From job seekers to job keepers: job retention, advancement and the role of in-work support programmes

Karen Kellard, Laura Adelman, Andreas Cebulla and Claire Heaver

A report of research carried out by the Centre for Research in Social Policy on behalf of the Department for Work and Pensions
CONTENTS

Acknowledgements vii

The Authors viii

Summary 1

Part one - Introduction and overview

1 Introduction 7
  1.1 Research Aims 7
  1.2 Research Method 8
    1.2.1 The availability, and use, of evaluation evidence 8
    1.2.2 A ‘typology’ of evaluations 9
  1.3 Background and Context to Job Retention and Advancement 10
    1.3.1 Why is job retention and advancement on the UK policy agenda? 10
    1.3.2 Recent labour market policy developments in the UK 13
    1.3.3 Job retention and advancement overseas 17
  1.4 Report Structure 21

2 The role of transitional employment schemes: a brief overview 23
  2.1 Co-ordinating Services Through Intermediary Organisations 23
  2.2 Working with Employers 25
  2.3 Pre-employment training and education programmes 26
  2.4 Job matching 27
  2.5 Job Rotation 27

Part two - Review of current post-employment initiatives

Addressing work-related needs: childcare and transport 33
  3.1 Childcare 33
  3.2 Transport 35
    3.2.1 Cost of transport 35
    3.2.2 Availability of transport 37

4 In-work financial support 41
  4.1 Wage supplements and other financial assistance for employees 41
    4.1.1 Wage supplements for employees 41
    4.1.2 Rent assistance 46
    4.1.3 Saving incentives 46
    4.1.4 Loans 48
    4.1.5 Emergency cash grants 50
4.2 Wage subsidies for employers 51
4.2.1 Welfare recipients 51
4.2.2 Long-term unemployed people 53
4.2.3 Young people 55
4.2.4 Older people 56
4.2.5 Disabled people 57
4.2.6 Ethnic minorities 59
4.3 Retention incentives 59
4.3.1 Retention incentives for employees 59
4.3.2 Retention incentives for employers 60

5 Non-financial support and advice – case management 61
5.1 Welfare recipients 63
5.2 Long-term unemployed people 74
5.3 Young people 75
5.4 Disabled people 78
5.5 People with a history of substance abuse 80
5.6 Ex-offenders 82
5.7 Women returners 85
5.8 Ethnic minorities 85

6 Non-financial support and advice services 87
6.1 Job coaching 87
6.1.1 People without disabilities 87
6.1.2 Disabled people 88
6.2 Mentoring 91
6.2.1 Employer-led mentoring schemes 92
6.2.2 Independently led mentoring schemes 93
6.3 Peer support groups 95
6.3.1 Welfare to work programmes 95
6.3.2 Voluntary organisations 96
6.4 Telephone Helplines 96
6.4.1 Telephone helplines for employees 96
6.4.2 Telephone helplines for employers 97
6.4.3 Telephone helplines for both employers and employees 97

7 In-work skill development and training 99
7.1 Basic and job-specific skills training 99
7.2 Financial assistance for employees undertaking training/education 101
7.3 Financial assistance for employers who provide training for entry level employees 101
7.4 Training employers in job retention and advancement techniques 102
8 Advancement strategies 105
  8.1 Career ladders and skill supply chain 105
  8.2 Career guidance 107

Part three - Overview

9 Overview 113
  9.1 A review of different types of in-work support initiatives 113
    9.1.1 Childcare 114
    9.1.2 Transport 114
    9.1.3 Wage subsidies and other financial assistance for employees 116
    9.1.4 Wage subsidies for employers 117
    9.1.5 Retention incentives 117
    9.1.6 Job coaching 118
    9.1.7 Mentoring 118
    9.1.8 Peer support groups 119
    9.1.9 Telephone helplines 119
    9.1.10 Post-employment education and training 120
    9.1.11 Advancement strategies 120
  9.2 Issues in the delivery of in-work support programmes 121
    9.2.1 Involving non-public employment service organisations in the delivery of post-employment support 122
    9.2.2 Involving employers in post-employment services 124
    9.2.3 Co-ordinating in-work services and support: case management 127
    9.2.4 Identifying and targeting clients for post-employment support 132
    9.2.5 The costs (and benefits) of in-work support programmes 134
    9.2.6 Issues for future research 135

Appendix A - Impacts from random assignment evaluations 137
Appendix B - The US employment retention and advancement evaluation project 163
Appendix C - Alphabetical index of programmes by country 165
References 179

Other research reports available 195

LIST OF TABLES

Table A.1 Proportion of the full MFIP group participated in employment or training related activities 138

Table A.2 Quarterly average impacts of urban, single parent full MFIP recipients compared to AFDC recipients 139
Table A.3 Impacts of full MFIP for long-term urban single parent recipients compared to AFDC 140

Table A.4 Full MFIP impact for two-parent families compared to AFDC 140

Table A.5 Employment and earnings impacts of New Hope 144

Table A.6 Impact of social support 144

Table A.7 SSP impacts on employment, earnings and income assistance 148

Table A.8 SSP impacts on employment stability and months of full-time employment in first three years after random assignment 149

Table A.9 SSP impacts on the distributions of wage growth for those working at least two of the three months from month 12 to 14 and at least two of the three months from month 32 to 34 between the end of year 1 and end of year 3 150

Table A.10 SSP plus impacts on supplement take-up rate by subgroup 153

Table A.11 SSP Plus Impacts on employment, earnings and IA receipt 154

Table A.12 Incidence of different case management services within six months of programme enrolment 156

Table A.13 Employment, earnings and AFDC impact of PESD during two-year follow-up period 157

Table A.14 Case/referral management services 158

Table A.15 Project NetWork proportion of eligible population enrolled by site 160

Table A.16 Receipt of education, training and rehabilitation services 160

Table A.17 Impacts on annual earnings by follow-up year, based on administrative records 161

Table A.18 Impacts on employment – full sample of follow-up survey respondents 162

Table B.1 ERA site characteristics (from MDRC presentation to National Association for Welfare Research and Statistics August 2001) 164
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the advice and support received from the project steering group, in particular from Anthony Johnson (the project liaison officer at the Department for Work and Pensions), and Stephen Morris (Centre for Management and Policy Studies, Cabinet Office).

Thanks are also extended to colleagues in CRSP for advice throughout the project, and to CRSP’s administrative team who, as ever, provide a faultless support service.
Karen Kellard is Assistant Director of the Social Security Unit within CRSP. Her research interests relate to the organisation and delivery of social security and welfare related services, the transition from unemployment to work, and the development of labour market policies to help people retain work and advance in employment.

Laura Adelman, Research Associate, has worked at CRSP since January 1999. Her recent research has included analysis of key life cycle transitions, and access to minimum income, both using the European Community Household Panel Survey, and establishing budget standards for disabled people in Jersey. She was also responsible for analysis of the children’s data in the Poverty and Social Exclusion Survey of Britain. Laura’s main research interests include the measurement and impact of poverty and social exclusion, and the living standards of children.

Andreas Cebulla joined CRSP in late 1996 and was appointed Assistant Director (Lifestyles and Living Standards) in 2001. He previously worked at the Northern Ireland Economic Research Centre and spent some four years on secondment to Central Government Departments, where he conducted and managed policy evaluation studies. His research interest includes European social policy and welfare-to-work programmes.

Claire Heaver, Research Associate, joined CRSP in 1997. Claire has experience in both qualitative and quantitative methods. Projects have included Earnings Top-up, Housing Benefit and Council Tax Benefit Extended Payments, Analysis of Family and Working Lives Survey and Education Maintenance Allowance.
SUMMARY

Background
Welfare reform policy in the UK aims to increase financial self-sufficiency and independence by assisting and rewarding the move from welfare into work primarily through the New Deal programme and Tax Credits.

New Deal programmes have primarily focused on facilitating the transition into work. Less emphasis has been placed on helping former unemployed people retain their new jobs in the long-term. Programme participants, who have been placed in employment, face an appreciable risk of early exit from work into unemployment. Repeated returns to benefits are known to have ‘scarring’ effects on individuals’ future employment prospects and can increase the likelihood of further spells of unemployment in the future. Those who remain in employment may find there are few opportunities for progressing within the job or encounter difficulties in advancing to ‘better’ jobs elsewhere. As a result, there is now growing interest in the provision of post-employment or ‘in-work support’ services to help these people to retain work and progress in employment.

The research report
In August 2001, the Department for Work and Pensions, in conjunction with the Centre for Management and Policy Studies (Cabinet Office) commissioned the Centre for Research Social Policy (CRSP) to conduct a review of post-employment support and advancement programmes for long-term unemployed workers in OECD countries. The aims of the study were to assess what kinds of support programmes have been successful in helping benefit-leavers retain employment and advance in work, what kinds of systems are most effective in delivering such programmes and what lessons can be learnt for UK policy development. The outcome of the study is a comprehensive report on post-employment initiatives which will be useful as a ‘toolkit’ for exploring alternative ideas for policy development in the UK.

Research methods and evaluation evidence
Electronic and manual searches were made of resource databases, and, national and international experts in welfare-to-work and labour market programmes were consulted, leading to the identification of some 170 post-employment support programmes, the majority of which were found to be in North America. Only a minority of these programmes have been evaluated, and of these, an even smaller number have been subjected to the most rigorous methods of evaluation using random assignment; all of these latter evaluations were in the US and Canada.

The report provides a review of both financial and non-financial post-employment initiatives introduced in OECD countries to improve job retention and advancement rates. Where evaluation evidence is available, it is used to assess which types of in-work support initiatives have been found to make an impact on job retention rates. The report also reviews the effectiveness of different methods for delivering post-employment services.
Few employers provide childcare support or transport for employees, but those who do report benefits in terms of higher employee retention and improved work performance. The available evidence indicates that childcare and transport provision must be flexible and meet both the employees' and the employers' requirements. Incentives or subsidies may be required to encourage employers and/or transport companies to provide new or additional services.

There is some evidence that earnings supplements may facilitate job retention, particularly amongst lone parents, however, employees may find it difficult to retain their job when earnings supplements end. Evidence, mainly from the US, indicates that providing emergency financial assistance, such as grants or low cost loans, can improve retention. Some post-employment service programmes now offer advice and training in money management to help new employees cope with the changes they experience when returning to work.

Wage subsidies for employers are more likely to increase recruitment and retention of employees if employers are committed to providing training and/or other support for employees. Practical assistance, such as with workplace adaptations for disabled people, may also increase retention.

Retention incentives are payable to the employee or the employer and are specifically linked to the length of time an individual stays in work. Few of such programmes have been evaluated, and there is a lack of evidence to indicate whether they are more (or less) effective as a retention strategy than other forms of financial assistance.

Job coaching provides practical assistance to individuals with the tasks needed for their job, on the job. Job coaching requires good relationships with employers, or working closely with employers to develop appropriate programmes. There is some limited evidence (from the US and Norway) that job coaching may improve job retention rates for disabled workers.

Mentoring matches the new employee with a co-worker or external volunteer who helps the new employee adjust to the workplace and the routine of being back in work. Some employees may reject non-work-based mentors because they cannot, or do not want to, dedicate time to mentors outside work. There is some evidence from the private-sector, Welfare-to-Work Partnership in the US that mentoring can have a successful impact on retention rates.

Peer support groups provide support for new job entrants from others in similar positions to share experiences, talk about problems and build workplace networks. Evidence suggests that participants can find peer support groups useful, but there is no evidence on how they affect job retention.

Telephone helplines are designed primarily to provide practical assistance, rather than one-to-one support. In the US, such schemes were found
for both employers and employees. Helplines can help raise awareness among employers of retention strategies but there is no direct evidence of how they effect retention rates.

*Post-employment education and training*  There is limited evidence that post-employment education and training programmes may improve job retention rates. Experience suggests that skills-training must closely match the needs of employers and employees and fit in with work and home schedules. Financial assistance may encourage both employers and employees to pursue education and training opportunities.

*Advancement strategies*  Career ladders are formalised progression routes in particular industrial or occupational sectors or between identified employers. They require substantive investment in time and financially.

Career guidance programmes mainly provide information to employees about how to advance in employment. They need to be proactive and are best provided to all employees so they are not seen as a stigmatised service.

There is a lack of clear evaluation evidence at the moment as to whether career ladders and career guidance can make an impact on advancement in employment.

*Findings (2): Delivery of in-work support services*  Voluntary participation in post-employment service delivery can be improved if not-for-profit and private sector organisations, known to be independent of public-employment services (PES), deliver local programmes. Involving non-PES organisations may require performance benchmarking and the provision of financial incentives to be effective.

*Involving employers*  A key incentive for employers who provide, or participate in providing, post-employment services is the prospect of reducing staff turnover and recruitment costs. Implementation costs are a major obstacle to participation. Low-level, customised pre-employment programmes may provide an avenue to gradually increasing employers’ involvement.

*Co-ordinating in-work services and support*  The diversity of clients’ support needs calls for the co-ordination of multiple provisions and referral services. Case worker skills and expertise may need to be maintained and enhanced through training. Teams of case workers with diverse skills may ease pressure on individual workers and enhance service delivery.

*Case management/case worker approaches*  In the schemes reviewed, case workers can provide a range of services that usually include counselling and encouragement, referral services, advice on benefits and emergency assistance for clients, particularly in the early months of a new job. Case management appears to work best if case workers are able to build a long-term trusting relationship with a client. Experience indicates that caseloads must be kept low if case workers are to provide the individually intensive assistance that most clients require.

There is mixed evidence of the impact of case management on job retention rates: the most clear evidence of success comes from small-
scale studies of case management services designed to meet the needs of specific client groups, including: disaffected young people, women returning to work, disabled people, ex-offenders and substance abusers.

**Identifying and targeting clients**

The arguments for and against the targeting of services are finely balanced: targeted services can be resource-intensive and costly and there can be no guarantee that they will reach all workers that require help. Non-targeted services that are available for all workers who qualify can be wasteful of resources and equally fail to reach workers that most require assistance. The main risk of targeting is that it may stigmatise potential clients. Various strategies have been employed to counter such risks with some successes being reported.

Making programmes mandatory may circumvent the problem of allocating resources to identifying and tracing participants. However, although mandatory programmes may make recruitment easier, the processes required to ensure compliance and to respond to non-compliance can be administratively burdensome. Mandatory participation may also adversely affect the relationship between clients, employers and case workers.

**The costs of in-work support programmes**

Job retention programmes that actively recruit clients tend to be costly, particularly if clients face several job retention ‘barriers’ and require intensive support. Pro-active programmes in the US have been shown to increase programme participation, but it is unclear whether they also improve job retention rates. Re-active, low-key approaches incur lower costs but yield very few outcomes and probably fail to reach the most critical cases in need of support.

**Summary of evaluation evidence**

Given the fact that most initiatives have not been subjected to rigorous evaluation, all findings must be interpreted with caution. The key points are summarised below.

There is some evidence that job retention rates can, at least in the short-term, be improved by introducing earnings supplements to workers and subsidies to employers, particularly when combined with other non-financial support.

There is limited, less robust evidence that:

- employer-provided childcare may improve job retention, reduce absenteeism and improve work performance;
- providing financial assistance for benefit-leavers to deal with domestic emergencies may improve job retention;
- providing transport assistance (for example, through van pools) to help workers get to and from work may improve job retention rates;
- job coaching, skills training and mentoring programmes may have an impact on job retention.

There is mixed evidence that case management approaches to programme delivery may improve job retention rates: the provision of in-work support by case workers may have an impact if carefully resourced and focused on the needs of specific client groups, including: disaffected young people, women returning to work, disabled people, ex-offenders and substance abusers.
Department for Work and Pensions

Research Report No 170

From job seekers to job keepers: job retention, advancement and the role of in-work support programmes

Part one - Introduction and overview
In August 2001, the Department for Work and Pensions, in conjunction with the Centre for Management and Policy Studies (Cabinet Office) commissioned the Centre for Research Social Policy (CRSP) to conduct a review of programmes designed to help long-term unemployed workers to retain a job once they have obtained employment, and to advance in work. The review examines the impact of support programmes on job retention in selected OECD countries. Of particular interest is the type of support measures provided, their impact on different groups of workers, and the effectiveness of different organisational systems.

1.1 Research aims

The specific initial research questions, outlined in the Invitation to Tender, were:

- what kinds of in-work support programmes for long-term unemployed people, and other entrants to work from periods of inactivity, are most effective in terms of job retention, and why?
- what are the most effective organisational systems of in-work support programmes for improving job retention rates for long-term unemployed workers?
- what policy/good practice lessons have emerged from existing evidence?

Other research questions arose as the project progressed, some of which were required to feed into the developments of initiatives to be tested through the forthcoming Employment Retention and Advancement Demonstration project (currently in its design phase, led by the Centre for Management and Policy Studies). These included:

- what are the experiences of programmes that have sought to involve employers in job retention?
- what are the experiences of private sector led job retention programmes?
- what effect do retention incentives have?
- what counter-factual evidence is there of programmes’ effectiveness?
- what evidence is there to support mandatory programmes (as opposed to voluntary)?
- what type of training (for example, soft skills, vocational qualifications) works best, and for which groups of clients?
- how do programmes address advancement in employment?

1 Although the Invitation for Tender originated from the then Department for Education and Employment.
how does the involvement of voluntary or community based organisations affect outcomes?
how effective are case management approaches to providing in-work support?
does profiling work in identifying clients who need (more intensive) support for job retention?
how are client-group specific problems identified and tackled?
do programmes distinguish between different types of clients and do these different groups have different ‘success’ rates?
is it possible to compare programmes by type of approach (for example, cost benefit analysis)?
how effective are financial inducements in fostering job retention and/or advancement?

This report has not been able to fully address all of these key questions because of limited evaluation evidence for the programmes reviewed. Furthermore, in many countries (typically in Europe) it proved extremely difficult to identify in-work support programmes, and locate information about them (see Section 1.2.1 for further explanation).

The research also sought to identify where further research work could be undertaken, as well as recommendations for policy development. Issues of particular interest included involving employers in the provision of in-work support, case management (including the extent of services provided, and caseload sizes), and the needs of ‘special’ groups (such as disabled people and young people).

1.2 Research method

The central element of the research is a review of literature to identify in-work support programmes in selected OECD countries. This included searches of internet sources, electronic databases and scanning reference lists, grey literature and conference proceedings. In addition, consultations with leading overseas researchers and academics were carried out through an existing CRSP network of social security experts, as well as via electronic mailing lists.

1.2.1 The availability, and use, of evaluation evidence

This review of post-employment initiatives includes both programmes that have and have not been evaluated. In fact, the majority of programmes reviewed have not been evaluated. The original research specification required the project to focus on the effectiveness of in-work support programmes. However, as it became apparent that a large number of initiatives had not been evaluated, it was agreed that it was important to present the range of initiatives that existed, even if measures of their effectiveness were not available.

This network has been developed as part of another CRSP research project, commissioned by the International Social Security Association, to assess the gaps in social security and healthcare provision in selected countries around the world.
The review of programmes in Chapters 3 to 8 includes all the relevant information that was available from the resources uncovered. These usually include country and area of programme, start date, client group, service provider, services offered and evaluation evidence and details (where available). However, the level of detail available about the programmes and their evaluations varied greatly, largely depending upon the sources of programme information. For instance, the most detailed information was obtainable when programmes had their own websites or research reports. When information about programmes was limited to citations within research reports reviewing post-employment or welfare-to-work initiatives or other documents providing an overview of funded projects, for example, the description was usually more limited (often not even including a start date). Detailed information on evaluation design was often also limited if there were difficulties in accessing the original reports. This was a particular problem for European Social Fund (ESF) projects, with only limited information available via the ESF website (often without programme dates).

There are a number of reasons why there is a dearth of evaluations. As noted elsewhere, the majority of in-work or post-employment support programmes are in the US where many of these programmes have been ‘implemented rapidly to address this (job retention) challenge and have not had the benefit of rigorous research to demonstrate their effectiveness’ (Brown et al., 1998b, p. 1). In other countries too, programmes are often of a relatively small scale, and evaluations can cost a great deal to implement and undertake. ESF projects are required to include an evaluation, although at the time of writing there appeared to be no publicly available evaluation reports.

1.2.2 A ‘typology’ of evaluations

Of the evaluations undertaken, their rigour varied greatly. For the purposes of this review, a broad fourfold typology of evaluation design was developed:

- Random assignment – a strict programme/action and control group design where in-work support services are only available to the programme or action group; enabling rigorous measures of the programme’s impact.
- Quasi-experimental – an evaluation which includes a comparison group of some description, but which is not randomly assigned. A less rigorous measure of a programme’s impact.
- Outcome – measures of ‘success’ based on survey data and/or qualitative interviews. No comparison group.
- Process – an examination of the implementation and running of a scheme, not specific quantitative outcomes/outputs. No comparison group.
Where a programme appears to have been evaluated, but the results were only available from other reports, only the results (and other relevant details where available) are presented. Where the evaluation report was available, this is clearly marked in the text with **EVALUATION** written following the programme name. Throughout the report, abbreviations are used to highlight important aspects of the programme: the evaluation type; whether the evaluation was carried out in-house or independently; and whether participation in the programme was voluntary or mandatory. The abbreviations used are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation type</th>
<th>Who evaluated</th>
<th>Mandatory/voluntary participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA Random Assignment</td>
<td>IND Independent organisation</td>
<td>M Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q-E Quasi-Experimental</td>
<td>IH In-house evaluation</td>
<td>V Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Outcomes</td>
<td>Pr Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Random assignment evaluations are described in much greater detail in Appendix A, providing information on the programme components; data collection instruments; stage of random assignment; proportion of participants that received treatment; a list of the impacts measured and a presentation of the most relevant impacts.

The emergence of job retention and advancement to the forefront of current debates about UK labour market policies is as a result of a number of factors. Whilst this report does not seek to explore each of these in detail, attention is drawn to the following issues that have contributed to the emergence of job retention and advancement on the policy agenda:

1.3 Background and context to job retention and advancement

1.3.1 Why is job retention and advancement on the UK policy agenda?

- **A significant proportion of unemployed people make repeated and frequent moves between work and unemployment**

  Research findings have consistently indicated that about half of people leaving unemployment, return within a year (see for example, Teasdale, 1998), with a significant proportion of these returning to unemployment with three to six months (see, Ashworth and Liu, 2001; Trickey et al., 1998; Sweeney, 1996). Whilst some of these exits are to some extent anticipated (for example, because of the temporary nature of the jobs), others are premature (for example, job unsuitability).

