benefits of \$200 per month (upper bound estimates assume 30 percent of participants receiving benefits).
  4. *Unemployment insurance savings* calculations assume 30 percent of participants receiving unemployment benefits of \$1,000 per month.
  5. *Tax benefit calculations* assume 15 percent of earnings change as tax payments (upper bound estimates assume a 20 percent tax rate).

**Table F.1. Advance at Work vs. Employed WFICC (<\$14/hr), Five year net cost-benefit analysis, FY 2009 (Taxpayer perspective)**

	FY 2009	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
<b>Economic costs</b>						
1) Personnel expenditures	\$1,392,569	---	---	---	---	---
2) Services	\$ 436,010	---	---	---	---	---
3) Building and facilities	\$ 103,286	---	---	---	---	---
4) Equipment/supplies/materials	\$ 354,789	---	---	---	---	---
5) Admin. & operational overhead	\$ 138,948	---	---	---	---	---
6) Other resources	\$ -					
Total economic costs	\$2,425,601	---	---	---	---	---
<b>Benefits</b>						
1) Increased earnings	---	\$698,008	\$593,307	\$488,605	\$383,904	\$ 279,203
2) Increased taxes	---	\$104,701	\$ 88,996	\$ 73,291	\$ 57,586	\$ 41,880
Total benefits		\$802,709	\$682,303	\$561,896	\$441,490	\$ 321,084
<b>PV Total Returns</b>		\$ 779,329	\$643,136	\$514,215	\$392,258	\$ 276,969
						<b>Total PV of 5-Year Returns</b>
						\$2,605,907
						<b>5-year ROI</b>
						1.1
						<b>Range</b>
						0.8 - 1.3

Table F.2. Sector vs. WFICC, Five year net cost-benefit analysis, FY 2009 (Taxpayer perspective)

	FY 2009	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
<b>Economic costs</b>						
1) Personnel expenditures	\$1,885,044	---	---	---	---	---
2) Services	\$ 694,072	---	---	---	---	---
3) Building and facilities	\$ 174,648	---	---	---	---	---
4) Equipment/supplies/materials	\$1,412,376	---	---	---	---	---
5) Admin. & operational overhead	\$ 484,699	---	---	---	---	---
6) Other resources	\$ -					
Total economic costs	\$4,650,839	---	---	---	---	---
<b>Benefits</b>						
1) Increased earnings	---	\$11,254,392	\$ 9,566,234	\$7,878,075	\$6,189,916	\$ 4,501,757
2) Welfare savings	---	\$ 75,168	\$ 37,584	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3) Unemployment insurance savings	---	\$ 156,600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4) Increased taxes (from increased earnings)	---	\$ 1,688,159	\$ 1,434,935	\$1,181,711	\$ 928,487	\$ 675,264
Total benefits		\$13,174,319	\$11,038,753	\$9,059,786	\$7,118,403	\$ 5,177,021
<b>PV Total Returns</b>		\$12,790,601	\$10,405,083	\$8,290,988	\$6,324,609	\$ 4,465,743
			<b>Total PV of 5-Year Returns</b>			\$42,277,024
			<b>5-year ROI</b>			9.1
			<b>Range</b>			8.5 – 11.1

**Table F.3. Community Partners Program vs. WFICC, Five year net cost-benefit analysis, FY 2009 (Taxpayer perspective)**

	FY 2009	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
<b>Economic costs</b>						
1) Personnel expenditures	\$1,099,684	---	---	---	---	---
2) Services	\$ 560,404	---	---	---	---	---
3) Building and facilities	\$ 64,602	---	---	---	---	---
4) Equipment/supplies/materials	\$ 356,166	---	---	---	---	---
5) Admin. & operational overhead	\$ 150,890	---	---	---	---	---
6) Other resources						
Total economic costs	\$2,231,746	---	---	---	---	---
<b>Benefits</b>						
1) Increased earnings	---	\$12,563,767	\$10,679,202	\$7,475,441	\$4,111,493	\$ 1,644,597
2) Welfare savings	---	\$ 158,976	\$ 79,488	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3) Unemployment insurance savings	---	\$ 331,200	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4) Increased taxes (from increased earnings)	---	\$ 1,884,565	\$ 1,601,880	\$1,121,316	\$ 616,724	\$ 246,690
Total benefits		\$14,938,508	\$12,360,570	\$8,596,758	\$4,728,217	\$ 1,891,287
<b>PV Total Returns</b>		\$14,503,406	\$11,651,023	\$7,867,251	\$4,200,959	\$ 1,631,441
				<b>Total PV of 5-Year Returns</b>		\$39,854,080
				<b>5-year ROI</b>		17.9
				<b>Range</b>		14.1 – 25.9

---

## References

- Baum, S., Ma, J. (2007). Education Pays: The benefits of higher education for individuals and society. Available at <http://www.collegeboard.com/>
- Dunlap, L.J., and French, M.T. (1998). A Comparison of Two Methods for Estimating the Costs of Substance Abuse Treatment. *Journal of Maintenance in the Addictions*. 1(3): 29-44
- French M.T. (2003) Brief Drug Abuse Treatment Cost Analysis Program (Brief DATCAP): Program Version. First Edition, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida
- King, C.T., O'Shea D. et al. (2003). Return-on-investment estimates for Workforce Services in Texas. Ray Marshall Center for the Study of Human Resources. The University of Texas at Austin.
- Legal Momentum. (2009). Meager and diminishing welfare benefits perpetuate widespread material hardship for poor women and children. Available at <http://www.legalmomentum.org/>
- OMB Circular A-122. (2004). Cost Principles for Non-Profit Organizations.
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2008 American Community Survey.