- **These ‘frequent movers’ tend to be concentrated amongst certain groups of individuals**

  Those more likely to make frequent moves between work and unemployment tend to be male; females are more likely to move from work to (in)activities other than claimant unemployment (such as caring for dependants).

---

3 For further discussion about its emergence as a policy issue, see for example Kellard et al., 2001 and Walker and Kellard, 2001.
A number of other characteristics also appear to be associated with frequent moves (Ashworth and Liu, 2001; Trickey et al., 1998; Kellard et al., 2001; Marsh, 2001), including:
- dwellers of rented properties (particularly social housing tenants);
- age (under 25s and over 55s);
- absence of qualifications;
- poor numeracy;
- no driving licence/no access to private transport;
- poor social networks (particularly affects lone parents);
- poor health; and
- multiple benefit spells.

- **Frequent moves between work and non-work activities can be detrimental to individuals, and to society as a whole**

  The consequences of job loss and unemployment on individuals and families has been the subject of extensive investigation (see for example, Shaw et al., 1996; Kempson et al., 1994; Ritchie, 1990). These effects can only intensify if the unemployment spells are prolonged and repeated. Not least, the ‘damage’ or ‘scarring effects’ that repeated spells of unemployment has on individual future employment prospects is of concern (see for example, Gregg, 1999), as labour market attachment may be eroded, skills become out of date. Furthermore, employers are known to be reluctant to recruit people with a fragmented labour market history (Kellard et al., 2001). Repeated spells of unemployment also have costs to society, particularly financial costs in terms of benefit expenditure and lost tax revenue.

- **Active labour market initiatives have, to date, placed limited emphasis on job retention or advancement**

  Recent labour market interventions have placed, often successfully, considerably more emphasis on helping people to obtain work, and considerably less on assisting them to retain employment. Notable recent developments are evident, however, in a number of initiatives, including: retention measures in the New Deal family of programmes; the specific focus of Employment Zones on job retention (both of which take a relatively short-term definition of retention); and the Employment Retention and Advancement demonstration design project (see Section 1.2.3 below).

- **Entry level employment typically offers little opportunity for progression or advancement for those with few, or no, skills**

  Employers tend to be reluctant to invest in training or developing their ‘entry-level’ employees. Certainly it is evident that most training is directed towards those already (highly) qualified, and that a significant proportion of the workforce receive no training (DfEE, 2000), which includes those concentrated in low-skilled work. This may in part be due to a perception that such workers are easily replaced, or a failure to recognise the high costs of recruitment, even for hourly paid/unskilled workers (Kellard et al., 2001).
Whilst it is generally accepted that the experience of work may enhance future employment prospects, there is concern that a significant proportion of work taken by entry level employees offers little opportunity for skill development or progression, and therefore does not necessarily enhance future employment prospects. At worst, frequent moves between low-paid insecure and poor quality work, and unemployment may be of some damage to future employment prospects (Gregg, 1999).

- **Some groups of people find it more difficult to progress or advance in the labour market than others**
  Different groups of people appear to have different progression or advancement rates in employment, which may in part be related to individual characteristics (such as qualifications), but may also be due to other factors, such as employers’ attitudes towards training and development (particularly for entry level workers), individual desire to advance in work, or the (in)ability to move around the labour market without assistance (such as government financial assistance at periods of transition). For example, evidence suggests that people from ethnic minority backgrounds have a lower employment progression rate (in terms of earnings) than their white counterparts in many sectors of employment (Social Exclusion Unit, 1999), even taking into account any language disadvantages (Leslie and Lindley, 2001).

- **Employers have increasingly higher expectations from new entrants and returners to the labour market**
  Job requirements, even for entry level employment at the lower end of the labour market, have risen (NDTF, 1999), with employers expecting certain levels of literacy and numeracy and basic computing skills, as well as softer skills, such as communication and team working (Kellard et al., 2001; Snape, 1998; NDTF, 1999). This not only affects the ability of individuals to obtain work, but their ability to remain in a job, or to progress in the labour market - evidence suggests that the employment retention rates of employees with only a basic level of education has fallen (Walker et al., 1999).

- **Changes in labour market demands may effect job retention**
  Employers increasingly demand a flexible workforce, and one that can be rapidly adapted to allow for peaks in demand, hence (entry level) jobs are increasingly on a short, fixed-term or a contract basis (Kellard et al., 2001). In addition, the use of temporary workers is rising, particularly in high turnover industrial sectors, often recruited through private employment agencies (call centre staff are a classic example of this) (Cully et al., 1999; Forde, 2001). Although there is some evidence to suggest that temporary work may act as a stepping stone to more sustained work in the longer-term (Trickey et al., 1998; Booth et al., 2000), counter-evidence indicates that temporary or short-term contract workers may experience lower job satisfaction and job security, and receive lower pay and less (if any) work-related training than their permanently employed counterparts (Forde, 2001; Booth et al., 2000).
The current UK government is committed to tackling poverty, by pursuing a goal of full, and sustained, employment opportunities for all, and by placing an increased emphasis in helping people to ‘break out’ of the low-pay no-pay cycle by helping them to stay in work and to gain the skills to progress in work, or up the ‘earnings ladder’ (DfEE/DSS/HMT, 2001; HMT, 1997). This concern is in recognition of the consequences of repeated and prolonged unemployment, to individuals and society (see, for example, Gregg, 1999; Trickey et al., 1998), including increased poverty and insecurity, poor health and social exclusion, as well as fiscal costs.

As a result of ongoing research and evaluation of current and past labour market programmes, a considerable amount is now known about the barriers faced by unemployed people in (re)entering work. However, enabling people to retain their ‘new’ job, and to move to another (ideally ‘better’) job presents additional challenges. These raise issues for researchers and academics, to try to identify and measure the complex interplay of individual, structural and environmental barriers that may hinder or facilitate sustained employment, as well as for policy makers and governments to design and implement policies that may support and encourage individuals to move into, and remain in, the labour market. In the UK, there are already a number of developments underway that may encourage job retention and advancement. The most notable of these, outlined below, include the New Deals, Employment Zones, ONE (and Jobcentre Plus), Tax Credits, and transitional employment schemes, such as Intermediate Labour Markets (see Chapter 2 for discussion on the latter).

There are also a number of other current Jobcentre Plus policy initiatives that may support, or enhance job retention, including Work Trials, Employment on Trial, Access to Work, Rapid Response Service and Work Based Learning for Adults, as well as enhanced Employment Service and New Deal models (such as the New Deal for Lone Parents ‘outreach’ programme).

---

Past initiatives that have also sought, to a greater or lesser extent, to facilitate sustained moves into employment have included Workstart Pilots, Project Work Pilots, Jobfinders’ Grant, Jobmatch and Jobstart.
The New Deal Programmes

Many of the New Deal programmes have some element of in-work support provision. Access to such provision varies, for example:

- in New Deal for Young People, participants are eligible for in-work support from their Personal Adviser (for up to 26 weeks) whilst on (subsidised) Employment Options;
- for New Deal for 50+ participants, in-work support services (primarily in the form of an Employment Credit, and access to a Training Grant) are available for up to a year in work;
- in New Deal for Disabled People (National Extension), participants are eligible for Job Broker services both pre- and post-employment (Job Brokers are paid a retention bonus for clients who remain in work for six months);
- in New Deal for Lone Parents there is no time limit on the availability of Personal Adviser (PA) support, although it is generally assumed that such support will cover the transitional period;
- in the enhanced New Deal for 25+, PAs are able to offer specialist assistance to placed clients and their employers, to help to resolve quickly and effectively any problems that may arise, as well as helping to meet additional ‘settling in’ costs (for employers).

(Source: New Deal web site, Employment Service statistics, briefings and Press Releases).

The extent to which New Deal participants are aware of, and take up, PA in-work support in part depends on whether, and to what extent, such support is promoted. For example, New Deal for Lone Parents evaluations suggests that the take-up of PA in-work support and advice was lower than might be expected because the majority of clients were unaware that it was available (Lewis et al., 2000). One of the reasons for this may be due to the intensive caseloads that many Personal Advisers have, leaving them limited capacity to proactively promote the in-work support that is available. However, when clients did take up services, they found them extremely valuable (ibid.). Nevertheless, New Deal statistics suggest that approximately one-third of lone parents continue to receive some form of in-work support on moving into work (although no further information is available on the nature of such support, there are some variations in take-up, for geographical location, age – of both child and parent – and ethnic group) (Employment Service Statistics, April, August and November 2001).

Take-up of in-work services may also depend on whether participation in the New Deal programme is voluntary or mandatory. The available evidence suggests that voluntary New Deal participants are more likely to take up the in-work services provided through their PA than are those who have participated through a mandatory programme. This may, in
part, relate to a desire to disassociate from government-provided support once there is no obligation to do so. It may also be related to the stronger labour market attachment of those who voluntarily take up welfare to work services.

The New Deal Innovation Fund, which provides venture capital to new ideas and activities, aims to enhance New Deal outcomes by helping people move from benefits to sustained work. A number of small-scale projects have been tested which aim to increase job retention rates through the provision of post-placement in-work support, for both clients and employers. The projects include the provision of a full-time placement officer and the provision of after-care support workers for New Deal leavers. Such provision has been estimated to reduce the number of placed clients leaving a job before 13 weeks by half (DWP/ES, 2001).

**Employment Zones**

Fully-fledged Employment Zones have been in existence since April 2000. The objective of Employment Zones is to address problems of long-term unemployment in identified deprived areas, with a specific aim of increasing the numbers of long-term unemployed Jobseeker’s Allowance clients moving into sustainable employment (typically defined as a 13-week period without a return to JSA claimant status). The innovation in Employment Zones centres around the use of a Personal Job Account, which can be used at the discretion of the Personal Adviser, in conjunction with individuals, to fund support or services for the individual to help them to overcome the barriers they may face in obtaining and retaining employment (ranging from paying for training to purchasing clothing for an interview). At the time of writing, no formal evaluation evidence was available to indicate the extent to which Employment Zone approaches have improved sustainable employment, although it does appear that the key to success is the intensive support provided through the Personal Adviser, and a demand led approach to quality job matching clients with employers (internal DWP correspondence, 2001).

**Wage supplementation: Family Credit, Earnings Top-up, Tax Credits**

In the UK, there have been numerous wage subsidies designed to increase the earnings of low-income families, notably Family Income Supplement, Family Credit, the Earnings Top-up pilot and most recently, tax credits. The Employment Tax Credit is likely to be introduced in 2003 and will replace the current Tax Credit system. There are current debates about whether wage subsidies increase in-work poverty traps, and thus act as a disincentive to employment progression. For example, a review of the effectiveness of the Employment Credit payable through the New Deal for 50+ found that the earnings for the majority of recipients had not increased by the time the credit expired (after 12 months), resulting in a
drop in income for many clients (Atkinson, 2001). It is generally recognised that, as a single policy intervention to encourage job retention and advancement, wage supplements are unlikely to have a major impact, but need to be accompanied by a number of other measures (including non-financial) to ‘make work pay’ (Bennett and Hirsch, 2001).

**ONE and Jobcentre Plus**

The ONE pilots were designed to explore new ways of delivering social security benefits to people of working age, by bringing together organisations and agencies through a single point of contact. The aim was to offer an integrated, tailor made service for clients, through a Personal Adviser, and to provide an enhanced ‘work focus’ to the process, as well as providing benefit related services. One of the objectives of ONE is to increase sustainable levels of employment by getting more people into work. However, the various evaluation results do not indicate a significant effect on sustainable employment (see, for example, Green et al., 2001). Jobcentre Plus, which builds on lessons learnt from ONE has more provision for supporting clients (and employers) in work. However, it is still in pathfinder stage, with national rollout planned from April 2002.

**The UK Employment Retention and Advancement Demonstration Project**

In collaboration with several stakeholder government departments, the Centre for Management and Policy Studies (CMPS) in the Cabinet Office is taking forward the design phase of the ERA Demonstration project. The project forms part of CMPS strategy for improving the evidence base for policy making and is intended inform how best practice in policy making and evaluation should develop, as well as understanding of the specific policy area. The project is currently in the design phase, which leads on from a series of consultation meetings convened by the HM Treasury Welfare-to-Work team.

The main objective is to design a demonstration project that can test a number of interventions. These interventions will each be designed to help those in low-paid, low-status employment retain work and advance in the labour market. The design phase will:

- develop policies or interventions for the demonstration to test, which are designed on the basis of the available research evidence, are amenable to rigorous scientific evaluation and can be delivered on the ground;
- design an implementation strategy for the policy interventions which is practical, meets the policy objectives and harmonises with the evaluation strategy. Work in this area will include looking at who might be best placed to deliver the interventions and how;
- design an evaluation of these interventions based on a random assignment methodology that is sensitive enough to detect their net impact;
• design a data collection strategy that will provide the data required to evaluate the demonstration; and
• specify the required content of a cost-benefit assessment of the demonstration, formative elements of the evaluation as well as contextual analysis.

These elements will be drawn together in the form of a detailed specification of requirements.

Early work has focused on the potential for testing three types of intervention as part of the ERA Demonstration project. These are:
• a case worker to help those in work negotiate the barriers they face in retaining and advancing in employment;
• a financial incentive for job retention and advancement; and
• a combination of case worker and financial incentive.

Although the details of the evaluation will be determined in the course of the design phase, the evaluation is likely to have three main elements:
• a formative study, comprising both qualitative and quantitative methods along with a contextual analysis to address process and implementation issues.
• an impact assessment, using a random assignment methodology to derive unbiased estimates of intervention impacts; and
• a cost-benefit analysis.

This review found that very few countries had a specific policy emphasis on job retention or advancement for newly employed former benefit or welfare recipients. This section briefly reviews the policies of those countries for which relevant post-employment initiatives were found, and which have thus been included in this report (see Part Two).

United States

There is a wealth of post-employment initiatives being undertaken in the United States, at both state and local level. The context of the United States interest in job retention, and ‘self-sufficiency’ largely stems from welfare reform, and the associated emphasis on personal responsibility. Important to this is the concern regarding the large proportion of single parent welfare recipients. In 1997, it was found that 73 per cent of families receiving welfare were single parent families, decreasing slightly to 66 per cent in 2000 (Zedlewski and Alderson, 2001).

Since 1996, most individuals (excluding certain ‘special’ groups, such as severely disabled people) have to find some form of work within two years after the start of their welfare receipt. In addition, welfare assistance is time limited (to two year spells), and limited in an individual’s lifetime (in most cases this is just five years). A large number of studies have
shown the inability of the majority of these individuals to find steady employment, and most that do are in low quality jobs that do not improve, and with low wages that do not increase over time (see Strawn and Martinson, 2000, for an overview). States themselves also face financial penalties if a certain proportion of its welfare caseload is not employed or participating in work-related activities. Therefore, a number of federal policies allow, and have encouraged, states to implement measures that support job retention, including post-employment initiatives.

The funding of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), the US cash welfare assistance, is provided to states in a block grant that remains the same each year, regardless of welfare caseload size. Since the introduction of TANF in 1996 welfare caseloads have dramatically reduced leaving states with a large surplus of funds. In addition, the 1999 final TANF regulations has allowed much greater flexibility for the use of the TANF funds, for example, to assist all low-income parents whether or not they have custody of their children. Workforce development services that can be provided from these funds do not have the time limits, work requirements or other conditions that do apply to the receipt of TANF cash assistance itself. This means that the funds can be used for a wide range of workforce development services for working families such as earned income tax credits, childcare, transportation, wage subsidies, individual development accounts, emergency cash payments, work-related expenses and other non-financial services (for example case management).

Also established in 1996 under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, of which TANF was part, was the Welfare to Work (WtW) Grants Program. These formula-driven competitive grants were targeted at specific groups of the welfare population, particularly the ‘harder-to-employ’ or those with greater barriers to employment. From its inception the grants could also be used for non-custodial parents. The grants were provided for states to fund non-cash assistance work-related activities designed to move the harder to employ and non-custodial parents into long-term employment. The mixture of pre- and post-employment activities could, among other things, include: wage subsidies, on-the-job training, post-employment training and education, job retention services and additional supportive services.

The Workforce Investment Act was introduced in the summer of 1998. The funds available are provided to support workforce development services and, although not as flexible as TANF, they do allow services to be provided to low-wage workers, and not just the (previously) unemployed. Under the Act, states and localities must implement employer-led workforce investment boards and retention and wage progression outcomes must be tracked over the longer-term. The funds can be used for a number of pre- and post-employment services including individual job preparation services, skills training, work-related basic education, English as a Second Language, case management (pre- and
post-employment), paid and unpaid work experience, customised training, supportive services and needs-related payments. The education, training and support services have the emphasised goal of facilitating career advancement and wage enhancement.

A final programme in the United States worthy of note is the Job Access and Reverse Commute grant program that began in the financial year of 1999. On the basis of an application, the programme funds one-half of a state or locality plan to develop new or expanded transportation services to connect welfare recipients and other low-income individuals to work or employment-related services (the state/locality must fund the other half). Examples of services that will be funded include: shuttle buses; vanpools; new bus routes; connector services to public transport areas; and guaranteed ‘ride home’ programmes. All the programmes funded must have a co-ordinated, regional approach to the problems of job access.

The US has also been at the forefront of large-scale, random assignment evaluations of post-employment initiatives, although, given the number of initiatives underway, the proportion of evaluations is still small. However, a new random assignment evaluation is currently being developed by Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) for the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The Employment Retention and Advancement (ERA) Evaluation Project is a multi-site, multi-year evaluation of programmes to assist low-wage workers retain employment and/or advance in the labour market. Each site has chosen its own target group (for example, TANF applicants/recipients, TANF leavers, broader working poor, hard-to-employ) and service provision (for example, intensive case management, education and training, incentives, childcare/supportive services). They will also have different service delivery systems. The first report on programme design and early implementation should be available for public release (from HHS) within a few months (see Appendix B for more details of this evaluation).

Canada

Canada’s policy focus on job retention and advancement has arisen primarily because of the large increase in social assistance recipients during the 1980s, which predominantly occurred because of the changing economy following the recession of the 1980s. Canadian policies therefore are centred around enabling welfare recipients to enter employment through training and work experience (Human Resources Development Canada, 1996). Some programmes that have been developed come under the definition of post-employment support used in this report, namely wage subsidies to employers and earnings supplements for employees.
New Zealand

Similarly, policies in New Zealand have aimed for a reduction in benefit dependency and an increase in the proportion of welfare recipients/unemployed moving into work, with a specific aim of moving towards sustained employment and increased income. A Labour/Alliance government statement issued in June 2001, *Pathways to Opportunity*, outlines the move from a ‘traditional welfare’ to ‘social development’ welfare system approach, and states that one of its success measures is moving ‘people into sustainable work’ (New Zealand Cabinet, 2001). Previous to this, for lone parents, the policies to encourage work have largely been limited to financial provision. However, for the long-term unemployed and ethnic minorities (Maori and Pacific peoples) non-financial support services have been developed, and these are planned to be extended to lone parents (and former carers) from the autumn of 2002.

Australia

Australia’s employment policies are also concentrated on assisting disadvantaged groups (people with disabilities, the long-term unemployed, carers and older people) to (re)enter the labour market. Although there is little specific policy emphasis on job retention, a number of federal and state initiatives to encourage movements into work found in this review can be defined as post-employment support schemes. As in Canada, the majority of these are wage subsidies for employers, but do also include non-financial support for some groups, notably people with disabilities.

European and other OECD countries

Few other OECD or European countries have policies directly focused on improving job retention and advancement for unemployed or other groups inactive in the labour market (the exception to this is disabled people, particularly those in work facing the onset of impairment or disability). All European Union member countries have had to produce National Action Plans on Employment for the past two years and not one country specifically mentions job retention or advancement in these plans. However, the European Council’s recommendations to member states, based on these reports, include the implementation of ‘comprehensive lifelong learning strategies’ and governments and social partners to work in partnership ‘to improve the level and quality of employment’ (European Union website, 2001). In its own Employment Report for 2001, the European Union does not specifically mention job retention strategies, although it does suggest that the (increasing) use of temporary contracts does not necessarily lead to stable employment.

The European Union established the European Social Fund (ESF) over 40 years ago with the specific aims of improving individuals’ skill development and work potential. Between 1995 and 2000 the ESF
operated the ADAPT and EMPLOYMENT initiatives to improve and support member states’ active employment policies. The ADAPT initiative was run to support companies and workers respond to industrial change (see further details on Job Rotation in Chapter 2). The EMPLOYMENT initiative was split, targeting four groups who had special difficulties in the labour market:

- NOW: equality of opportunities between men and women;
- HORIZON: people with disabilities;
- INTEGRA: socially excluded people; and
- YOUTHSTART: young people.

EQUAL (from 2000 onwards), the new ESF initiative following on from ADAPT and EMPLOYMENT, is structured around the four pillars on which the National Action Plans for Employment are based: employability, entrepreneurship, adaptability and equal opportunities. It is part of the European Union strategy ‘for more and better jobs and for ensuring that no one is denied access to them … (and) … will test new ways of tackling discrimination and inequality experienced by those in work and those looking for a job’ (European Commission, 2000, p.1). A number of projects funded by the EQUAL initiative are included in this report.

A few European countries have introduced post-employment initiatives without ESF support. The majority of these, however, are concerned with integrating disadvantaged groups (most usually people with disabilities and the long-term unemployed) into the labour market. Such schemes are included in this report primarily because they provide wage subsidies to employers or employees.

The OECD, through its Local Economic and Employment Development (LEED) Programme, is currently developing an exploratory project to investigate local measures aimed at increasing employment retention and advancement for disadvantaged workers in the labour market, particularly those who have recently left benefits (author’s personal correspondence with LEED programme staff).

1.4 Report structure

The report is divided into three main parts. Part One contains this chapter and Chapter 2, which outlines transitional employment programmes.

Part Two contains a detailed description, and evaluation evidence where available, concerning the in-work support programmes identified in the review. Chapter 3 discusses in-work assistance with childcare and transport, followed by Chapter 4 which focuses on financial assistance for new entrants to work (for both employees and employers). In-work support programmes that utilise a case management approach to providing services for different client groups are then presented (Chapter 5), followed by an overview of specific non-financial support and advice services (Chapter 6). Chapter 7 outlines in-work support programmes that
concentrate on skill development and training, and Chapter 8 considers programmes that have an element of employment advancement.

Part Three provides an overview (Chapter 9) of the findings, including implications for the organisation and delivery of in-work support programmes, and considerations for the design of future policies to enhance job retention and advancement. It brings together the key lessons learned from the review of international in-work support programmes and specifically looks at policy options for programme delivery. The first part (Section 9.1) summarises the key findings from the review for different types of in-work support programmes and various sources of evidence in accessible format. Section 9.2 is a reflection of critical questions raised in connection with the delivery of in-work support programmes, and presents key issues centring around providing in-work practical or non-financial support, providing financial support in work, involving employers in the provision of in-work support services, engaging clients in in-work support services once they have moved into work, and issues relating to case management (including the organisation and size of caseloads).

Appendix A to this report is a detailed analysis of the evaluations of in-work support programmes, notably those that have utilised a random assignment approach (that is, an experimental design). These are included at the specific request of the Centre for Management and Policy Studies to inform the design of the Employment Retention and Advancement demonstration project. Appendix B provides further information about the US Employment Retention and Advancement Demonstration Project. Appendix C provides an alphabetical list of programmes included in the review, by country.
2 THE ROLE OF TRANSITIONAL EMPLOYMENT SCHEMES: A BRIEF OVERVIEW

Although the main focus of this report is on the effectiveness of in-work support programmes, there are a number of recent developments in the UK, and elsewhere, in the provision of pre-employment programmes that may, in the longer term, enhance job retention and advancement, and hence warrant some discussion before turning to a detailed review of in-work support. Such programmes can be defined under the umbrella term of 'transitional employment', as they aim to bridge the gap between labour market inactivity and the world of work. Some seek to provide paid work through a local project or environment that is designed to mimic or replicate as far as possible the ‘real’ world of work, such as the services provided through Intermediate Labour Markets (ILMs\(^5\)), which generally provide a combination of tailored training programmes with waged work. Many of these initiatives are modelled to a greater or lesser degree on initiatives that have been developed in the United States (although some operate for profit). Notably, ILMs in the UK have learnt many lessons from the pioneering Wildcat Corporation (New York), which was set up (as a non-profit making organisation) to improve the connection of disadvantaged jobseekers to the labour market, using a demand-led approach to develop tailor-made training packages.

There are several aspects to transitional employment schemes that appear to foster job retention, including co-ordinated personal services (Section 2.1), working with employers (Section 2.2), providing tailor-made training and education (Section 2.3), job-matching (Section 2.4) and job rotation (Section 2.5).

Assisting jobseekers who are ‘disadvantaged’, particularly those who have multiple disadvantages (for example, low skills, poor social skills, history of unemployment etc) before they move into mainstream employment, can increase their likelihood of obtaining, and retaining, employment (Evans and Kazis, nd). These functions are typically provided by intermediary organisations operating what is generally termed ‘intermediate labour markets’.

The definition of such organisations can vary, but is used to describe any organisation that provides an intermediary service, by linking unemployed people (or others who have been absent from the labour market) to employers, through a variety of interventions. These interventions may include, among others, work preparation/job readiness training, work placements, training in soft skills, career advice/development, and basic

---

5 ILMs were pioneered by the WISE group in Scotland in the mid 1980s, but their development has accelerated in the last five or so years.
skills and vocational training. In addition, intermediary organisations typically operate a demand-led approach, focusing on the specific requirements of employers, to facilitate successful job matching. Increasingly, intermediary organisations are providing post-placement or retention support to both individuals and employers. This post-employment support may be in the form of initial ‘orientation’ (‘hand holding’ in the first few weeks of employment), mentoring type roles or ‘crisis’ management (providing on-going support at times of personal difficulties) as well as liaison with the employer. Organisations involved in these kind of intermediary functions may include public employment services, private sector recruitment/employment agencies, local/community based organisations, education or training providers or specialist groups (dealing with specific client groups), or, increasingly, partnership organisations that bring together different types of expertise.

A core feature of ILMs, which distinguishes them from other in-work support programmes that are the subject of this report, is that the work placement is temporary (usually between six and 12 months), and is in addition to ‘mainstream’ employment. Gaining work experience is an important way to enhance an individual’s future (sustainable) employment prospects, and there is evidence to suggest that many people who go through an ILM programme move on to sustained employment, which they may not have done without the programme (by definition, the target groups for ILMs are usually those who have been out of the labour market for some time, or who have considerable disadvantages) (Marshall and Macfarlane, 2000). Follow up evidence, though limited6, suggests high retention rates. Where participants have been systematically tracked in mainstream employment (for example, the Wise Group and Glasgow Works), over 90 per cent are reported to be still in work after six months, compared to less than 40 per cent in other programmes (such as Training for Work and New Deal for Young People). Earnings of ILM leavers are also reported as higher than leavers of other comparable programmes, by approximately £1,500 a year (Marshall and Macfarlane, 2000). Factors which enhance job retention of ex-ILM participants are said to be the provision of continued in-work support and guidance and advice of ILM workers who may telephone or visit new employees.

Nevertheless, costs of ILM programmes are high, at an estimated minimum of about £10,000 per person (average length on programme of 36 weeks) (Marshall and Macfarlane, 2000). This compares to estimated annual costs to the Exchequer, for lost taxes and benefits for an unemployed individual, in the region of £8,200 (Bivand, 1999). However, ILM programmes are typically focused on the ‘hardest to place’ individuals, by default those requiring the most resource intensive assistance. Intermediary

---

6 Marshall and Macfarlane found that only a third of the ILMs surveyed completed any kind of evaluation (2000). At the time of their research only Glasgow Works and the Wise Group measured labour market progress of individuals once they had left an ILM programme.
organisations frequently highlight the importance of intensive personal support, both pre- and post-employment and the failure to recognise this intensive requirement in the funding regimes or formulas (Marshall and Macfarlane, 2000; ILM Convention, 2001). According to the successes reported above, and elsewhere, the longer-term benefits from investing in programmes such as ILMs, which enhance individual self-sufficiency and hence job retention (and possibly advancement) are clear. Nevertheless, it should still be borne in mind that not all participants in transitional work programmes such as ILMs do make successful moves into work (Marshall and Macfarlane, 2000); a small but significant proportion continue to find it difficult to get, and keep a job.

2.2 Working with employers

One of the reported strengths of intermediate work programmes is that they are strongly influenced by the demands of employers, that is, they work closely with local employers and industrial sectors to identify needs, including jobs which employers may find difficult to fill, and implementing a tailor-made training programme for clients to equip them with the types of skills employers demand. Partly because of the difficulties some employers face in filling entry level vacancies (and partly due to the desire for numerical flexibility), there is increasing evidence in the UK that employers are using workers employed through temporary employment agencies (Forde, 2001). This can allow the worker to be ‘screened’ for permanent positions, using the period of temporary work as a probationary period (typically between two and six weeks). There is little ‘risk’ to the employer, as they are under no obligation to retain the worker if they are not appropriate for the employer’s needs. However, it is in the employment agency’s advantage to ensure that the employer is happy with the agency worker, so that the employer continues to use the services of the agency. For this reason some employment agency staff provide on-going support for workers placed with employers through on-site discussions with employers and temporary workers about the task and job performance (Forde, 2001).

This function has also been developed through other organisations, acting in an intermediary role. For example, Lewisham College provides a similar service to employers and clients. Clients are placed with employers, following a period of training (through a 13 week work preparation programme) developed in conjunction with employers (primarily in the financial services sector) to fill specific job requirements (Local Economy Policy Unit seminar at South Bank University ‘What’s new for Labour’s second term’: presentation by representative of Lewisham College, November 2001), often undercutting typical employment agency charges to the benefit of the employer. Any individuals subsequently placed (typically through a 16 week paid internship period) are then supported

---

7 The wage or salary is paid by Lewisham College. When this type of service is offered by employment agencies, typically the wage or salary is paid by the employer (see Forde, 2001).
by a Work Placement Manager from the college. Whilst the Lewisham initiative is still in its infancy, evidence suggests that the outcomes are positive, and that employers have recruited and retained individuals that would not have been recruited through standard recruitment methods, and there are plans to extend the service to other industrial sectors.

In the United States, it has been suggested that a possible weakness of previous state funded labour market policies is that they have placed too much emphasis on individual skill development, and insufficient emphasis on the needs of employers/job vacancies (Evans and Kazis, nd). The type of venture typified by the Lewisham College example given above attempts to bring employers and providers closer together, by providing a programme of skill acquisition, training and personal development that is tailor-made to the requirements of a particular industry, or even employer, rather than following a path towards a recognised qualification. Other examples of ‘broker agencies’ include the Speke Garston Partnership. The Partnership (local authority, private and voluntary sector) acts as a broker agency for major local employers, such as Liverpool Airport and Ford Motor Company.

Furthermore, the new Jobcentre Plus service, which is being rolled out nationally from April 2002, places considerable emphasis on working with employers, and has introduced Account Managers to work closely with major employers.

2.3 Pre-employment training and education programmes

As the previous sections have indicated, the provision of demand-led pre-employment training and education programmes are a central component of transitional employment schemes. However, they require the full participation, co-operation and support of the employer, who often have to guarantee employment of varying lengths of time for successful trainees. An example of one such successful (in terms of job retention, but not advancement) programme is Canada’s federal Employability Improvement Programme, which was introduced in 1991 to replace a number of previously existing training programmes. The main objective of the programme was ‘to offer a flexible choice of training programmes and services to improve the employability of clients who were experiencing difficulty in finding and retaining jobs’ (HRDC, 1995, p.3). Clients who chose the work experience component (as opposed to the training component) were placed with employers who provided on-the-job training and work experience to participants. Employers received a wage subsidy and financial assistance for the training costs incurred. Placements had to be for at least 80 hours and a maximum of 52 weeks (the average was 24 weeks) and was intended to lead to long-term employment. The evaluation of the scheme compared participants in the scheme, defined as those who had started training between July 1991 and January 1994 (and had completed it by March 1994), with a group of potential clients for the programme. The latter were drawn from administrative data files and selected based on a number key characteristics
in order to match those of participants. The proportion of weeks in work in the two years after programme participation was larger than the proportion of weeks two years prior to participation (61.9 compared to 45.5 per cent). However, average earnings decreased slightly following programme participation. Comparing participants to non-participants suggested that employment duration was enhanced following the programme, with participants working more weeks per year after participation (approximately 13 more weeks), and having higher annual earnings (approximately $4828) with less time in receipt of social assistance.

2.4 Job matching

Previous research findings have emphasised the importance of a quality ‘job match’ between the individual and the employer, in facilitating job retention (for example, Kellard et al., 2001; Evans and Kazis, nd). Unsuitable or inappropriate job matches will often lead to premature exits from work (Ashworth and Liu, 2001; Millar and Ridge, 2001). There is some evidence to suggest that those who ‘hold out’ for the right job have a higher chance of that job being sustained, than those who are less selective in the job they take (Trickey et al., 1999); indeed it is possible that taking an unsuitable, and hence unsustainable, job may be detrimental to an individual’s future employment prospects. The majority of pre-employment schemes have within them some element of job matching, not least because many providers of pre-employment services receive outcome-related funding which is linked to successful and sustained job placements (although job retention is generally only measured to a 13 week duration). The key to successful job matching appears to be intensive pre-employment interventions with individuals, to identify barriers to work, and providing appropriate training or skill development – all of which are a central function of intermediate labour markets and transitional work programmes. One example of such a scheme is the Australian ‘Job Matching’ programme. The programme includes a network of around 200 organisations (private, community and government organisations) who are dedicated to finding jobs for long-term unemployed people. The programme, which uses a profiling scheme (see Chapter 4) – the Jobseeker Classification Instrument – to identify and classify jobseekers into three assistance (and funding) levels, reports high levels of ‘positive outcomes’. For jobseekers placed in Job Matching jobs over a six month period (in 2000), 70 per cent were either in work, or studying three months after the placement (Australian Government website, 2002).

2.5 Job Rotation

Job Rotation is a labour market tool which has its roots in Denmark, where it has formed a central part of the employment strategy. The purpose of Job Rotation schemes are to ‘backfill’ temporary vacancies that have arisen whilst an incumbent employee receives training, by placing an unemployed person in the temporary vacancy. Thus the development of the existing employee is enhanced, whilst productivity is maintained and the unemployed person gains valuable work experience. The European Union now supports a number of Job Rotation initiatives in Europe, with the estimated participation of 622 companies (EU Job
Rotation website, 2001). Although Job Rotation schemes do not appear to attract government funding, some funding is available through the European Social Fund ADAPT programme, although such programmes are often required to obtain additional local funding (Centre for Social Inclusion website, 2001). Job Rotation programmes are generally managed through an intermediary organisation, such as a voluntary sector group. The development of a Job Rotation scheme requires careful planning and a major commitment for all parties involved. Evidence suggests that approximately three-quarters of ‘substitutes’ (i.e., unemployed placements) obtain work after their Job Rotation placement, either in the Job Rotation company, or with another company (EU Job Rotation website, 2001). In the UK, a small number of programmes have been developed, predominantly in the London area, but also in other areas, including, for example, Speke Garston, in Liverpool. Funding for such projects generally comes from the European Social Fund, or from Employment Zone funding and the Single Regeneration Budget. Employers are generally able to utilise some form of wage subsidies. An evaluation of UK Job Rotation schemes, primarily using qualitative evidence, reported positive (but not measurable) results, including high satisfaction (from both unemployed people and employers) (Parker, 2001).
From job seekers to job keepers: job retention, advancement and the role of in-work support programmes

Part two - Review of current post-employment initiatives
This part of the report reviews in detail in-work support programmes for newly employed people. It focuses on programmes or initiatives for people who have moved into work from being in receipt of social security or welfare benefits. However, it also includes programmes for other groups often disadvantaged in the labour market, such as: people with disabilities or mental health problems; ex-offenders; those with a history of substance abuse; women returners and young people. The initiatives of relevance to this study are predominantly to be found in the United States, but there are also programmes found in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and some European countries.

Post-employment initiatives have been defined as those which are designed to encourage or assist job retention or advancement once in employment. The definition does not include programmes which have a limited work incentive, that is, without any focus on job retention. Tax credits are also not included in this review as they are the subject of numerous separate large scale and ongoing evaluations.

A range of services is on offer to assist newly employed people to keep their job, with relatively fewer concentrating on helping these individuals advance in the labour market. These broadly fit under the following headings:

- childcare (Chapter 3);
- transport (Chapter 3);
- wage supplements and other financial assistance (Chapter 4);
- retention incentives (Chapter 4);
- non-financial support and advice – case management (Chapter 5);
- job coaching (Chapter 6);
- mentoring (Chapter 6);
- telephone helplines (Chapter 6);
- peer support groups (Chapter 6);
- post employment education and training (Chapter 7); and
- advancement strategies (Chapter 8).

As has been suggested earlier, there are a limited number of programme evaluations available (although some are forthcoming in 2002). Therefore, a significant amount of programmes reviewed are limited to descriptive information about the type of service, although in many cases this provides illuminating findings, for example, on innovative approaches. Where there are evaluations, these are clearly distinguished in the text. Where there is no evaluation evidence given, the reader should assume that such information is not (presently) available.

---

8 Some programmes provide services that fit under more than one heading. If enough detail is available in the literature to warrant their placement in more than one section then this is undertaken. However, in the majority of cases, where there is one main service and other additional services are secondary, these are included only in the section under their main service heading.
This chapter explores in-work support services designed to address individual work-related needs that may affect the ability of ex-benefit recipients to retain employment, notably childcare (Section 3.1) and transport (Section 3.2).

Having affordable, reliable, flexible and accessible childcare in place is vital for parents as they move into work. The stability of childcare once in work can also be critical. Childcare problems once in work can contribute to premature exits from work. Many entry-level jobs can require individuals to work non-standard hours which can increase the difficulty of obtaining, and paying for, suitable childcare, particularly when there is a change in the required pattern of work. Furthermore, the stability of work may be affected if usual childcare arrangements break down, or a child’s sickness prevents them from attending their usual childcare provider.

Many low-income workers may have difficulty in accessing private transport to travel to and from work, and are thus reliant on public transport. However, public transport services may not match employers’ locations, or their required working hours. Furthermore, working parents may need to also travel to childcare providers on route to work, which can cause further difficulties for those without private transport. For those who do have private transport, the running and repair costs can be prohibitive.

3.1 Childcare

In the US, all states provide subsidised childcare for a transitional period to former or current welfare recipients who move into employment, usually for up to 12 months. Some states have extended the length of transitional childcare from 12 to 24 months, in recognition of the importance of continued availability of childcare as a contributor to sustained employment. A number of states provide subsidised childcare for those below an established income criteria (regardless of their TANF receipt), to ensure that all low-income parents benefit from provision. For example, in Washington’s WorkFirst Working Connections Child Care Program families with incomes under 225 per cent of the federal poverty line may receive subsidised childcare.

Entry level employment in the United States typically involves non-standard hours (Rangarajan, 1998a). Childcare therefore has to be flexible enough to meet the demands of shift-work and variable hours. In addition, there is increasing awareness of the need for back-up childcare in emergency circumstances (such as a child becoming ill and not being able to attend their usual childcare or school) if employment is to be
maintained. In the US, States and other organisations are introducing innovative schemes to ensure that these needs are met.

States are encouraging providers of childcare services, and employers, to provide childcare during non-standard hours and for emergencies. Providers are generally encouraged to supply childcare in non-standard hours through financial incentives paid for by States (for example, Washington, Illinois, Missouri, Ohio, West Virginia), or as a ‘preferred supplier’ if they offer out of hours care (for example, Florida).

Similar incentives are available to providers who offer emergency childcare (for example, Oakland County, Michigan). In other programmes, ‘slots’ at childcare providers or day care centres have been bought by the state or county to ensure provision for children who are unwell (Milwaukee, Wisconsin and New Jersey). An alternative measure used in the Post TANF Wrap-Around Fund in Bergen County, New Jersey, provides the payment to the former TANF recipients when their child is ill and cannot attend their usual childcare (up to a maximum of $900 a year).

There are also examples of States providing financial encouragement to employers to assist with childcare provisions. For example, Rhode Island’s Employment and Retention Services Unit provides a Child Care Tax Credit to employers who supply on-site childcare or purchase off-site childcare for employees’ children. The credit equals 30 per cent of employer expenditures for costs associated with on-site facilities and operational costs or off-site purchasing costs up to a maximum of $30,000. In Florida, the amount employers pay towards the childcare costs of their employees receiving a State childcare subsidy is matched (dollar for dollar) by the Child Care Executive Partnership.

Very few employers in the US provide childcare without financial incentives. In 1998, just three per cent of employers outside of the Welfare to Work Partnership provided childcare services (defined as childcare subsidies, referrals to centres that can help, access to an in-house service and/or subsidised in-house childcare) for employees (Welfare to Work Partnership, 1998). Even among Welfare to Work Partnership employers, only 12 per cent were providing childcare services. Nevertheless, the benefits of providing childcare appeared very positive: about two-thirds of Welfare to Work Partnership employers providing childcare reported higher retention (67 per cent), reduced absenteeism

---

9 The scheme also provides incentives to those offering infant care and care for children with special needs.

10 In 1997, Chief Executive Officers of five companies – Burger King, Monsanto, Sprint, United Airlines and United Parcel Service – joined together and founded The Welfare to Work Partnership. It is now composed of more than 20,000 employers who have committed to hire and retain former welfare recipients and other unemployed and low-income workers. The Partnership provides information, technical assistance and support for businesses to achieve these goals.
and improved work performance (both 62 per cent) and over two-fifths (43 per cent) reported long-term financial savings for the business. Despite these advantages, over four-fifths of Welfare to Work Partnership employers did not offer childcare support. The main reason for not providing childcare was cost (42 per cent). Furthermore, a significant proportion of employers (16 per cent) felt that it would be hard or impossible to provide special programmes for welfare hires that are not available to all.

Transporting children to childcare providers can be another challenge to steady employment, and many van pools (specific bus services to transport workers to and from work, see Section 3.2.2 below) do not include this as part of their service. The US Department of Transport Liveable Communities initiative has tried to minimise this problem by providing childcare at public transport facilities. These currently exist in Oakland, California, Windemere, Ohio and Chicago, and Los Angeles. In other areas, Head Start11 buses which take children to childcare are then used to transport parents to points that are served by appropriate public transport to enable them to get to work.

3.2 Transport

The ability to get to work (and back again) on time is vital to maintain steady employment. However, it is only in the US that many States, counties and voluntary organisations have recognised the importance of transportation for low-income workers and the difficulties they face accessing it either because of its cost and/or its availability. In response, they have established a wide variety of schemes to deal with both of these issues.

3.2.1 Cost of transport

In the US, the cost of transport to and from work has been identified as contributing to premature exits from work (Rangarajan, 1998a). This could be because the cost of getting to and from work had been underestimated, it may become prohibitive following a change in working hours, or repairs to a vehicle could be too large to be met. In the US, three main types of programmes have been developed to address these difficulties:

- the provision of free or low cost cars;
- loans for cars; and
- assistance with other transport costs.

---

11 A child development programme for low-income children aged 0-5, pregnant women and their families.
Providing free or low costs cars

In the US, a car is often the only, or the quickest, way to work. A number of schemes have been established which provide cars either at a low cost or for free to clients who otherwise would not be able to accept work. Some schemes provide ownership to the cars immediately, in others car ownership is passed to the participant on reaching a specified length of sustained employment. Both non-profit organisations and states or counties are providing such services. Examples of these include:

- **Clinton Community Action**, Clinton County, Ohio, refurbishes cars and sells them to programme participants at a low price. Monthly payments are at a low interest rate and include petrol and insurance costs.

- **Amazing Grace Garage**, Alamo County, Texas, provides vehicles at a low cost to clients referred to them on the basis of need. After 12 months of employment the client assumes ownership of the vehicle.

- In the **Charity Cars** scheme in Sanford, Florida, donated cars are provided to recipients who must gain employment within 30 days and maintain it for three years, after which point they then assume ownership of the car. Following the widespread publicity of the scheme, in 1998, Charity Cars International was created to help other communities implement such schemes.

- States and counties running similar schemes include: **Texas, Arizona, Kansas** and **Nebraska** and the county of **Anne Arundel, Maryland**.

Loans for cars

Other schemes (both State and non-profit sector) provide loans to clients who need a car to get to work. In these schemes repayment of the loan has a time limit, and a requirement that budgeting classes are attended. Examples include:

- The **People Incorporated of South West Virginia**’s ‘Cars for Work’ programme provides a maximum loan of $2300 (interest free) to clients enrolled in TANF, employed and requiring a car to get to and from work.

- The State of Tennessee’s **First Wheels Program**, allows clients to buy a vehicle paying back the loan at low monthly rates, interest free.
Assistance with other transport costs

Some states have concentrated on helping to relieve transport costs by either subsidising public transport or by subsidising the work-related expenses incurred for existing car owners. Much of this assistance, however, is limited to transitional periods from unemployment to work. For example:

- **Georgia** provides a one-off $195 Work Support Payment for transportation;
- **Indiana**’s clients receive up to $200 per month for 90 days after entering work to reimburse their transport costs. They also provide vehicle repair costs of up to $500, again only in the first 90 days of employment;
- **Kansas** pays a transportation allowance of $25 per month for up to three months;
- The **Post TANF Wrap-Around Fund in Bergen County**, New Jersey, provides car repair and car insurance up to the value of $500 per year/$1000 in a lifetime. They also provide two equal payments towards work transportation costs up to the value of $128 a year;
- **Michigan** provides $900 for transport to work costs over a 12 month period.

Other schemes provide vouchers to cover, for example, petrol or use of public transport:

- **Tennessee’s Regional Transportation Brokers** can provide a monthly bus pass, a taxi service or participation in vanpools, or $5 a day petrol or carpool voucher.
- The State of **New Jersey Transportation Program** provides free public transport for the first month in work, with the opportunity to extend the provision for a further three to six months.

3.2.2 Availability of transport

Low-income families who do not have the use of a private car, may rely on public transport systems, which are often limited in coverage (for example, they do not reach suburban employers at appropriate hours or affordable prices). Schemes that have been developed in the US to address these issues include:

- van or car pools;
- filling in the ‘gaps’ in public transport systems;
- using alternative bus services;
- using volunteers; and
- involving employers.
Van or car pools

In areas with poor public transport, some schemes have introduced ‘van pools’ to commute workers from their inner-city residences to their suburban employers. These include the following county examples:

- A pilot project run by Dallas County’s Local Workforce Development Board, Texas, in which the Board contracted the 2000 Roses Foundation (a community based non-profit organisation) to provide a van pool and car purchase service. Two 15 passenger buses provide transportation for women employed at worksites in suburban areas with a high concentration of employers, but not served by public transport. It operates for 18 hours a day with routes determined by client residence and employer locations. Clients pay $50–$60 a week for the service and these funds are held in an ‘escrow account’\(^{12}\). At the end of a four to six month period clients may use these funds to purchase a vehicle (using financial institutions that have agreed to underwrite high-risk car loans for the project). At the time of the report, 50–60 clients were using the services (Texas Workforce Commission, 2001).

- North Carolina is encouraging counties that are already running van pools for TANF clients to allow non-TANF clients access (for a fee) therefore enabling other disadvantaged groups to use the transportation and generating additional revenue.

- Bridges to Work (EVALUATION: RA; IND; V) is funded by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Ford, MacArthur and Rockefeller Foundation. Five demonstration sites were set up to provide a targeted commuting service (from 1996 to 2000) for urban residents working in the suburbs. All five sites provided van pool services to commute workers from the inner cities to the suburbs, but with variations in: charges to clients; providers involved; and the use made (if any) of existing public transport systems. All participants also received pre- and post-employment counselling and guaranteed emergency transport home (provided by local taxi companies). The site programmes were evaluated using random assignment, with half of the clients assigned to an action group and half to a control group (800 in total). The action (or ‘treatment’) group could receive 18 months of Bridges to Work services (placement, transportation and retention support).

The strong economy meant that many of those not in work were the ‘harder to place’ and therefore the programmes had to refine recruitment strategies and include job preparation services such as workshops on attitude, dress, communication and interview techniques. An interim report states that retention was the highest in Baltimore\(^{13}\) where:

---

\(^{12}\) An escrow account is a savings account in which the savings produced are to be used for a special purpose, in this case a vehicle.

\(^{13}\) The report does not state their measure of retention. It is assumed therefore that it uses the most common definition of retention of 90 days. The report, unfortunately, does not provide figures for the retention rates.
wage differential between city and suburban jobs appeared to be greater; transportation services were available 24 hours a day, seven days a week; and where a network of social service providers offering support to participants had been developed, services not provided in the other demonstration sites (Reardon, 2001). A final report on the impacts of this programme is anticipated for the beginning of 2002 from the evaluators Public/Private Ventures.

An alternative solution to van pools is car pools where clients share a car. The present review found only one local example of this, CommuteShare, provided by the Good News Garage in Vermont. In this scheme, programme applicants submit their weekly transport needs (for work, childcare, grocery shopping and other services) and Good News will match these with up to three other participants, two of whom must be qualified drivers. Participants pay a monthly sliding scale fee collected by a credit union (which participants are encouraged to join).

According to their programme information, after six months of operation the demand for CommuteShare services exceeded capacity.

**Filling the gaps in public transport systems**

Some states are providing additional funding to counties to assist them in providing a more complete public transport service. For example:

- Since it began in 1999, Wisconsin has expanded (to $10 million in 2001) its Employment Transportation Assistance Program which provides co-ordinated public transport services for low-income workers. Enhanced services include: additional bus and taxi routes, increased evening and weekend services, vanpool and shuttle services, car loan and vehicle donation programmes. State funds also go towards employer-sponsored initiatives, volunteer driver programmes and the hiring of local mobility managers to co-ordinate transportation for workers and employers.

- Expanded from a pilot to a state-wide work first programme in 2000, Michigan’s Project Zero (for those not finding work in 60 days) is intended to reduce to zero the number of public assistance households without earned income. Recognising the importance that transportation plays in achieving this, the Department of Transport has provided $1 million in state money to extend public transport’s hours of service and areas of operation.

- In Connecticut, the Welfare to Work Transportation Access Group found that most entry-level jobs were in the suburbs and required non-standard hours or patterns of work, which did not fit current public transport provision. In response, two new bus routes were developed, as well as transport to smaller, more remote, suburban job sites.
Using alternative bus services

In a number of areas, existing specialised transportation services (for example, for older people, disabled people or school children) are being utilised for use by welfare clients. For example:

- In **Monmouth County, New Jersey**, former welfare recipients in jobs (or job training) integrate with the transit services already established for the elderly or those with disabilities.

- In **North Carolina**, co-ordination has been developed with the school bus network to allow welfare recipients to ride on the buses to access jobs at local schools (when no alternative modes of transport are available). These adult riders are trained to be bus monitors.

- **Southeastern Arkansas** uses their vans in operation for elderly people to assist residents needing transport to employment.

Using services of volunteers

Other schemes have involved volunteers, who regularly drive participants to work or drive them in emergency circumstances. For example:

- **Scott County, Indiana** uses senior citizen volunteers to transport welfare clients to work.

- **Oregon’s GATEWAY** system provides a data bank and dispatch system that matches participants in need of temporary or emergency transport with volunteer drivers who are reimbursed on a per mile basis.

Involving employers in providing transport

Finally, states have begun to encourage employers to be involved with the provision of transport for their low-income employees. Employers in all states may use the federal **Transit Benefit Program** which allows them to claim a tax reduction if they provide employees with transportation. Employers must contribute at least $65 a month towards the costs (increasing to $100 per month in 2002). The largest programmes are in **New York** and **Pennsylvania**, where employers purchase public transport vouchers or passes for their employees.

There are examples of employers providing transport assistance to their employees without the incentive of financial assistance from states. For example, many hotels and restaurants in **West Florida** were having difficulty filling jobs because of their distance from residential communities. Therefore 34 employers set up a three-route vanpool service with fees paid by the rider and matched by the employer. Nevertheless very few employers provide transport services. In 1998, just 17 per cent of Welfare to Work Partnership employers and six per cent of the non-Welfare to Work Partnership were providing some form of transportation service.
This Chapter reviews programmes that provide different forms of financial assistance in employment. Financial support to entry level employees is important as the majority will move into low-paid work, particularly if they are no longer eligible for benefits (for example, health benefits in the US and, potentially, housing benefits in the UK). Being in work may also bring increased costs such as childcare and transport (as discussed in Chapter 3). Therefore providing additional financial support can boost disposable income and therefore act as a work incentive. Furthermore, difficulties in accessing capital for new employees (for example, savings or access to loans) means that individuals may be unable to cover unforeseen expenses that occur whilst in work (such as car repairs). Without access to additional resources, such circumstances may result in them leaving employment.

As noted in Section 1.3.1, employers are often reluctant to hire benefit recipients. Financial assistance can therefore also be used to encourage employers to recruit and retain such workers.

The provision of in-work financial support may take a variety of forms, from wage supplements, loans and grants to new employees (Section 4.1), to financial subsidies to employers to retain new employees (Section 4.2). In addition, specific retention incentives are provided through some programmes (Section 4.3).

Numerous forms of financial assistance have been made available to employees to encourage job retention in the US. These come in the form of: wage supplements (Section 4.1.1); rent assistance (Section 4.1.2); saving incentives (Section 4.1.3); loans (Section 4.1.4); and emergency financial support (Section 4.1.5). In Canada and Ireland (the other countries covered here) financial assistance is restricted to the provision of wage supplements for employees. As noted earlier, this report does not include a review of the role of tax credits as a supplement to employees’ wages in its definition of post-employment support, as these are the subject of other detailed evaluations (see, for example, Bennett and Hirsch, 2001).

In the US, at least two states have tested wage supplements as a way to encourage employee retention by increasing a client’s disposable income. Both schemes were tested using a random assignment design and therefore impacts can be said to be because of the programmes.
Minnesota Family Investment Program (EVALUATION: RA; IND; M)

The Minnesota Family Investment Program for AFDC recipients moving into employment was implemented as a pilot in three urban and four rural counties. It operated from April 1994 to June 1998.

For those in the randomly assigned programme (‘treatment’) group, three changes were made to their AFDC grants: their basic grant was increased by 20 per cent to offset work-related expenses; 38 per cent of earnings were disregarded in calculating the family’s grant; and childcare subsidies were paid directly to the provider (whereas under AFDC they were reimbursed to the parent via their grant). Ex-welfare participants were required to undertake employment and training activities if they were not working full-time. The evaluation found an increase in work participation for the treatment group: 50 per cent of MFIP parents worked compared to 37 per cent of AFDC parents and their earnings were 23 per cent higher than those in the control group (Knox et al., 2000). Of those that went to work in the first year, MFIP participants were more likely to stay employed for at least 12 months.

A variant of MFIP, MFIP Incentives Only, as the name suggests, provided the earnings supplement but did not require participants to undertake employment-related activities. It encouraged part-time work (fewer than 30 hours per week) to a greater extent than full-time work (over 30 hours per week). This programme increased employment, but not to the same degree as Full MFIP, and the employment increases were largely in part-time work. Therefore earnings increases were not as large as those occurring amongst the Full MFIP group, suggesting that combining earnings supplements with employment-related services can have a greater impact (Bloom and Michalopoulos, 2001).

Milwaukee’s New Hope Project (EVALUATION: RA; IND; V)

The project, which began in 1994, enrolled volunteers during an intake period that lasted until the end of December 1995. Workers with an income below 150 per cent of the federal poverty line could volunteer for the project. Those randomly assigned to the programme group were entitled to the following New Hope benefits for three years: an earnings supplement reducing the proportion of each additional earned dollar that was lost to taxes or reduced benefits; affordable health insurance; and childcare subsidies. The evaluation found that:

- among those not employed full-time at enrolment, the proportion of sample members who were not employed at any time during the observation period was reduced by a half (from 13 per cent in the control group to six per cent in the programme group);
• the number of quarters that sample members not employed full-time at enrolment worked was increased by 0.7 of a quarter and annual earnings increased by 13.2 per cent (an increase of $1389);

• the participants who were most likely to have sustained earnings increases were those entering the programme with one potential employment barrier rather than no barriers or two or more (such as limited work experience, having very young children or lacking education qualifications) (Bos et al., 1999).

Self-Sufficiency Project (Canada)
(EVALUATION: RA; IND; V)

From 1992 to December 1999 Canada piloted a wage supplement for lone parents to encourage sustained moves to employment – the Self-Sufficiency Project (SSP). Single parents who had been on Income Assistance for at least one year were offered a generous, temporary supplement to their earnings if they went to work full-time (at least 30 hours a week) and ceased receiving Income Assistance. Single parents who were randomly assigned to the programme group, had one year to find employment and sign up for the supplement. If this had not been achieved within one year then they were not entitled to the supplement at any time. The monthly cash payment equalled half the difference between a participant’s earnings and an ‘earnings benchmark’ (uneared income and earnings of other household members were excluded). For many the supplement approximately doubled their earnings. It was provided for up to three continuous years as long as the single parent remained in full-time work and off Income Assistance.

The evaluation is ongoing, but evidence to date demonstrates that:

• Full-time employment doubled. The proportion of the programme group working full-time in the first year increased from eight to 29 per cent compared to the control group’s increase from eight to 14 per cent.

• The programme also doubled the number of people who worked full-time for a year or longer, from 10.4 per cent of the control group to 20.9 per cent of the programme group;

• SSP participants’ wages were low (within two dollars of the provincial minimum wages);

• In the three year evaluation period, wages for employed members of the control group grew by 12.7 per cent on average, compared to 11.7 per cent for programme group members (Michalopoulos et al., 2000).

The evaluation also includes a small study called SSP Plus which, in addition to the wage supplement, provides voluntary employment services to help participants find work and includes post-employment services. The early findings suggest that, although the proportion of parents finding
work was greater than amongst regular SSP recipients (half found full-time work and received at least one supplement payment), many lost these jobs quickly. The additional annual earnings impact was on average $200 per year more than those with just a supplement. This is smaller than the difference found under MFIP. This is said to be because of two main reasons. First, SSP Plus services were voluntary whereas under MFIP services were mandatory. Secondly, under the SSP supplement, earnings were substantially increased even without employment services because the SSP supplement encouraged full-time work whereas the MFIP supplement encouraged part-time work to a greater degree (Bloom and Michalopoulos, 2001).

Domestic Purposes and Widows Benefit Reforms (New Zealand) (EVALUATION: Pr/O; IND; M)

In 1999 New Zealand’s Domestic Purposes Benefit (lone parent benefit) and Widows Benefit were reformed to include work tests for those with a youngest child aged between seven and 13 (part-time work test) or aged 14 or over or no children (full-time work test). To assist the transition to employment, recipients had access to an employment transition grant (available in the first six months of work) to cover any loss of income because of a lack of paid sick leave. In addition those that moved into employment were entitled a cash subsidy for childcare to cover 20 hours per week during the school term and 30 hours per week during school holidays. Finally, debt repayments were frozen for 91 days after moving into employment.

The evaluations of the reforms included a mixture of qualitative and quantitative methods. In-depth interviews were undertaken with benefit recipients, childcare users and providers and survey data was collected on recipients who had moved into employment, childcare users and providers. There was also a process evaluation with Department of Work and Income Case Managers, focusing on the implementation and operation of the reforms. These evaluations found that there was an increase in the number of lone parents moving off benefit, particularly amongst those with a youngest child aged 14 or over (Ministry of Social Development, 2001). It was found that case managers were more likely to pursue helping this group of recipients. However, during the time of the reforms, there was an improvement of general employment conditions and other policy changes took place which may also have contributed to this increase.

The evaluation also found that, despite the childcare subsidy, accessible and affordable childcare was difficult to obtain. Take-up of the subsidy was lower than anticipated, largely because of problems with its

---

14 Under the Labour/Alliance government, these work tests are being removed from August 2002 because of a belief that it fails to adequately support lone parents and former carers to get and keep a job. New Zealand is now adopting an enhanced case management approach.
implementation. However, those that did use the childcare services appeared to be more likely to move into employment or undertake education or training. The cost of childcare, although reduced, still remained a problem.

The reforms also included a small Post-placement Support pilot designed to provide ongoing support to parents who had moved off benefit into employment. The voluntary services were provided by case managers from the welfare agency, contracted community organisations or both, for six months. However problems with its implementation meant that it did not operate as intended because of:

- a lack of resources and tight time frame in which to become operational;
- difficulty identifying eligible clients;
- difficulty encouraging clients no longer receiving benefits to remain in contact with the welfare agency in order to receive the services.

Therefore the evaluation did not attempt to assess its impact.

Ireland’s Back to Work Allowance
(EVALUATION: O; IND; M)

In Ireland, the Back to Work Allowance (BtWA) wage supplement scheme for the newly employed was introduced nationally in July 1993. It allows long-term unemployed people aged 23 or over to take up paid employment or become self-employed without the (total) loss of the benefit. During the first year of their (self-) employment, the previously unemployed maintain 75 per cent of their social welfare payments, reducing to 50 per cent and 25 per cent in the two subsequent years respectively. Participants also retain all ‘passported’ benefits such as a fuel allowance and butter voucher. Participants are designated to a Job Facilitator whose role it is to assist jobseekers, recruit employers (who benefit from exemption from contributions to the national insurance scheme (PRSI) if participating), and to provide (unspecific) after-care services to employees.

The evaluation of the Allowance involved sample surveys of entrants to the scheme and firms that had recruited under the scheme, prior to the end of September 1994. It found the programme weak in helping employed and self-employed participants retain their new activities (WRC Social and Economic Consultants, 1997). This was particularly the case after three to six quarters of participation in the programme, at which point the BtWA rate declined from 75 per cent to 50 per cent. The evaluation was critical of the role of the Job Facilitator who rarely had sufficient time to offer jobsearch assistance or employer recruitment services at great depth, or to offer any after-care services at all. The main reason was their high average caseload of 330 participants, which the evaluation’s authors reported was likely to increase to 550, as the programme was expected to expand in the future.
In the US, the amount public housing residents pay in rent increases in line with any increases in earnings. In other words, much of the gain in earnings that public housing residents make on moving into (or advancing in) employment is lost to higher housing costs. To adjust for this, schemes have been introduced whereby a higher earnings disregard is used to calculate rent, therefore increasing residents’ disposable income:

- Some states including Connecticut and New Jersey offer vouchers to cover rental costs that exceed 40 and 45 per cent of family income respectively.

- Established in 1991, the Economic Initiative Program of the City of Phoenix Housing Department is a programme that comprises up to four phases\(^{15}\). The programme also includes an 18-month income disregard before rents are increased in line with earnings. Participants are encouraged to use the money saved to purchase necessary items to help them gain and maintain employment (for example, a car or their own home). Between 1991 and 1999, of the 57 participants that completed all phases almost all (93 per cent) obtained unsubsidised employment, with an average wage of $9.50 per hour, and 12 had bought their own homes (Wood et al., 1999).

- Jobs-Plus Community Revitalisation Initiative (EVALUATION: Q-E; IND; V) A number of initiatives have been set up under the Jobs-Plus Community Revitalisation Initiative for Public Housing Residents. This demonstration project, conceived by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Rockefeller Foundation and MDRC, began in 1997 in seven cities. The aim is to boost employment among all working-age residents of the selected public housing sites by providing employment and training services, neighbour-to-neighbour outreach, and financial incentives in the form of limiting rent increases. In all seven sites, the percentage of countable income used to calculate rent is either reduced or flat rents are set. In two sites a portion of their rent is placed into a savings account which may be used when clients have maintained employment for 12 months. The evaluation will measure their effectiveness for increasing employment by these means by comparing these public housing sites against another one or two in the same city where the programme did not operate. The evaluation is due to be completed in 2003.

In the US, there are also other schemes which use savings incentives to encourage (new) employees to stay in work, or to build up funds that can be used for work-related activities (such as training) or for other benefits (such as home ownership). Two nationwide initiatives, available to all states, are highlighted.

---

\(^{15}\) The four phases are: a life skills training course; educational/vocational skills training; placement in subsidised employment; and, for those not successful in obtaining unsubsidised employment, assistance with jobsearch, resume-writing and interview skills.
The **Family Self-Sufficiency Program** (FSS) was enacted in 1990 and modified by Congress in 1992 and 1998. It allows any public housing agency to operate an FSS programme with the approval of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Under the scheme, families living in public housing or with a Section 8 voucher\(^{16}\) receive case management services to identify employment goals and help them access skill-building and other support services. As family earnings increase, the public housing agency deposits the increased rental charges that a family pays into an escrow account. The money can be accessed when the resident has successfully completed the contract (usually five years), is employed and all family members have not received welfare assistance for 12 months of the contract. Housing agencies may allow families to withdraw from their accounts during the contract to pay for college or vocational training, work-related expenses, or home ownership. Some programmes match the savings that are made into the account – these matched accounts are known as Individual Development Accounts (see below). Less than half of public housing agencies offer the programme and most of those that do strictly limit programme size.

Analysis of national data found that 46 per cent of Section 8 families that enrolled between autumn 1999 and autumn 2000 had an employed member, half of whom worked full-time (Sard, 2001). For families that had successfully completed the programme over the same period more than 75 per cent had an employed member and more than 80 per cent of these worked full-time. According to programme participants, the ability to access their accounts on an interim basis for specific needs helped them to remain in employment. A number of case manager services were also identified as important in helping participants retain employment including: the confidence case managers gave participants to search for a job; the emotional support received from case managers and the peer support groups provided; case managers’ local knowledge of community services available to clients; and their ability to provide small loans (for those without the necessary savings) to obtain or repair cars so employment could be accessed.

**Individual Development Accounts** (IDAs) are matched savings accounts from which the assets accrued can be used for post-secondary education and training, business capitalisation and home ownership. As of September 2001, 23 states had passed legislation and were operating IDAs (although three of these did not match savings). States determine their own administrators, funding sources, match rates (including the minimum and maximum savings at which matches will be made),

---

\(^{16}\) A Section 8 voucher is given to a very low-income family selected by a public housing agency to assist with the payment of their rent in private market housing.
eligibility requirement and, to some degree, their approved uses. To illustrate the variations in these programmes, a few example programmes are outlined below:

- In **Connecticut** the Department of Labor administers the IDA initiative. Four sites provide a match of 2:1 for those with household income at or below 80 per cent of the area median income. The deposits must be made with earned income (unless the participant is disabled, in which case deposits may be made from income other than earnings). The state maximum allowable match is $1000 per account per year or $3000 over the lifetime. The matched fund must be used within five years from the start of the programme or it is lost. In addition to the regular uses, the IDA may also be used for car purchase for employment, lease deposits and approved emergencies.

- In **Illinois** the Financial Links for Low-Income People programme has been administered by the Department of Human Services and the National Center on Poverty Law since 1998. Up to $1000 will be matched at a 2:1 rate over a two-year period. In addition to regular uses for the fund, funds can also be used for car ownership or repairs.

- In **Vermont** there is a limit of 1:1 matches from the state and 2:1 from other sources. Participants must be TANF recipients, or those eligible for TANF (whose annual income is at or below 200 per cent of federal poverty figures and earned income must be at least equal to the amount saved in an IDA). Participants are required to deposit at least $25 per month into the account, to commit to saving for a year and to deposit a minimum of $300 per year for up to four years.

**4.1.4 Loans**

Low-income families may have difficulty in accessing loan facilities through mainstream providers because of poor credit ratings, and/or limited means to repay a loan. In the US, low or no interest loans, as outlined in Section 3.2.1, are available in some states for the purchase of cars. Other states provide loans for a wider range of employment-related items. For example, **Wisconsin Works** provides short-term, no interest ‘job access loans’ to cover immediate expenses that have a direct relationship to obtaining or maintaining employment, such as car repairs, car loans, work-related clothing or equipment, rent to prevent eviction, moving expenses (if moving to a new area is required to obtain/maintain employment). The maximum amount loaned is $1600 and typically must be repaid in 12 months either in cash or through a combination of cash and voluntary community service.

**Family Loan Program and Ways to Work**

(EVALUATIONS: O; IND; V)

In the mid-1980s, the McKnight Foundation (a private philanthropic organisation) created the Single Parent Loan Program for families in Minneapolis and St Paul (Twin Cities). It was extended to two-parent families in 1991 and changed its name to the **Family Loan Program**.
The loans are provided to low-income parents who have exhausted other loan sources, are in employment or pursuing post-high school education that will lead to employment, have sufficient disposable income (in order to ensure repayment) and be the custodial parent of a child under 17 (or 18 if child in high school). The purpose of the loans is to help families pay for unexpected expenses that could interfere with their ability to stay employed or in school. Five community agencies in the area administer the loans. Loan co-ordinators screen applicants and anonymous loan committees make the decision to award a loan. Most loans go to purchase or repair cars, but are also made for other needs such as childcare, health or housing. A limit of $2200 is available for car purchases and less for other loans. Borrowers have two years to repay these no-interest loans. Loan co-ordinators support borrowers’ repayment by maintaining regular contact. Often those that are not suitable for a loan will be referred to other services and/or provided with financial counselling.

An evaluation of the Family Loan Program was undertaken in 1995 (Mueller, 1995). Outcomes for a random sample of borrowers included:

- nearly 90 per cent reported both that the FLP loan enabled them to meet their transportation needs (87 per cent) and improved their ability to meet the needs of their children (88 per cent);
- 46 per cent reported that it had improved their employment status;
- of the 160 borrowers that reported receiving public assistance at the time they received a loan (between 1990 and 1993), only 95 were receiving benefits in 1995 (i.e. the loan helped decrease use of public assistance);
- less than one per cent of those that did not use public assistance when they received their loan had started to receive public assistance since that time (i.e. the loan had prevented borrowers’ need for public assistance);
- the majority of borrowers did not find it difficult to repay the loan. Of the one-fifth that did find repayments difficult, just over half found it difficult because of insufficient funds (51 per cent) and a third because of a change in job status (34 per cent).

In 1996 the McKnight Foundation partnered with the Alliance for Children and Families (a non-profit association representing over 350 family-serving organisations) to expand the programme nationally. In 1998 the name was changed to Ways to Work and was incorporated as a non-profit organisation. As part of the Alliance, the Ways to Work Inc. assists the family organisations to implement the programme in their region. The objectives and administration of the loans remain the same, although some now require low interest on the repayments. Borrowers participate in financial management classes provided by the local agency and may receive additional support services\(^\text{17}\). Loan co-ordinators continue

---
\(^{17}\) The programme information does not specify what types of support services the local agencies provide.
to follow-up with borrowers during the repayment period to support their repayments.

The preliminary outcome evaluation of the Ways to Work programme randomly selected a sample of 185 borrowers from 20 of the Ways to Work sites. It has found that whilst the majority maintained or increased their previous earnings and use of TANF generally declined, many continued to use food stamps and use of medicaid remained high (Lengyel, 2001). However, the evaluation suggests that numbers are too small to draw generalised conclusions about these aspects.

4.1.5 Emergency cash grants

Many new employees may have limited financial resources on which to draw should an emergency occur (such as a breakdown in childcare or transport). To help alleviate such difficulties, in the US many states have an emergency support programme for those who are no longer in receipt of cash welfare assistance. However, most of these schemes have a strict time limit on accessing emergency funds, and some even disallow recipients back on TANF for a period if they accept such funding. Examples of programmes that offer access to emergency funds include:

- **Alabama**: the service is available for up to a year after leaving TANF, and must be related to accepting or retaining employment, such as car repairs, clothing, transportation and other emergencies.
- **Arkansas**: a one-off cash payment can be made to clients for an immediate job-related need which, if not resolved, would result in termination of employment.
- **Kansas**: employment retention assistance of up to $1500 is available for emergency expenses that will help maintain self-sufficiency in the three months after leaving TANF assistance.
- **Kentucky**: provides supportive payments of up to $1500 for those facing short-term family or personal difficulties, such as transportation, childcare, child support, and housing or employment-related problems. However, once individuals have received this payment, they are excluded from receiving TANF for a year.

Two of the demonstration programmes (described in detail in Section 5.1) allowed case managers to provide emergency financial assistance, including those in the Post-Employment Services Demonstration and in Pennsylvania’s GAPS programme. In the latter, over three-fifths of participants received some kind of in-kind or direct financial help, such as material goods, food assistance, transportation to work or emergency financial assistance. One organisation in the GAPS programme placed particular importance on the use of financial assistance, and staff views were that access to the fund was, in many cases, instrumental to participants keeping a job. Similarly, the Seattle Jobs Initiative includes a Career Investment Fund, most frequently used for transportation, food, clothing and childcare.
4.2 Wage subsidies for employers

Financial support in the form of wage subsidies has increasingly been provided for employers to encourage the retention of their new employees. Retention bonuses are also increasingly being provided to employers, but as these can be other than financial, and are described separately in Section 4.3.

A number of countries have introduced wage subsidy initiatives to encourage employers to hire and retain disadvantaged jobseekers. The wage subsidies have been provided in a variety of ways, including: diverting the recipients’ cash assistance to their employer; paying a portion of the wage for each hour worked; paying a set percentage of the new employee’s wage; paying a set weekly amount (regardless of the wage); or providing subsidies to upgrade jobs. The subsidies also differed in the target groups they served: welfare recipients; the long-term unemployed; young people; older people; people with disabilities or ethnic minorities. Some of the subsidies are targeted to specific industries. Despite these differences, all but three of the subsidies are provided for a fixed period (the Australian Wage Subsidy and Supported Wage Schemes, and the French AGEFIPH programme, all for people with disabilities).

4.2.1 Welfare recipients

A number of schemes in the US are for welfare recipients:

- **Florida’s WAGES Work Supplementation** initiative ‘diverts’ the cash assistance that TANF participants would receive to the employer as a hiring incentive for a specified period of time (no longer than six months). Employment must be: full-time (32 to 40 hours), at a rate at least equal to the federal minimum wage, with wages and benefits comparable to that of other employees engaged in similar work. In addition, employment should lead to long-term unsubsidised work. Work supplementation may be discontinued with employers who fail to provide continued employment after the period of the work supplementation.

- **Rhode Island’s Employment and Retention Services Unit** has a number of schemes. They can provide local service or manufacturing-based companies up to $2.50 per hour for every hour a new TANF employee works (not to exceed $2600 per employee). Companies hiring employees previously unemployed for 26 weeks may be eligible for 40 per cent of the eligible new employee’s wages. The Unit is also using subsidies to directly upgrade the quality of jobs, especially within smaller businesses. For example, the state may use subsidies to offset the cost of benefits so that an employer may turn a part-time job into a full-time one or can increase the hourly wage of a job.

- **In Seneca County, Ohio**, wage subsidies of ten per cent are provided to employers who hire low-income individuals. Employees will also receive incentive bonuses depending on length of time they keep the job (see Section 3.5 for further discussion on retention incentives for employees).
The Oregon JOBS Plus scheme was introduced into Oregon’s Welfare to Work programme in 1996 after being piloted. It is generally used for welfare recipients that have been unable to find an unsubsidised job. For a maximum of six months, employers hiring JOBS Plus participants receive a wage subsidy of $6 an hour for up to 40 hours a week and all payroll taxes, Social Security Taxes and worker compensation costs are paid. In return employers hire a welfare recipient (or unemployment insurance claimant, food stamp recipient or non-custodial parent) and sign an agreement which includes that they undertake the following requirements:

- provide appropriate training;
- recruit mentors from among their employees;
- do not displace regular employees;
- pay wages not ‘substantially less’ than wages for similar jobs;
- allow any participant in subsidised employment eight hours a week (paid) jobsearch time, after four months in the job;
- contribute one dollar an hour to an Individual Learning Account after 30 days on the job (for further detail on accounts of this type, see Section 4.1.3 above on Individual Development Accounts).

A case study investigation was undertaken involving: on-site visits; interviews with senior policy, programme managers and local providers; and information from local and state welfare offices (Roberts and Padden, 1998). This investigation found that in October 1996, 50 per cent of participants were hired into unsubsidised job, rising to 61 per cent of participants by October 1997. Programme staff, employers and the programme participants themselves reported that the job experience is ‘very beneficial’ for workers. They consistently report that “clients change dramatically” during their time in subsidised jobs. The changes take the form of physical appearance and self-confidence. Some are less depressed and many appear to be more competitive for acquiring a better job’ (ibid. p.73).

An important finding is that small employers are more likely to use the programme. It was suggested that this was the case for at least three reasons: they ‘had more heart’ i.e. they were making the appointment based on non-economic grounds; they had less bureaucracy than large firms and therefore could make such decisions quickly; and the process was simple to manage (unlike tax credits). It may also be suggested, however, that small firms would be less likely to be able to afford to train new employees and therefore a wage subsidy allowed them the financial support to do so.

There was concern that employers may receive wage subsidies for those that they would hire without a subsidy. However, the fact that employers do not have to guarantee hiring after the subsidy can allow them to ‘test’ employees out before taking them on permanently.
4.2.2 Long-term unemployed people

Wage subsidy schemes for the long-term unemployed exist in many countries, including Canada and Germany, but detailed evaluation evidence could only be obtained for schemes in New Zealand and Sweden.

**Employment Generation Program (Canada)**

The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in Canada runs the Employment Generation Program. For their employers to receive a subsidy, participants must be unemployed or under-employed (defined as working less than 20 hours per week or working in an area not related to their field of study) and actively seeking employment. They must also not be eligible for Employment Insurance (neither currently in receipt of it nor have received it in the past three years), nor have received Employment Insurance maternity or parental benefits in the past five years. Employers must provide 60 weeks continuous employment and the post must not lead to the displacement of other workers. Employers in the private sector receive 50 per cent of the hourly wage (up to a maximum of $4.00) for the first and last 20 weeks of the 60-week programme. In the non-profit sector, employers receive 100 per cent of the hourly wage (maximum: $5.68 an hour) for the first and last 20 weeks.

**Job Integration Assistance (Germany)**

In Germany’s *Eingliederungshilfe* (job integration assistance) employers of individuals who have been unemployed for at least one year (or out of the labour market for three years whilst raising children) may receive up to 50 per cent of local wage levels. These are usually made available for six months (but can be provided for up to two years for ‘difficult cases’). Employers of individuals unemployed for 12 months or for six months with other (unspecified) job-placement complications may be entitled to a maximum of six months work remuneration and employer contributions to cover times when the employee is unable to work.

**New Zealand’s Job Connection Programme**

(EVALUATION: O; IND; V)

This programme, piloted and then extended nationally in 1996, aimed “to assist very long-term jobseekers by giving them an opportunity to work full-time for six months and gain skills and experience which will improve their chances of obtaining stable employment” (Bellet, 1997, Executive Summary). The programme defined the very long-term unemployed as people registered as unemployed with the New Zealand Employment Service (NZES) for at least 208 weeks.

Under the programme, participants were placed on a fully funded work project for six months, during which time they received intensive supervision and assistance. The programme’s objective is for participants to gain stable employment with the same or a different employer. (They
may also enter another activity, which “will bring them closer to employment” (ibid., p.5)).

Employers who take on a very long-term unemployed person under this programme receive a subsidy of NZ$380 per week per worker for up to 26 weeks. Employers that take on four or more very long-term unemployed people are also eligible for a Supervision Grant, which rewards them with extra NZ$325 per week for 26 weeks.

The programme case managers provide post-placement follow-up to improve the chance of successful transition into regular employment. The follow-up may include:

• support and advice to jobseekers and employers;
• monitoring of jobseekers’ training;
• checking that agreed supervision is being provided by the employer; and
• monitoring for potential subsidy abuse.

Job Connections was evaluated in late 1997, using focus groups with NZEZ Employment Advisors, in-depth interviews with employers and jobseeker participants, and telephone interviews with 100 employers and 300 jobseekers. In addition, it analysed unemployment register information for nearly 500 participants who had finished their placement on or before June 30 1997. The evaluation found that three months after completion of their placement, 45 per cent of past participants remained unemployed and on the NZES register. Of the remaining, 47 per cent had found some form of employment, including subsidised employment (22 per cent).

The evaluation did not include a genuine control group. However, a comparison with all other jobseekers registered for 208 or more weeks during the evaluation period (1 June 1996 to 30 June 1997) revealed that, at 47 per cent (N=1115), Job Connection participants were considerably more likely to have moved into full-time subsidised or unsubsidised employment. Only seven per cent of other very long-term unemployed had made a similar move during that time (N=14081). However, the results may have been distorted by the fact that Job Connection tended to select the more work-ready from amongst the very long-term unemployed.

**Sweden’s Activity Guarantee**

Sweden’s Activity Guarantee, introduced in August 2000, is targeted at long-term unemployed people who are defined as persons registered at the unemployment office for at least 24 months. The programme offers three types of recruitment incentives: general, extended and special. Under the general recruitment incentive, the programme offers employers 75
per cent of the unemployed person’s wage costs for six months and 25 per cent for a further 18 months. The extended recruitment incentive offers a 75 per cent wage subsidy for 12 months, followed by a further 50 per cent subsidy for another 12 months, if the recruited individual has been unemployed for at least 48 months. The special recruitment incentive applies to recruiting unemployed people over the age of 57 and unemployed for at least 24 months. It offers a 75 per cent wage subsidy for 24 months.

Monitoring results for 2000 have shown that 63 per cent of general recruitment cases and 41 per cent of extended recruitment cases were in work 90 days after the end of the subsidy period. This compared to 40 per cent of individuals who had undergone one of Sweden’s labour market training programmes (the report does not specify whether these individuals were also long-term unemployed) (Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications, 2000).

**4.2.3 Young people**

Wage subsidy initiatives specifically for young people were found in Canada, the US, Australia and France.

**BladeRunners Program (Canada)**

This is a wage subsidy employment programme that focuses on construction and related trades. It is based on a pilot programme that operated in Vancouver in 1994. It operates in seven provincial cities in British Columbia with local community organisations contracted by the State’s Community Development Unit to deliver the projects. Participants must be between the ages of 19 and 28, have recently completed a pre-employment/life-skills programme, demonstrate basic English language skills and have multiple barriers to employment. The wage subsidy is available for 34 weeks, but participants may continue in the programme as ‘Senior BladeRunners’. The local organisation employs a BladeRunners co-ordinator who works with no more than 17 participants at one time. Co-ordinators guide youth in career planning and construction trade requirements, they monitor participants by making site visits every other day in the first couple of weeks. They also work closely with employers to develop jobs and ensure the success of the work placements. Performance evaluations between youth and their employers are undertaken at regular intervals (one, three and six months) to help solve any problems early on. The programme also helps participants locate other community support services to resolve challenges that may affect their work performance. Senior BladeRunners continue to benefit from the advice and support of co-ordinators but are also encouraged to help newcomers, developing peer/mentoring relationships. The evaluation indicates that in 1997-8 the average duration of the work placements was 4.68 months. Fifty-three per cent of the trainees were working after the subsidy ended. At the oldest site, Vancouver, 64 per cent were working after the subsidy ended (41 per cent had moved into apprenticeships) (PEPNet, 1999).
BMC Enterprises (United States)

In the US, BMC Enterprises is the largest black-owned business in Baltimore. It owns 15 “Stop Shop Save” grocery stores in the metropolitan area. In its programme, operated since 1996, applicants, who must have a GED or high school diploma and have passed a physical and drug test, are referred to them from the Baltimore Department of Social Services. Recipients have two weeks classroom training covering basic workplace and life skills, customer service skills and company-specific cashier skills. They then spend four weeks undertaking on-the-job training at the stores, after two weeks of which they are placed on the Stop Shop Save payroll earning $5.50 per hour (but they do not receive this pay until they finish training). After successful completion of training, participants are hired by Stop Shop Save and are paid $6 an hour for 35 hours a week. BMC receive wage subsidies for these placements and participants continue to receive medicaid and childcare during the time they are subsidised. Employees are eligible for a wage rise every six months. The evaluation evidence suggests that between 1996 and 1998, 70 young people had entered the programme, 52 completed the six-week course and 44 remained employed (Roberts and Padden, 1998).

Youth Employment Scheme (Australia)

In the state of Victoria, Australia, a 12-month wage subsidy of $12,500 is paid to an employer providing a young person (aged 15 – 24) with a placement as a trainee or an apprenticeship (compared to average Australian annual earnings from full-time work of $44,19518). Employers receive an extra training subsidy of $1250 for providing such a placement for young people that are long-term unemployed or otherwise disadvantaged.

Emploi-Jeunes 2001 (France)

A recent youth employment initiative from the French Ministry of Employment, Emploi-Jeunes 2001, provides a number of benefits to employers hiring young people aged 18 – 26 (or aged 18 – 30 if the young person is unemployed or has a disability). These benefits include a wage subsidy of up to Ffr102,010 per year for 35 or more hours per week, reviewed annually. (This compared to average French annual earnings from full-time work of Ffr168,60019. They also receive assistance with training costs and training is compulsory for those with minimal or no qualification. In addition a rebate is available for social security contributions and they receive the costs of setting up the position.

Two wage subsidy schemes were identified to encourage employers to hire older people. They have not been evaluated.

---

18 Calculated as 52 times the average weekly earnings from full time work ($849.40) available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics website (http://www.abs.gov.au).

19 Calculated as 12 times the average monthly earnings from full time work (Ffr14,050) available from an Institut nationale de la statistique et des etudes economiques (INSEE) paper (http://www.insee.fr).
Experience Pays, a scheme in Queensland, Australia, provides a wage subsidy to employers who hire jobseekers over the age of 45 for 12 months. As well as the age requirement, the jobseekers must also have been unemployed for over 12 months. Their employment must not displace an existing worker and must be for an average of at least 25 hours per week. Up to $2200 will be paid to their employers after three months of employment and a further $2200 after nine months of employment.

In Germany’s federal scheme, Lohnkostenzuß für ältere AN (wage subsidy for older employees), employers of those aged 50 or over who have been unemployed for at least a year in the past 18 months may receive 50 per cent of the local wage level (or up to 75 per cent of local wage level if unemployed for 24 months or more). The subsidy is usually provided for five years with a ten per cent reduction each year. In exceptional circumstances they may be provided for up to eight years without a reduction.

Wage subsidy programmes were also found for people with disabilities. Two of which (the Australian Supported Wage System and the French AGEFIPH programme) have been formally evaluated.

Norway’s Fleksibel Jobb (FJ) programme, a pilot scheme established in July 2000, combines the provision of financial incentives to employers with job placement assistance provided by job centre personnel. It is a programme for people with disabilities that required a less intensive support system than those helped by the Arbeid med Bistand programme (see Section 6.1.2 for details). A wage subsidy is paid to employers for up to five years at a maximum rate of 75 per cent for the first six months of a placement and 40 per cent thereafter. Fleksibel Jobb is considered innovative because, unlike other measures aimed at helping disabled people into employment, this initiative also supports temporary employment. To date the piloted programme has only involved some 200 disabled people, but is set to be introduced as a nationwide programme in early 2002 (offering about 1000 places).

During the pilot phase, and most likely also after full implementation, local job centre personnel act as counsellors for the disabled person. On average a counsellor will prepare individual action plans (for gaining employment) for up to 25 FJ clients, i.e. disabled jobseekers. In addition, the counsellor will need to deal with a usual caseload of some 100-200 able-bodied jobseekers. These plans are passed to project leaders who are responsible for implementing them at the regional level. A period to follow up and monitor progress in the implementation of the action plan is planned, but details have yet to be finalised. One suggestion is to let the follow up coincide with the three-monthly subsidy review that project leaders undertake in liaison with employers. An evaluation of the pilot programme is not yet available.
The Australian **Wage Subsidy Scheme** for people with disabilities was introduced in July 1998. It pays a wage subsidy to employers if the employee works at least eight hours per week for at least 13 weeks (in some cases the wage subsidy can be paid if the time limit was not reached). The level of the wage subsidy is ‘dependent on the level of employer incentive considered necessary for a worker to obtain durable employment’ (Department of Family and Community Services, 2001). However, the subsidy will not exceed the amount paid to the employee. The employment services organisations for people with disabilities (see Section 6.1.2) negotiate the value and duration of the subsidy with employers.

Australia also has the **Supported Wage System** (SWS) (EVALUATION: O; IND; V) for those who cannot obtain employment with wages of full value because of their disability. Introduced in 1994, the SWS includes a 12-week trial period after which the administrators (employment service organisations) determine the minimum wage rate to be paid in negotiation with some of the following: the employer, employee, union and accredited assessor. Employers also receive an Employer Payment to help with the cost of setting up the post (this cannot be paid if they are receiving the wage subsidy), for workplace modifications and on-the-job support (the latter two in specific circumstances). An evaluation of the scheme found that take-up steadily increased with over 2000 new SWS employees in 1998/1999 and 1999/2000 (KPMG Consulting, no date). Retention rates appeared positive. From June 1997 to June 2000, there were 3675 new SWS employees of whom 2340 continued to be employed under SWS at the end of the period (however it is not clear whether it is simply the most recent employees that are still employed).

In Germany employers hiring people with disabilities may be eligible for **Eingliederungshilfe für Behinderte** (job integration assistance for handicapped persons), a wage subsidy of up to 80 per cent of local wage levels (most usually 50 per cent is provided). The subsidy generally lasts for five years with six-monthly reductions of at least 20 per cent.

In France, **AGEFIPH** (Association Nationale de Gestion du Fonds pour l'Insertion Professionnelle des Handicapés) organise a voluntary retention programme for disabled people and people injured in a work accident, which is funded through France’s disabled person’s quota-levy scheme. Besides providing financial assistance for workstation modifications and accessibility improvements, and offering general work assessments and training, the programme compensates employers for the loss in work productivity of disabled persons (by funding their wages in relation to their loss of productivity), which allows the employer to maintain existing wage levels. The wage compensation is provided as soon as there is evidence of the employee’s productivity declining.

An evaluation of the job retention grant, which covers the cost of adaptations, was found to have enabled 90 per cent, of the approximately 400 people who received assistance, to retain work up to one year after
the adaptation had been made (cited in Grapin et al., 1998). The wage compensation grant has not been evaluated.

4.2.6 Ethnic minorities

Finally one wage subsidy scheme was found for ethnic minorities. Since July 1999, Australian employers who provide a job for Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander registered jobseekers receive a wage subsidy; **Indigenous Employment Wage Assistance**. Employers receive up to $4400 paid over 26 weeks for full-time work, and for part-time work (of at least 20 hours) $2200 is paid over 26 weeks.

4.3 Retention incentives

In the United States, retention incentives are being provided to both employees to encourage them to remain in employment and to employers to encourage them to retain their newly-employed workers. Retention incentives are usually one-off payments, or only a few payments, made at previously defined ‘key’ milestones (most usually a specified number of months in retained employment). This is opposed to regular payments as is the case for wage subsidies. These one-off payments are made to encourage retention (by the employer or employee) up to, and beyond, these key stages.

4.3.1 Retention incentives for employees

In the United States, cash or in-kind retention incentives are paid to employees by states, or their welfare to work contractors, to encourage sustained employment. The incentives provided vary, not just by type, but also by the length of retention required, the weekly hours of work that must be undertaken and the value of the incentive paid.

Examples of US state cash incentives include:

- **Kentucky** which provides $500 payments to those working for more than 35 hours a week, on reaching 90, 180 and 270 days in a job (limited to $1500 in a lifetime).
- **New Jersey’s Supplemental Work Support** pays $200 a month to current TANF recipients working for at least 20 hours a week for the first four months in work. However, they must have previously received TANF for at least six months prior to working.

County initiatives have similar guidelines:

- The **Mesa County Workforce Center, Colorado**, provides cash incentives to current or former TANF recipients who have been working 30 or more hours a week for at least the minimum wage for three months ($400) and six months ($600).
- In **Trumbull County, Ohio** (as part of the state’s Prevention, Retention and Contingency Program20) $1500 is provided to a newly employed WorkFirst client who maintains employment of 30 hours or more a week for six months. The employment must be continuous, but can be with different employers.

20 A funding scheme that gives county boards discretion to provide an array of post-employment supports.
Examples of in-kind incentives include:

- The **Advanced Works** program in Larimer County, Colorado, which provides a ‘Start to Work Kit’ with $50 worth of work-related coupons (such as for petrol and haircuts) for participants after two weeks in work. Additional incentives are provided after participants have been employed for two, four and six months.

- The **Full Employment Council** in Kansas City provides clients (including non-custodial parents) with vouchers worth $1800, if they have remained with a single employer for nine months. The vouchers can be used by the client to pay for services or expenses such as housing, car repairs, counselling and further education and training.

About a quarter of contractors in **Pennsylvania’s Community Solutions** project offered either cash incentives or vouchers after various lengths of time in employment (for more detail on this programme see Section 5.1).

4.3.2 **Retention incentives for employers**

Retention incentives to employers, provided in the US by states, vary by the length of time that workers must maintain employment and the amounts that they are paid for achieving these goals. They are usually made with the expectation that employers have invested in additional training and/or support to assist the new employee in their transition into work. For example:

- The **Full Employment Council** in Kansas City provides employers with $1000 if a new employee from welfare remains in employment for nine months. The payment is expected to offset training costs for interns, or the costs of purchasing outside training.

- In the **Florida WAGES** scheme, a simple cash-back bonus is given to employers who hire welfare recipients with less than six months TANF eligibility remaining, at wages that prevents them from still receiving cash benefits (i.e. wages that are above the TANF threshold). Employers are given $250 after 30 days employment and an additional $500 after the first 90 days.

- **Utah’s Employment Services Program** pays $500 per month for six months to employers who hire hard to place TANF clients. Employers must attend a one-day special supervisory training course to equip them to take an active ‘case management’ role towards the new employee. If those clients are still in the job after 12 months, the employer receives an additional $1000 bonus. The subsidy and bonus is designed to underwrite the employer’s costs in assuming active case management responsibility for the hard to place clients that they recruit.
In this chapter, programmes that provide non-financial support and advice through a case management approach are reviewed. In addition to financial difficulties, many disadvantaged jobseekers face significant non-financial difficulties in their (re)entry into work. These may include: practical difficulties (for example, accessing childcare or transport services), adjusting to the workplace environment and employer expectations, or other challenges associated with maintaining stable employment, such as poor social and communication skills which can affect their ability to deal with potential workplace conflicts. If not overcome, these difficulties may result in early exits from work.

In recognition of this, the majority of post-employment programmes reviewed included mechanisms to provide non-financial support and assistance (often to employers as well as employees). These are typically provided through case management\(^{21}\) (see Chapter 10 for further discussion on case management).

The specific role of these case managers, however, varies in a number of ways:

- the range and type of support services they provide;
- the ‘target’ group (employer and/or employee);
- their location; and
- the frequency and duration of the provision of support.

**The range and type of support services provided**

- **Check-up:** for some case managers, their main role is simply to check-up and monitor progress over the transitional period (often to ensure that employment is on-going for their records). However, most also include referral and advice.

- **Referrals:** most act as ‘brokers’ of services, by referring clients to providers of specialist services, such as childcare, transportation, substance abuse treatment or housing.

- **Advice:** others provide more intensive services, including advice, counselling and problem-solving to relieve problems in the workplace, such as employer/employee relations, office conflicts, time management or moral support and encouragement.

\(^{21}\) In the majority of programmes in the US the title given to those responsible for providing these services is ‘case manager’. However, in some other programmes in the US and some outside the US, titles other than this are used for the providers of these services such as ‘counsellors’, ‘job retention specialists’ and ‘career advisors’.
• Financial: in addition, some have the role of ensuring that clients (and employers) are receiving all the in-work benefits to which they are entitled (and that these have been correctly calculated) and sometimes also to provide emergency financial assistance to support steady employment (as noted in Section 4.1.5).

These services may also vary in the way in which they are provided: either by face-to-face meetings and/or telephone conversations.

The ‘target’ group

Employee: all case managers are focused on the employee, some exclusively so. Often this is because clients have specifically asked for employers not to be contacted, for other case managers it is not their role to contact employers.

Employee and employer: many are responsible for contacting the client’s employer to ensure that they are satisfied with the client and help to resolve any problems that have arisen.

Employer: some case management systems have a separate staff member whose role it is to contact employers. Termed ‘job developers’, they work closely with employers to identify appropriate job vacancies or placements and skill requirements, as well as monitoring progress. Furthermore, they also work to encourage employers to use their services again to fill future vacancies.

Their location

Office-based: the majority of case managers are office-based but those that undertake face-to-face contact do come out to the worksite to see employees and employers. Sometimes case managers may carry out home visits.

Worksite: where there are large numbers of clients working at a particular employer, some case managers will be located at the worksite.

Frequency and duration of support services

The frequency of contact with clients and/or employers may vary in intensity:

• 24 hours, seven days a week: in the most intensive systems, case managers have either bleepers, mobile phones and/or answerphones so that they may be contacted at anytime, when a problem arises.

• Weekly: for others, at least in the first few weeks, contact is weekly, often declining over time.

• Monthly: the least intensive systems provide support services just once a month. However, for most, this is a decline from more regular contact at the beginning of the programme.
In most cases, employees are contacted more frequently than employers. However, those that visit the employee at the worksite will often visit the employer at the same time. In most cases, both clients and employers may approach the case manager if necessary.

The length of time that services are available to the employee and/or the employer may also vary

- **No limit**: some services may stop providing regular case management services, but will allow clients to contact them at any time after the official end of the service.
- **Years**: the majority of services are provided for one or two years, with declining regularity of contact over time.
- **Weeks or months**: some employers (or job placement contractors) are paid a retention bonus or incentive when the placed employee remains in the job beyond a specified period. In these cases, support usually lasts for as long as the retention period usually ranging between three and nine months. Others have a much shorter follow-up period, particularly those programmes that mainly offer a pre-employment service.

There are numerous examples of case management systems, in the US in particular. Therefore the examples provided here have been divided into those for specific client groups: welfare recipients; long term unemployed people; young people; people with disabilities; people with a history of substance abuse; ex-offenders; women returners and ethnic minorities.

5.1 Welfare recipients

Most of the welfare to work programmes with post-employment services in the US feature some form of case management. Therefore, to restrict the number of examples provided, this section focuses on those that have been subject to some form of evaluation, although just one (the Post Employment Services Demonstration) used a random assignment design.

**Steps to Career Success (STEPS)**

(EVALUATION: Q-E/Pr; IND; V)

Funded since 1992, STEPS is based in Pierce County Department of Community Services, Tacoma, Washington. STEPS provides case management services for one year to current or former welfare recipients that have moved into full-time work. In the first phase, services were designed to help participants develop a personal plan, access community resources and to create a stronger support base within their family. In the second phase, the case management model was refined to provide individualised rather than uniform service delivery. These services fell into three main categories: supportive listening and presence; advocacy

---

22 It is unclear from the documentation whether it is still in operation.
and acting on behalf of clients when finding resources; and providing financial resources that STEPS had available. This individual approach required great flexibility among case management staff. In addition, phase one had found that client needs were far greater than anticipated, therefore in phase two caseloads were restricted to 50 participants to provide a more intensive service. Case managers also provided bimonthly newsletters to inform of important topics and resources. The initial phase also included mentoring but these services were not greatly used as the newly employed reported that their lives were too busy and complicated to include this time intensive service. In Phase two the case manager acted as mentor in the early stages. When the client seemed ready to move to a different mentor this was proposed or it was found that once clients’ lives had stabilised (usually after three to six months of continuous work) they would request a mentor. Case managers also provided group sessions containing career and life-planning materials, with childcare and refreshments available.

A process evaluation was carried out during all stages of the research (Leon-Guerrero et al., 1996). During Phase 2, the evaluation targeted a participation (experimental) group of 73 welfare recipients entering the workforce and a comparison group of 95 welfare recipients who entered the workforce in South King County, Washington (where no such services were available). The evaluation included interviews at intake, six and 12 months, and also analysed case manager documentation and client records.

There were several early concerns during recruitment (which used a number of welfare and community organisations to publicise its services). These included: the need to translate publicity materials into several different languages; that programme components should not be so complicated and demanding that they discourage clients from using the services; clients’ negative attitudes towards government programmes making clients hesitant about using the services; and staff reluctance to refer clients to STEPS as long as a control group was planned.

It should be noted that the evaluation did not control for any differences that may have existed between the experimental (STEPS) and comparison groups. The labour market of the two areas was also reported to be different (with a stronger industrial base in the comparison area). In addition one STEPS case manager was absent for a large number of weeks during the evaluation which may well have impacted upon the results. At 12 months:

- for both the experimental and comparison group the employment rate was equal (76 and 77 per cent respectively);
- whilst the experimental group’s employment rate had risen between six and 12 months, the comparison group’s employment rate had remained stable. The evaluators suggest that this ability to rebound from unemployment may be directly attributable to the programme services;
just over half of experimentals and comparisons had retained work for 12 months (55 and 53 per cent respectively). However, amongst experimentals 50 per cent of these had moved into a new job or been promoted compared to 34 per cent of comparison group members (because of small numbers this difference is not significant);

• the total number of weeks employed over the 12 month period was slightly greater amongst experimentals (32.78 compared to 31.41).

• among those that had become unemployed during the period, 92 per cent of experimentals were looking for a new job compared to 53 per cent of comparison groups members.

Comparison group members reported a higher prevalence of problems relating to childcare (39 compared to 25 per cent); personal health problems (36 compared to 26 per cent) and problems scheduling work and family activities (38 compared to 32 per cent). Only 26 per cent of the comparison group could identify potential childcare arrangements when their state assistance was terminated, whereas 61 per cent of STEPS participants could do so.

STEPS clients were asked to rate the helpfulness of STEPS programmes in eight areas on a five-point scale. The services that received the highest rating were case manager support (4.86) and solving minor financial emergencies (4.77). It was also reported that when clients moved from the case manager to an alternative mentor, clients preferred mentors to be at the worksite and when this was possible a positive relationship was achieved. In addition, the group sessions were not a success because, instead of supporting each other through the transition, generally clients did not want to associate with other persons who had been on welfare preferring to see their peer group as the working population.

A new project is also underway as a result of STEPS. An incidental finding (not specifically evaluated or measured) by the researchers of STEPS was that those who were working for a supportive employer were the most likely to be successful in retaining work. Therefore under the Employer Assistance Project the employer hiring the welfare recipient is the client. Employers voluntarily meet with a ‘project business representative’ serving as their single point of contact. The services that the business representatives provide include: identification of the skills needed for the job; screening and referring of qualified applicants; assistance with hiring and with the paperwork associated with on-the-job training contracts and financial incentives; on-going support in job retention; referrals to clients’ case managers; and problem-solving. These services are either provided at the worksite or over the telephone. The researchers state that job retention has been 20–30 per cent higher than that amongst employers without such services. The programme has just been asked by agencies who have noted their success to add people with disabilities and dislocated workers to their job seeker pool. A survey of employers has been undertaken, the report of which is due to be complete in April 2002.
Project Match

Project Match is a community-based employment programme that has served welfare recipients and low-wage workers in Chicago since 1985. Project Match’s early experience led to the development of the Incremental Ladder to Economic Independence to convey the probability that welfare recipients moves into employment will result in both upward (into better jobs) and downward (losing a job, or moving into a lower paid job) movements. The ladder design could also incorporate clients sequencing and combining activities in different ways, their combination of training and work, and/or voluntary or community work. (Project Match’s allowable activities includes both training and voluntary work as a route into self-sufficiency and employment.) The Project Match counsellors are responsible for providing all types of services so that participants cannot ‘slip through the cracks’. They also make a long-term commitment to participants for three to five years. Therefore the client/counsellor relationship is seen as crucial. The long history of the programme has been built on developing relationships of trust with their clients, through staff:

- doing what they say they will do (for example, making contact with the clients when they say they will);
- listening to client’s concerns even if they are not directly related to employment;
- being available to clients at short notice (for example, through drop-ins), and on occasions outside of formal appointment times (for example, outside of regular hours or at weekends).

In the Project Match scheme, the most easily resolved barriers are addressed first – typically childcare and transportation – which can then allow participants to ‘get going’. Other barriers can be addressed over time, when the counselling relationship has been built up. A crisis may trigger involvement, a participant may ask for help, or counsellor may learn of a problem. Counsellors try to deal with these whilst the clients maintain work/training. The counsellors have a caseload of 75, which Project Match believes is the optimum to allow for clients’ cyclical demands. In 1998, a longitudinal study of Project Match participants revealed that many participants have required post-employment services for the full five years (reported in Kramer, 1998). Within two years, about one-third of its participants had gained steady (if not always full-time), employment and another 14 per cent became steady workers over a five-year period (reported in Brown et al., 1998b).

Pennsylvania’s GAPS programme
(EVALUATION: O; IND: V)

This programme began in September 1997 to serve employed residents of Allegheny County who were former or current TANF recipients.
Over the three years that the programme ran it served about 600 voluntary participants, recruited through mass mailings. The Pittsburgh Foundation contracted with four community-based organisations in the Pittsburgh area to provide employment retention services. Case management was the central element of the programme. The case managers’ one-on-one contacts provided supportive counselling (from workplace behaviours to parenting skills); advice on childcare, transportation, and other issues; referrals to other services in the community for clothing, food, childcare housing or job training; and helping participants find jobs, either for advancement purposes or because of job loss.

Contact gradually declined, averaging two contacts a month in the first month compared to one contact every other month after 18 months because participants’ need for services had declined. Case managers reported that, after a year on the programme, the majority of participants had achieved more stable employment and personal situations. An evaluation of the programme found that participants liked regular contact with their GAPS case managers (Wood and Paulsell, 2000). Most participants said they had the right amount of contact but almost two-thirds wanted more contact. Participant satisfaction with GAPS services and case managers was high (over 80 per cent). Those who had received tangible services via their case manager (for example, childcare arrangements or direct financial assistance) were particularly likely to be satisfied with the programme (over 90 per cent). However, the evidence suggests that clients were less likely to find the services useful for handling difficult situations at work (a common reason for leaving a job), helping them keep a job and for helping them advance to a better job. In all cases, the greater the number of contacts with their case manager the greater the level of participants’ satisfaction with each of these elements. (Handling difficult work situations in particular: those with ten contacts were 20 percentage points more likely to think that the service had helped them in this situation.)

The main evaluation outcomes included:

- Seven in ten participants experienced no unemployment during the first six months, with half maintaining their employment continuously for 18 months.
- Among participants employed when they entered GAPS, 85 per cent were continuously employed for the first six months and 60 per cent for 18 months.
- The median length of time for re-employment was four months.
- Among GAPS participants who were former TANF recipients when they enrolled, only three in ten returned to TANF during the first 18 months of the programme.
Among participants receiving TANF when they entered the programme, six months after programme entry, 67 per cent were still receiving it, but by 18 months after this had dropped further to 43 per cent.

Participants’ average income increased over time – at the second survey their average income was 13 per cent higher than at the first survey. However whilst 32 per cent experienced a wage increase of 20 per cent or more over the period, 29 per cent experienced a decline.

Without a random assignment design, it is difficult to determine the ‘real’ impact of this programme. However, the retention rates are far greater than those reported elsewhere, including one of Pennsylvania’s other programmes (Community Solutions described below) undertaken at approximately the same time.

**Pennsylvania’s Community Solutions (EVALUATION: O/Pr; IND: V)**

Also in Pennsylvania, Community Solutions began in 1998 when the Department of Public Welfare funded 70 Community Solutions programmes located throughout the state. Thirty-five non-profit organisations (such as technical and college colleges, employment and training agencies) and five for-profit organisations were contracted to provide services to place participants in full-time jobs and help them retain these jobs for at least a year. The organisations provided a mixture of pre-employment services over two to 12 months (for example, job readiness training, job placement, access to supportive services, basic education or English as a Second Language training, vocational training). Post-employment services included case management for up to 12 months; job coaching; mediation with employers; incentives; help obtaining transitional benefits or tax credits; help with re-employment; and career advancement and other support services. Contractors were paid for clients who achieved certain benchmarks:

- participation in five-day assessment and first day of programme activity ($1000);
- placement in unsubsidised full-time employment of at least 30 hours a week ($1000);
- employment with medical benefits within six months of starting employment ($400); and
- 12 months job retention with no more than seven days unemployment ($1600).

Case managers typically contacted participants weekly during their first month of employment then gradually reduced their contact to once a month. These contacts were usually by telephone, but some contractors also used face-to-face contacts. Some contractors also followed up with employers especially during the first few weeks of employment, although this was often at the request of the employers themselves.
The evaluators collected results from DPW records. They revealed that (Paulsell and Stieglitz, 2001):

- 44 per cent of enrolled participants were placed in full-time jobs;
- half of these had access to medical benefits within six months; and
- only one in ten of those placed in employment met the retention goal.

This retention rate is extremely low. However, it may be underestimated because the retention rate of employees receiving services from programmes whose contracts were terminated or who stopped operation (because of bad outcomes and low enrolment, respectively) were not measured. Also, contractors still in operation often had difficulty gaining the relevant information from employers.

The evaluation also carried out interviews with contractors and their staff and found:

- Contracting organisations reported that maintaining contact with employed participants was difficult – some had moved, changed jobs or disconnected their telephones without telling staff, whilst others were unresponsive to their attempts to contact them. Programme staff stated that these participants did not see the value of the follow-ups, did not think that they had the time for them, or they did not respond because they did not want to still have involvement with the welfare system after entering employment.
- Case management also became a challenge when staffing levels could not be maintained because enrolment rates (and therefore up-front payments to organisations) were low.
- Directors did, however, believe that employer mediation had prevented job loss but there is no evaluation evidence to substantiate this claim.

**Iowa’s Post-employment Pilot**  
*(EVALUATION: O/Pr; IND; V)*

Iowa’s Post-employment Pilot (PEP) program was developed in 1998 in three sites: Des Moines County, Marshall and Hardin Counties and Pottawattamie County. The PEP program operated within the existing structure of PROMISE JOBS (the State welfare to work programme) and therefore services were delivered by a combination of Iowa Workforce Development staff and subcontracted staff of various agencies. The services were originally restricted to employees still in receipt of TANF but it became apparent that other new employees were also in need of the services and so it was extended to include them. The services at the different sites could include:

- group activities: job readiness and life skills training, support group, computer training;
- individual case management: counselling; emergency financial assistance; jobsearch assistance; service referrals;
• employer-based: mentoring programme; employer training; job development.

Two sites operated fully voluntary programmes, whilst in the third, PROMISE JOBS participants had to attend an initial meeting at which they decide whether or not to participate in the programme, but, once they had decided to participate, they then had to continue with the programme. Another major difference between the sites was that, whilst in two sites all PROMISE participants that entered employment were referred to the programme, the third targeted who would be referred. This target population has changed over time. Between October-December 1999 the target population was clients that had worked at least one day each month in the past six months. In December 1999 it was changed to focusing on those without barriers to attaining full or increased employment but worked at least three months out of the previous 12, had low wages or hours and was in a job unlikely to lead to advancement. In May 2000 it was altered to its current target population of clients, those: working insufficient hours for the family to reach self-sufficiency; with earnings insufficient for the family to leave benefit; in a job with little prospect for advancement or without regular raises or benefits; and who has a history of multiple job losses.

The evaluation (consisting of analysis of the PEP database, visits and contacts with sites and focus groups with participants and non-participants) of the first ten months of the programmes found that the main challenge was low participation. The reasons for this included (Hill et al., 2001):

• working parents found it difficult and undesirable to add another commitment to their substantial work and family responsibilities. Participants in the focus groups felt that they did not have the time for the programme regardless of how it was presented to them.
• They were also reluctant to continue in a welfare programme once their commitments had been fulfilled.

However, programme participants emphasised the importance of the one-to-one interactions with case managers. The clients that were most satisfied with the programme were those most satisfied with their relationship with their case worker, with particular importance being placed on the case manager’s understanding of the challenges participants faced and the support and encouragement that they provided. PEP staff performed a variety of roles, including recruitment of participants, case managers, programme designers and mentor to the participants. PROMISE workers that moved into the PEP positions were knowledgeable about the clientele and administrative procedures but unprepared for the other responsibilities. They received little, if any, training. It was even more difficult for those staff responsible for both PROMISE JOBS and PEP caseloads (Hill et al., 2001).
The evaluation does not investigate participants’ outcomes, without which it is not possible to determine the success of the programme in terms of job retention, nor does it allow a comparison of the differences in outcomes that having a mandatory programme or a targeted programme creates.

**Washington WorkFirst (EVALUATION: Q-E; IND; V)**

Washington WorkFirst post-employment services originally included case managers providing information and referral, assistance with adapting to the workplace, childcare, transportation services and connections with training. They also worked with an employer to forestall a firing. The services also include the Washington Post-employment Labor Exchange Call Center (see telephone helplines, Section 6.4.1). Participation in the services is voluntary.

An evaluation compared employed clients who did or did not receive post-employment services between July and September 1999 (Lerch and Mayfield, 2001). During the three-month period, 14 per cent of employed clients used at least one service. (However, which of the services they used was not reported.) The outcomes for both groups were tracked for a year after the services were or were not received. Multivariate statistical analyses were used to compensate for the lack of experimental data.

After accounting for differences in client characteristics and economic conditions, post-employment services had a small but significant impact on the key employment outcomes over the follow-up year:

- Clients who received post-employment services were almost seven per cent more likely to stay employed than they would if they had not participated.
- Clients who received post-employment services had an average of $247 more in earnings per quarter than they would have had if they had not participated.
- However, clients who received post-employment support services worked 18 more hours per quarter than they would if they had not participated.

The increased earnings and hours worked were larger than the unadjusted differences (i.e. before client characteristics and ‘other influential factors’ were controlled for). This means that at the time the clients received post-employment services they were more disadvantaged in terms of individual characteristics and local economic conditions than those not receiving the services. In other words, the improvement made by those receiving services was greater because they were more disadvantaged before accepting the services.

During 1999, Spokane County provided its own version of post-employment services, a more intensive and proactive version of the WorkFirst services emphasising early contact with employed clients and
employers. Once a client obtained a job, letters were sent to employers informing them of the post-employment services available, availability of on the job training programme (where employers could receive a wage subsidy) and education and training provided by the community college, and their entitlement to a tax credit. The post-employment specialists visited the job site to check on both employer and employee progress, issues and needs. This more proactive and intensive approach led to an increase in the proportion receiving services: 17.1 per cent in Spokane compared to 13.4 per cent of those not in Spokane. However, Spokane’s services were no more or less effective than those provided throughout the state. Although the report gives no indication of why this might be, it appears that, although recruitment is more intensive and the case managers attempt to work more closely with employers, the services to clients do not vary greatly to those that can be received in the rest of the state.

However, before the publication of the evaluation, Washington had already altered its provision introducing the Job Success Coach Program based partly on the Spokane model of post-employment services. It focuses on clients ‘deemed most likely to have problems maintaining employment, communicates with clients early in the job-hunting process, encourages the use of participation in a client’s individual responsibility plan and makes services available for two years after a client leaves the caseload’ (ibid. p.4). Job success coaches also have responsibility for providing participants with additional support and mentoring, as well as connecting them with community and technical colleges to explore training options, authorise emergency services such as car repairs, help with childcare, employer relations and time management.

The WorkFirst Study is a survey collecting information annually on a sample of 3000 current and former WorkFirst clients. They were first interviewed between December 1999 and August 2000 and again in February-May 2001. However, take-up of the voluntary programme has been low – just five per cent of eligible clients had used Job Success Coaches, although the majority of these (78 per cent) found the services helpful. So far the study has only analysed participants’ opinions of the services that they have received and not on their outcomes (Klawitter and VanNynatten, 2001).

Alongside wage subsidies, case management programmes are the only post-employment services in the United States that have been evaluated using a random assignment design. However, at present, there is only one full evaluation (presented below), although further evaluations are underway as noted in Section 1.3.3.
The Post-Employment Services Demonstration
(EVALUATION: RA; IND; M)

The Post-Employment Services Demonstration projects began in 1993 and the major goals were ‘to promote job retention, provide rapid re-employment for those who lost jobs and, consequently, reduce welfare dependency’ (Rangarajan, 1998b). The four sites selected to participate were Chicago, Illinois; Riverside, California; Portland, Oregon; and San Antonio, Texas. Case managers within the welfare agency were responsible for attempting to contact 5000 clients who had been in the JOBS (welfare to work) programme and had found employment during a 12 to 18 month period between March 1994 and December 1995. They were randomly assigned to the PESD programme or a control group.

Each site hired between three and five case managers, staff that were separate from the main JOBS programme. All clients were assigned to a case manager, whose responsibilities could include:

- maintaining regular contact with all clients;
- counselling and support on issues such as money management, contingency planning, personal relationships and workplace behaviour;
- jobsearch assistance when clients lost jobs or wanted better ones;
- resolution of benefit issues;
- service referrals to health care or childcare providers, skill training or education, legal aid or specialised counselling;
- small, occasional payments to help with work-related expenses and emergencies that might threaten the stability of employment.

Services could be provided for between six months and two years after beginning work and leaving AFDC. Counsellors’ accessibility was maximised by providing flexible office hours, answering machines, bleepers and meetings outside office hours. On average staff members talked (by telephone or in person) with clients once a month.

Overall the demonstration had little to no impact on employment, earnings or welfare receipt. Statistically significant impacts (at the 90 per cent level) were only found for Chicago where there were small positive effects promoting employment and reducing welfare.

Many lessons were learned about offering these case manager services. In particular:

- Many clients required repeated efforts to establish direct communications and often numerous contacts were made before there was enough trust from the client to discuss potential job-threatening problems.
Many clients required ongoing services either because they quickly lost jobs or continued to have problems. In three sites between 40 and 50 per cent required services after a year.

Counselling and support was the most commonly delivered service – 60 to 80 per cent of clients received it during the first six months. It was also the service most valued by clients, particularly for ‘moral support and boosting self-esteem’. Helping clients resolve benefit queries was also common (the receipt of transitional childcare and the use of temporary work-related expenses increased).

Employer mediation was found to be difficult to deliver. Most PESD clients did not want case managers to call their employers either because they did not want employers to know about their connection with welfare or they did not want employers to assume that they needed external help to deal with their problems.

For case managers to be effective they need small caseloads. This was not maintained in the PESD where caseloads were between 100 and 170 clients, meaning that it was difficult to take a flexible approach and be accessible.

Having a proactive contact policy meant that case managers spent a lot of time calling clients and setting up meetings with them and therefore making it a costly and time consuming approach.

PESD sample members resented the welfare agency staff still being involved and did not want to be contacted by them. One programme changed its name and established its own logo and stationery, after which more clients were willing to participate (Rangarajan, 1998b and Rangarajan and Novak, 1999).

5.2 Long-term unemployed people

In some countries non-financial in-work support is available for the long-term unemployed.

In New Zealand, long-term unemployed (or at risk of long-term unemployment) Maori and Pacific people can, voluntarily, accept the services of an ‘In-Work Support Co-ordinator’ for up to three months after entering work. Their services include: helping with problem solving; support and encouragement; ensuring that they are receiving all financial assistance entitlements; and helping to deal with government departments. Their services are available after standard work hours.

An EQUAL project (see Section 1.3.3), U-turn, provides follow-up and aftercare to the unemployed that have moved into employment in Belgium. The project partners are proposing that aftercare will be provided through developing:

- a ‘network of experts’ that are already involved with the target group; and
- a network and dialogue between employers and employees.
In addition, they will develop tools and training techniques for those assisting the unemployed in their transition. No further information was available.

5.3 Young people

Evidence of case management systems in use for young people was found in the US, Belgium and Portugal.

**Vocational Foundation Inc.’s Moving Up Career Advancement Program (United States)**

Started in 1997/8, this programme serves disadvantaged inner-city New York residents aged 17 to 24. The programme begins with five months training that includes remedial maths and reading classes, computer instruction, General Equivalency Diploma (GED) preparation and job-readiness training. The training is designed to mimic the workplace environment: it has 9-5 schedules; trainees must punch the time clock; wear business attire; and follow typical workplace protocol when dealing with each other and the staff. In return they receive bi-monthly food and transportation stipends, which they are encouraged to think of as paycheques. After career advisors assist with placement (into jobs paying at least $6 an hour), they then contact participants at a minimum of *once a week by telephone*, including the first day of work, and *once a month in person*. These contacts are to help young people resolve work-related problems and address personal crises that affect steady work performance and attendance. They also contact employers at least once a month by telephone or in person to find out how the young person is getting on and help resolve any difficulties. Career advisors are equipped with pagers and can be contacted at any time. Staff performance is evaluated on programme goals. Career advisors, for example, must maintain contact with 80 per cent of their caseload and 70 per cent of those placed in jobs should still have them at three, six, nine, and 12 months. Two years after taking their first job, 74 per cent of graduates were still active in the programme in one way or another (attending college, participating in training, seeking new jobs) and 63 per cent of those placed in a job were still working. About 12 per cent had been promoted and 31 per cent been given raises. At the end of the two years, the average wage of those employed was $8.64, a nearly eight per cent increase from the first year (Proscio and Elliott, no date).

**MY TURN (United States)**

Founded in 1984, MY TURN (Massachusetts Youth Teenage Unemployment Reduction Network) targets at risk students around Boston providing a number of programmes in schools. These include employability skills curriculum, and work-based learning. MY TURN also provides one-year follow-up after job placement. During the first weeks of employment a MY TURN adviser visits the student at the worksite, reviewing the experiences of the new job and any issues that
have arisen. The adviser continues to meet first with the employer and then with the employee at the worksite once a month for one year. The programme believes that the follow-up services provide the continuity that their students need as they enter full-time employment. An external evaluation found that 71 per cent of MY TURN participants retained their first job for more than six months following high school graduation compared to 32 per cent of a control group (no details about the control group were available). Eighty-seven per cent of MY TURN participants were employed at the time of the survey compared to 42 per cent of a control group and 90 per cent of employed MY TURN graduates had full benefit packages (undefined) compared to 28 per cent of a control group (reported in PEPNet, 1999).

**STRIVE/East Harlem Employment Service (United States)**

The goal of this programme, founded in 1985, is to prepare, train, place and support inner-city youth and young adults in long-term employment. They offer three weeks of workshops geared to improving participants’ ability to communicate, using constructive criticism to improve their attitude and on-the-job behaviour. After training, job developers work with participants to enable them to seek jobs on their own and provide access to job leads. The programme emphasises post-placement support with a commitment to two years of follow-up services. Services include: case management; career development; counselling on housing and domestic related issues; alumni activities; replacement and upgrade services; personal development and educational advisement. STRIVE’s Career Path Project assists their graduates to combine formal education and training with their work experience in order to advance to better jobs. Clients work with Career Counsellors who supply information and assistance as well as perform regular check-ins to provide encouragement, and problem solve. Another initiative (in association with the Ford Foundation) is the Access Support and Advancement Partnership (a collaborative effort with a neighbourhood centre and an organisation called Jobs for Youth Boston). It provides advanced soft skills training and industry-specific hard skills training for STRIVE graduates who have maintained employment for six months to a year. Curricula are modified according to employer needs. Free training is offered from 6pm to 9pm twice a week and 9am until 3pm on Saturdays. The training can be completed in 10 to 24 weeks depending on the programme.

Consistently evaluations have shown a 75-80 per cent retention rate after the first quarter. Importantly they also only lose, on average, 18 per cent of their intake between initial group interaction on a Friday to the following Monday and another 18 per cent during the three week workshop period (reported in PEPNet, 1999).

---

23 As with other results where no length of retention is stated in the documents, it is presumed that 90 days is the rate to which is referred.
Juma Ventures (United States)

Founded in 1993, this programme serves low-income youth aged 14-25, most often they are residents of San Francisco’s inner-city neighbourhoods. The programme has three main components:

- **Employment in Juma-owned small businesses.** In this programme, adult managers not only manage the business and supervise youth as employees, but also act as mentors to the youth to support and help them develop.

- **Job Network programme – 18-25 year olds are provided with intensive, work-based training and are then placed in private sector jobs.** The programme has close ties to the Small Business Network (SBN, a coalition of more than 19,000 local employers) to access hundreds of job placement opportunities. It also has an Employer Advisory Group of key members of the SBN to help learn what additional skills they should be teaching, keep in touch with the economy and get feedback on the programme.

- **Workforces Resources is a youth development programme for the participants whilst they are at Juma and for at least a year after placement.** For employers the Workforce Resources provides job retention support, proactive check-ins with youth and their employers and they then help to address issues that arise. For youth, it provides ongoing skill enhancement, adult support, working parent services, life skills, career development, and educational assistance. Also, they provide an Individual Development Account (IDA) matching savings programme matching with $3 for each dollar saved towards education and $2 for each dollar saved for other purposes. In 1998, 100 per cent of the young people placed in jobs over the last 12 months had retained their jobs or advanced to better ones (reported in PEPNet, 1999).

Double Start (Belgium)

This ESF funded project, which includes non-financial support is being developed for low-skilled, unemployed young people. The project objectives include paying special attention to on-the-job guidance to support both the young person and their employer. In addition, it is anticipated that the employer will take on part of the guidance role to the employee.

Emprego Apoiado (Portugal)

This project, also ESF funded, is directed at a number of disadvantaged groups in Portugal, but is largely centred around young people with social problems and a lack of education. The project aims to work with employers to develop strategies, in conjunction with trade unions and social partners, to facilitate flexible, safe and stable employment. It also proposes a framework to ‘promote and support job keeping, establishing of coordinated work with other support systems, so that access to social resources, housing and transport will be facilitated and maximised’.
Case management systems have, or are being used for providing post-employment support services for people with disabilities in the US, Ireland and Austria.

Project NetWork (EVALUATION: RA; IND; V)

In 1992, a demonstration project in the US, Project NetWork, tested the effects of case management for increasing employment among Disability Insurance (DI) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) beneficiaries. The Social Security Association (SSA) and the Department of Health and Human Services tested four different models each in a different city:

- SSA case managers located in SSA field offices.
- Private sector case managers were contracted by SSA to provide services.
- State vocational rehabilitation case managers were under contract to SSA.
- Clients were referred to services through SSA field offices.

The case manager services included medical, psychological, and vocational assessments, individual employment plans, return-to-work services and on-going counselling and monitoring. The scheme also contained work incentives: their disability benefits could not be terminated or suspended for at least one year after beginning in the programme; the first 12 months did not count towards the DI work trial period and SSI beneficiaries were not subject to a continuing disability review.

The evaluation found that:

- there was an increase in people who reported receiving employment, training and rehabilitation services (of six per cent);
- there was an average earnings increase of $220 a year;
- the total number of months employed also increased in the two years follow-up from 3.5 to 4.2;
- the vocational rehabilitation model appeared to have the most positive results. Annual earnings increased by $538. However, the differences could not be solely attributed to the different interventions because the differences between the cities were not controlled for. Also the independent effect of the case manager role cannot be determined because of the inclusion of financial incentives (reported in Gardiner and Fishman, 2000).

Job Advocates (Ireland)

Job Advocates, launched in 1998 in the Clondalkin area of Dublin, works with young people who have (primarily learning) disabilities with a view to enhancing their employability. The tasks of the Job Advocates involve helping prepare CVs and exploring employment preferences. Job Advocates work with clients on a one-to-one basis and act as intermediaries
with employers. They also arrange periods of work experience and may provide follow-up after the young person has entered employment, as a way of ensuring job retention and of overcoming personal and work-related problems. However, no more specific details are available about these services or their usage. Between 1998 and 2000, 38 young people were assisted by Job Advocates; 18 of whom obtained regular employment, whilst 11 entered work experience, and nine were still on programme when monitored (Fitzgerald et al., 2000).

Also in Ireland, the ESF Roscommon EQUAL partnership (see section 1.3.3) will be using a 'key-worker' model in order to substantially increase the number of people with disabilities in work, and to improve the work opportunities available. A specific element of the project is ‘to provide rapid-response post-placement interventions’. The project also includes pre-employment customised training.

Arbeitsassistenz (Austria) (EVALUATION: O; IND; V)

Austria’s Arbeitsassistenz (‘work assistance’) was launched in 1992. Its aim was to bring people with mental health problems (back) into the labour market. The target group has since been extended to include all people with severe disabilities after an initial pilot phase. Arbeitsassistenz (AA) projects are run by not-for-profit organisations under contract from public authorities. The programme offers career planning advice, job brokering services, training for interviews, vocational training (by vocational training organisations) and help in jobsearch. In addition, providers can set up consultations with other advice centres, such as for debt advice, and arrange follow-up care, which primarily involves liaison with employers and dissemination of information and advice at the workplace. The programme’s emphasis is more strongly on placement than retention services. Programme duration should not exceed beyond one year.

An evaluation conducted in 1999 estimated that, between 1995 and (Spring) 1999, the programme had placed some 3,300 unemployed disabled people in employment lasting at least six months. This was estimated to correspond to a “success rate of 43 per cent to 50 per cent”. It is unclear, however, why the success rate should cover such a relatively large range.

In 1999, there were 83 projects in Austria running AA and employing around 174 Job Assistants. On average, a Job Assistant cares for 20 persons. The evaluation found that of the 3517 participating in the scheme since 1997 (Blumberger, 2001). Forty-two per cent had been placed in jobs and 16 per cent of all participants had maintained these jobs for six months or more. The evaluator is, however, critical of the role of the Job Assistants. They were mainly from the voluntary sector and had little or no experience in business matters, which hampered business advice and liaison with host companies.
The evaluation lacks any control group data, although it does compare the ‘success’ of the assistance programmes with job placement rates amongst disabled people prior to its introduction. The evaluation however does not take into account the influence of the considerably improved macro-economic conditions in Austria which coincided with the programme’s introduction.

Germany also introduced the Arbeitsassistenz in October 2000. By February 2001, it was reported that the programme had only attracted 92 applications.

5.5 People with a history of substance abuse

At present, case manager support for people with a history of substance abuse appears to be only available in the US\(^\text{24}\). The majority of programmes for this group include ‘enhanced case management’. In essence, this is a more intensive case management service than exists for welfare recipients without these needs both pre and post-employment. The enhanced services are mainly provided to ensure retention in substance abuse treatment and then to ensure retention in employment and/or to prevent relapse. Most of the services are state-run, but community organisations are also being funded by states to run them. At the moment, less detail is available about the services for this group than for other groups. In many cases, focusing on this target group is a new development for states. Examples of State and county initiatives are:

**Texas Welfare to Work Substance Abuse Initiative**

This is a pilot scheme in which basic substance abuse services (including substance abuse education, prevention and screening for all recipients; assessment and referral) are located on-site at each welfare to work office. The initiative also includes post-placement and job retention services to participants and employers. Recognising the difficulties employers may initially encounter there is a pre- and post-placement employer consultation for each of their welfare to work employees and individualised training for the assigned supervisor. For the participant, the initiative provides on-site problem resolution as needed and case management and long-term aftercare to prevent relapse.

**Integrated Resources for Independence and Self-Sufficiency Program**

Hennepin County, Minnesota, has introduced the for TANF recipients with mental health and substance abuse barriers to employment. Each participant works with a team of professionals which include a vocational counsellor (for assessment, job-readiness, training, placement and retention), a mental health professional (who provides mental and chemical health evaluations, counselling and testing) and a social worker (to help with housing search and family stabilisation).

\(^{24}\) Although there is a new programme in the UK to assist this group – Progress2Work.
Substance Abuse and Enhanced Employee Assistance Program

North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services has introduced the Substance Abuse and Enhanced Employee Assistance Program demonstration initiative. It has expanded the traditional Employment Assistance Program services which were developed as a tool to identify abuse problems to include other related issues such as financial difficulties, depression, child concerns, marital conflict and work performance problems. The enhanced services will provide gender-sensitive substance abuse assessment, two-year aftercare for relapse prevention and worksite mentoring programmes. Employers that discover any employees with substance abuse problems may refer them to the programme.

New Jersey Substance Abuse Research Demonstration (EVALUATION: RA; IND; M)

The New Jersey Substance Abuse Research Demonstration (SARD) project is funded by the State’s Department of Human Services. This five-year pilot is currently in its third year of operation. It is examining the effects that enhanced services have on the job retention of a sample of TANF recipients in two counties. These enhanced services include intensive case management and support services during and after treatment. After referral participants are assigned to a case management team who first identify the problem and then try to resolve barriers to treatment (childcare, transportation, psychological barriers). Participants receive small incentives for attending treatment.

In the random assignment evaluation those receiving intensive case management were much more likely to enter and complete treatment than in the Care Co-ordination where trained addiction counsellors co-ordinated treatment. Treatment entry was 88 compared to 65 per cent and 42 per cent attended all days compared to 22 per cent. Other non-random assignment tests have been carried out to identify the best screening devices. Here too it appeared that intensive screening (conducted by specialised staff using interview techniques to establish rapport and facilitate self-disclosure) was more successful than generic screening (relying on welfare case workers to identify the problems). Employment retention has not been measured.

However, the offer of post-employment services has not been taken up.

A researcher from the project reported that whilst: ‘In theory, women who were recruited into the SARD while on welfare and are now working could get case management. In reality, the women do not want any services from the project after they leave welfare.’

Post-employment Retention is Key (PERK)

The Texas Workforce Commission funded PERK for one year beginning in 1998. It is a community based organisation offering employment
services primarily to substance users and ex-offenders. Participants have a two-hour individual ‘client counselling and coaching follow-up assessment’ that is designed to get to know the client’s history, circumstances and needs. This is followed by four hours training in customer service and also social skills in the workplace. Once in work, the programme then provides mandatory weekly follow-up, job coaching and access to necessary support services for 12 months. Follow-ups with employers are also carried out.

Many of those with problems of substance abuse, also have a range of other problems, including housing. One example was found of a programme tackling both these barriers to employment: the Alethia House Supportive Housing Program.

**Alethia House Supportive Housing Program**

HUD’s Alethia House Supportive Housing Program, Birmingham, Alabama is a supportive living community for homeless women, either with children and/or pregnant who are in recovery from addiction, which was opened in 1996. To move into one of the 69 single family homes clients must have completed 90 days in the affiliated treatment centre or have been referred by another substance abuse treatment facility. Most of the families spend one year in the supportive housing. The programme includes six weeks job readiness training followed by six weeks of on the job training during the day, working as childcare aides, cooks, landscapers, house cleaners and clerical workers combined with counselling in the evenings. Case managers talk to employers about the benefits of hiring Alethia House clients (emphasising that they are drug-free, have completed six weeks of on the job training, and are ready and willing to work). Alethia House also ensures that clients have the transportation needed to get to and from work. Case managers stay in contact with clients after job placements throughout their stay in supportive housing. They visit clients at the worksite to demonstrate support and to help solve any issues that have arisen. They also hope that such visits will increase the likelihood that employers will hire additional clients in the future. Case managers also make weekly home visits to provide advice and support as needed. Although not officially evaluated, reported outcomes include that six months after leaving the programme, two-thirds are drug-free and employed (Wood et al., 1999).

5.6 Ex-offenders

Case management post-employment support for ex-offenders is also found in the US, as well as one European scheme (a partnership of six European countries). In addition to the case manager model, all the examples found provide some form of pre-employment training, either in the form of therapy aimed at preventing re-offending or, more commonly, job readiness training. As with case management programmes for other groups, these vary by the services on offer, the length of time for which they are provided, how regularly contact is made and whether or not employers
are involved. In the US, with the exception of the Texas Workforce Commission programme, all others are run by private organisations.

**Better People (United States)**

Started in 1998, Better People in Portland, Oregon, is a non-profit organisation that focuses on changing the way ex-offenders think through therapy, but also provides both job placement and retention services. The programme only places participants in ‘living wage’ jobs that pay over $8 an hour with health benefits. For the first 30 days of employment, the case manager’s contact with the employer and participant is weekly, often at the work-site (whilst participants continue with their therapy sessions). Employers are contacted either face-to-face or by telephone and discuss the participant’s job performance. This feedback is relayed to the participant and used to improve their performance. After the 30 days, monthly contact with employers continues for a year. Better People also provides an informal support group for participants. The evaluation reports that 65 per cent of participants were placed in a job, 97 per cent of these remained in work for 30 days, 78 per cent for 90 days and 59 per cent for 180 days (reported in Buck, 2000).

**Safer Foundation (United States)**

Safer Foundation in Chicago is the largest community-based ex-offender programme in the US. Formed in 1974, it currently provides 2800 ex-offenders with job assessment, support services and job placement assistance each year. Participants undertake pre-employment training seminars focusing on completing applications, interviewing skills, resume writing and how to behave at the workplace. For the not ‘job-ready’ they run an educational programme to prepare clients for their General Equivalency Diploma. Participants meet with employment counsellors for job referral and placement, who ensure that the job placement is a good match. The participants are assigned to a case manager (known as a ‘lifeguard’) who works with the clients for the first year after their placement. Their services include securing childcare and other benefit entitlements and on teaching participants problem-solving techniques. They also try to assist the clients to advance in their employment. Lifeguards have contact with their clients face-to-face or by telephone once a week for the first three to four months after placement and then once or twice a month for the rest of the year. Lifeguards also have a voice mail message facility on which clients may leave a message at any time. (However, the response will be the following workday rather than immediately.) Their services also include biweekly support groups for participants to discuss issues that arise in their work and personal lives. In the fiscal year of 1996, the programme had a retention rate of 41 per cent for 30 days. Among a partial sample of clients who remained employed for 30 days, 81 per cent were employed (with the same or different employer) after two months, 75 per cent after three months and 57 per cent after nine months (reported in Buck, 2000).
South Forty Corporation (United States)

The South Forty Corporation in New York City has been working with ex-offenders for over 30 years. Clients receive a week-long job readiness training seminar. During this week clients meet their job developer with whom they discuss job opportunities, and with their case workers they develop resumes and address other issues that may be a barrier to employment (e.g. childcare, substance abuse referrals). South Forty has a Private Sector Advisory Committee, through which it has developed strong relationships with employers who will provide job openings. South Forty has merged with the Osborne Association (an organisation that has provided services to ex-offenders and their families for 60 years, such as substance abuse treatment, family counselling, legal service) so that clients may easily be linked to these services. South Forty tracks their participants’ progress for six months after they are placed into a job and allows participants to return for referrals to additional services or better jobs if they have worked successfully at their first placement. No outcomes were reported.

Project RIO (United States)

Texas’ Project RIO (Re-Integration of Offenders), operated by the Texas Workforce Commission, first started as a two-city pilot programme in 1985. Each year it now provides job placement services for approximately 16,000 ex-offenders across the state. Its services include job preparation for inmates while they are still in prison. After their release, clients receive a week-long jobsearch and life skills workshop, as well as individual assistance and use of a resource room. The Project matches clients with ‘specific job openings on the basis of their skills and temperament’ (US Department of Justice, 1998b, p.9). Placements are usually at one of the 12,000 companies that have already hired RIO participants. Employment specialists provide all clients with an up to date directory of local social and community services, but they will play a more active role when necessary, such as making appointments or referrals. The employment specialists telephone employers at 30, 60 and 90 day intervals to find out whether there have been any problems with the placement, and encourage employers to call RIO if there are any problems. Employment specialists also help with re-employment services. The only job retention evidence was from a 1992 study by Texas A & M University which, using Social Security records, found that RIO participants worked during, on average, 1.8 quarters of the year after release compared to 1.1 quarters amongst non-participants (reported in US Department of Justice, 1998b).

Arci Solidarieta (Italy)

The EMPLOYMENT-INTEGRA programme (see Chapter 1 for details) funded Arci Solidarieta, a reintegration programme for ex-offenders based in Rome. The programme offered training courses, labour market
preparation (catering for ex-offenders’ psychological, social and emotional needs), vocational guidance and assistance, and a follow-up service after placement (no details about these services were available). The project worked with partners in Greece, Spain, France, Ireland and the UK where the programme was also implemented. Unfortunately no other information on this project was available.

5.7 Women returners

The review found one example of a case management programme encouraging women who had been out of the labour market whilst caring for children, to return to work.

The Austrian Government introduced the Re-integration Initiative in the autumn of 1995 (EVALUATION: Q-E; IND; V). The programme assists women with child dependants to return to work. The services provided include:

- specialised advice;
- job orientation courses;
- training and qualification courses;
- group sessions;
- assistance to re-integration;
- help with childcare.

An evaluation by the Austrian Employment Service suggests positive integration effects, and positive rating of the programme among participants (Arbeitsmarktservice Österreich, no date). Participants were more likely to be (back) in work than a comparison group of non-participant women aged 20-45. Unfortunately, the evaluation gives no indication how many women had actually participated in the programme, nor of the specific nature of the post-employment services they received.

5.8 Ethnic minorities

In addition to the in-work support available to Maori and Pacific peoples in New Zealand, an ESF project in Finland (MAJAKKA) has also focused on an ethnic minority - the immigrant population. To support their transition into employment they will provided with two job coaches - a native person and one with an immigrant background - to support themselves and their employer. Beyond the transition stage they may receive further training such as specific workplace language training and training in workplace culture.
This chapter reviews programmes relating to specific non-financial support and advice services. As suggested earlier, new employees moving to work from benefit receipt may require assistance to adapt to a number of aspects of their job. Whilst case management usually provides generalised support and advice, workers may also have some more specific requirements. For example, they may have difficulties with skill-specific or technical elements of the job itself and may benefit from the support of a ‘job coach’ (Section 6.1). Mentoring may be an appropriate mechanism to assist with difficulties in adapting to the workplace environment and co-workers (Section 6.2). In addition, new employees may benefit from sharing experiences with peers who have also made the transition from benefit to work (Section 6.3). The provision of out of hours and remote support services may also assist new workers to adapt to their new environment (Section 6.4).

6.1 Job coaching

Some programmes in the US often provide what is referred to as ‘job coaching’ whereby those with responsibility for the client provide practical assistance on-the-job, demonstrating how the work is done, or how to better organise their work, for example. In many cases this is another role for the case manager, but separate job coaching services are also found. Job coaching is often used for people with disabilities. Therefore this section has been divided into programmes for people with and without disabilities.

6.1.1 People without disabilities

For welfare recipients in the US, a number of programmes that included job coaching were uncovered, whilst outside the US, two programmes were found (one Austrian and one Belgian) for the long-term unemployed. No evaluation material was available for these programmes.

A few contractors in Pennsylvania’s Community Solutions offered limited job coaching. It was more likely that the programmes would be allowed to provide on-site job coaching when the employer had previously worked with the programme.

Also in the US, Reaching Independence Through Employment (RITE), a collaborative initiative between Goodwill Industries of NW North Carolina Inc., North Carolina Baptist Hospital (NCBH) and Forsyth County Department of Social Services, helps recipients get and keep jobs at NCBH. Each new employee has an Employment Transition

---

25 Goodwill Industries International is one of the world’s largest non-profit providers of employment and training services for people with disabilities and other disadvantaging conditions such as welfare dependency, illiteracy, criminal history and homelessness. It has sites across the US and Canada and has built up partnerships in 25 countries worldwide, including the UK with the Rehab Remanufacturing Services Ltd. (part of Glasgow Works).
Specialist (ETS) and an Employment Retention Specialist (ERS). The ETS accompanies the new employee to the job site, provides assistance with hands-on aspects of the job and helps resolve any barriers to maintaining employment (such as getting along with others, being punctual and addressing childcare issues). The ETS and ERS also communicate with supervisors and employers and maintain contact with RITE participants for at least one year.

The Social Security Administration in the US can assign a welfare recipient that has moved into employment to ‘technical assistant’ to teach them any technical aspects of the job. This service is provided for employers who have attended the organisation’s training to help them coach and mentor these new employees.

Established during 1998, in Vienna, Austria, the Dynamo activation project follows the conventional job-preparation and job placement model, providing assistance in the development of career plans (9-12 weeks), access to training and further education (8-12 months), and active jobsearch (or self-employment) (up to 16 weeks) for long-term unemployed people. Throughout the process participants are assigned to individual counsellors and trainers. After job placement, participants receive vouchers that entitle them to job coaching. Within a six-month period after their placement, participants can buy up to three hours of personal advice and/or request their counsellor/trainer visit their workplace. Of 100 individuals who took part in the project in 1998, 57 per cent of participants had obtained employment following the completion of the programme. However, no control group data is available nor was a separate evaluation of the job coaching element undertaken (Arbeitmarktservice Österreich, 2000).

In the Belgian EQUAL project (see Section 1.3.3), jobsustaining network, the main objective is to develop ‘an active network of and a helpdesk for professionally trained job coaches who are flexible and perform tailor-made coaching’. The job coaching is to be provided for both the employee and employer, as well as training for all levels of company employees. The network will carry out a publicity campaign and will permanently update the job coaching methodology based on feedback. Job coaches will be provided with a helpdesk, reflection group and training sessions. They wish to become established so that they may continue after ESF funding.

6.1.2 Disabled people

As noted earlier, job coaching programmes are typically found for individuals with impairments. Four examples were found of such programmes in the US, one ESF project and one Norwegian project (which has been formally evaluated). These programmes generally provide support for a set period from just 90 days to three years (although the job coaching element may not necessarily be carried out during the whole of this period), but in these latter cases the support becomes less intensive over time.
In the US, Florida has received a welfare to work grant to help place and retain welfare recipients with learning and other disabilities in employment. Administered by **Florida Developmental Disabilities Council**, and using the services of Seminole Community College and Palm Beach Habilitation Center, it will aim to place participants in jobs with the potential for upward mobility. In addition they will provide assessment, job matching, job coaching, and follow-up support for up to three years.

A rural welfare to work programme, the Gateway programme at Colorado Mountain College and a developmental disability agency, Mountain Valley Developmental Services, have partnered to form **New Gateways to Collaboration**. This initiative provides soft, basic and general job skills training for one semester followed by customised training for specific jobs in the second semester. Once participants have completed training, the disability agency places them in jobs and provides intensive job coaching at the worksite. For the first two days, the job coach stays with the worker all day and then, for the rest of the first month, the job coach works with them for a couple of hours a day. Less intensive follow-up continues for the following 12 to 24 months as necessary.

In collaboration with the Bloomingdale’s and Macy’s department store chains, Goodwill Industries of Southern California operates the **Supported Employment Program**. Applicants with developmental disabilities are screened and tested by Goodwill. If then accepted by the employer, they are employed part-time with the same terms and benefits as other employees. These employees then work together in small groups to ensure that clothing is marked with an anti-theft device and neatly presented for sale. A Goodwill employee (job coach) supervises and trains the employees based on instruction from store personnel. The annual job retention rate has been 95 per cent.

A private non-profit corporation in California, **Pride Industries**, is a self-sufficient commercial enterprise developed in order to create paid jobs for people with disabilities. In addition, they have established the Job Shop pilot project. In this scheme hard-to-place welfare recipients receive employment focused services to help them move into employment (i.e. pre-employment services such as intensive jobsearch and job readiness training). They also provide job coaching at the worksite to those that require a higher degree of intervention. Their follow up services are provided for 90 days after obtaining employment, and include direct employer contact, peer support and job retention counselling.

**CREATIF**, a programme funded under the EMPLOYMENT-HORIZON initiative, had partners in Spain, Belgium, France and Germany. It facilitated the placement of disabled people in regular employment by assisting in identifying and meeting training needs, and providing support in employment, although information on the latter provides little further detail.
In Australia the Department of Family and Community Services’ Disability Program funds over 400 organisations to provide employment assistance to help those with disabilities to find and keep ‘meaningful’ employment. Some organisations offer open employment services which assist people with disabilities get and keep jobs in the open labour market, whilst others provide supported employment. An example of the former is Western Port Employment Support Service Inc., a social profit community-based organisation in Mornington Peninsula, Victoria that has been running its Job Focus programme since 1989. This labour market service provides assistance to businesses employing people with disabilities (through the provision of on-the-job support) and to jobseekers with disabilities to assist them to find jobs. Once they are in work, Job Focus job coaching can be provided to help workers learn their new job and integrate into the workplace. Continued support can also be provided for as long as it is needed or, if contact has not been maintained, employees or employers may re-contact them for assistance.

Norway’s Arbeid med Bistand (AB) (‘work with assistance’) (EVALUATION: O; IND; V) is targeted at severely disabled jobseekers ‘who need job adaptations and training related directly to the work they are doing rather than training and qualifying prior to finding an ordinary job’ (The Labour Market Administration, nd b, p.1). The project commenced in 1992 and continued until 1995, when it was established as an ‘ordinary vocational service’ (The Labour Market Administration, nd a, p. 1).

Arbeid med Bistand teams are separate professional and economic units managed by administrators of labour market services. The teams are organised in groups of at least two job coaches with competence in marketing, working life, teaching methods, public administration or other professional education related to the specific target groups. On average, each job coach works with five jobseekers. The job coaches’ pre-employment services include undertaking an assessment of a work placement and to learn the tasks of the job in order to pass these to the participant. Post-employment they engage in advice and advisory services to the employer/co-workers and negotiate with the employer on working conditions and wages, for example, as well as negotiating adaptations to the jobs to fit the ability of the participant.

This support is available to participants for up to three years regardless of the point at which they begin work. So, in other words, the amount of post-employment support provided will depend on the time of placement. The support is expected to become less intensive over time.

An evaluation of the pilot AB, which was completed in late 1995/January 1996 covered progress and outcomes over a three-year period (Blystad and Spjelkavik, 1997). In total, 30 local projects and 515 programme participants were monitored. About 384 of the 515 participants (75 per
cent) had obtained employment following participation in the programme (129 had left before completing the programme). Participants with some previous work experience were most likely to obtain employment through the programme.

The type of post-placement support that a participant received depended to a large degree on the type of their disability. Thus, people with a learning disability were most likely to receive on-the-job coaching, whilst people with a mental health disability received “support around work-related issues” (ibid., p.25). The principal follow-up services received included attending meetings with employers, job coaches and other service providers (74 per cent), advice/consultancy with co-workers (63 per cent) and re-negotiation of work tasks, wages and employment conditions (50 per cent).

The evaluators point out that ‘job retention was better for those working approximately half-time.’ (ibid., p.33), but provide no definition, nor any data to support this claim. The main reasons for discontinued work relationships (affecting 205 participants) were employer dissatisfaction with the employee (17 per cent) and participant dissatisfaction with the job (16 per cent).

The evaluators suggest that there was a risk that job coaches lacked the expert skills needed to fulfil their complex coaching role. The evaluators were also wary of job coaches’ excessive intervention in the relationship between jobseeker, employer and co-workers, which may discourage jobseekers’ dealing actively with the problems they encounter and may lead to these employees not being fully integrated into the workplace.

6.2 Mentoring

Mentoring for new entry-level employees can be a mechanism for assisting the new employee to adapt to the workplace environment, and to the new tasks and responsibilities required of them. Thus, it can enhance productivity, workplace morale, and ultimately, job retention (Prince, 1999b). Through a mentoring service, clients are matched with a mentor who provides help to make the transition into work. Mentoring services are most usually provided by employers, or voluntary organisations and this determines whether mentors are a current member of the workforce (employer initiated) or volunteers outside the workforce (voluntary organisations). Although mentors provide similar support services as a case manager, mentors usually only provides support for one individual. Mentoring schemes may be employer-led or independently-led. Some programmes use the term ‘buddies’, which is generally interchangeable with ‘mentors’, although in some cases, mentors may have a higher employment status (for example, in terms of grade or employment experience) than buddies. Both, however, are distinct from peers, where the assumption is that they are in a similar position (that is, new entrants to work) to enable shared experiences.
6.2.1 Employer-led mentoring schemes

In the US, mentoring is much more commonly provided by employers than childcare or transportation, presumably because it is a low cost, but apparently effective support scheme for new employees. In 1998, 23 per cent of non-Welfare to Work Partnership employers and 34 per cent of Welfare to Work Partnership employers were providing mentoring schemes (Welfare to Work Partnership, 1998). Over two-thirds of the former had a formal programme where new workers are assigned a mentor for a specified period of time. They primarily addressed the issues of job skills (42 per cent), personal issues (19 per cent) and work ethics (18 per cent). Mentoring was seen to be having a significant impact. A study of the Partnership employers reported 68 per cent found that work performance improved; 65 per cent reported higher retention; 53 per cent saw reduced absenteeism and 45 per cent reported monetary savings. By providing their own mentors, employers can choose who to match a new employee with and can provide a structured programme tailor made to the needs of the employer and employee.

Employer-initiated schemes in the US tend to use current employees of the company as mentors. The duration of mentoring support varies.

- Since 1997, the Illinois Bus Company have hired former welfare recipients to train as bus drivers. Although the numbers of participants are small, the mentoring component of the programme is seen as the ‘heart’ of the programme’s success in retaining employers (the programme also provides transportation and childcare assistance to participants). For the first few weeks in work, new employees are contacted on a daily basis from a staff member of the training department.

- United Airlines introduced a peer-mentoring programme developed by union members, international employees, senior level executives and welfare recipients to support retention. It was designed as a peer model so that it would not interfere with employee-supervisor relationships. ‘Locational champions’ oversee the programme and assist mentors and employees. The mentors are volunteers and are expected to perform the role in their own time. New workers are assigned mentors within their first 60 days of employment. United Airlines adopted the programme for all employees in 1998 to improve long-standing turnover problems, citing the success of the welfare recipient programme as the reason for expansion.
In some areas of the US, groups of employers have worked together to provide mentoring programmes to entry level employees across the network of employers:

- In Seattle, the Trades Mentor Network includes five signatory companies. Mentors are trained volunteers from the company, and have at least twice monthly contact to guide and coach their assigned apprentice. Since 1992, 200 mentors and 105 apprentices have been trained. Fifty per cent of apprentices who did not have mentors left the programme compared to 25 per cent of those with mentors. All apprentices receive on the job training, but there does not appear to be any support services in addition to the mentoring.

- In Michigan, the American Society of Employers (ASE) ‘Stay the Course’ Mentoring Program that began in July 2001 matches an employed person, 25 years or older, from the ASE member base with a Welfare Reform adult or Work-Investment Act youth enrolled in work or training who has had difficulty obtaining, sustaining or advancing in employment. It is a one-on-one mentoring programme, whereby mentors must conduct at least one face-to-face meeting with their mentee, every month for the first year. ASE also offers group activities for all participants, an orientation for mentees and a training session for mentors. Success will be based on the number of mentees who sustain employment or completed training. This programme is being evaluated.

In Denmark there is an example of a sector-led initiative. An EQUAL project (see section 1.3.3), AKIU, Aktørorienteret integration, aims to increase the number of care workers for the elderly, in particular for the growing proportion of ethnic minority elderly people. Its main objective, therefore, is to ‘develop holistic models and methods for recruitment, training, integration and retention of refugee and immigrants in permanent employment within the social sector and health sector’. An important element of the model is retaining older employees to act as mentors for the trainees with a refugee or immigrant background.

6.2.2 Independently led mentoring schemes

A number of independent organisations in the US and in Europe are developing mentoring programmes, which typically use volunteers from outside the company hiring the employee. The majority of schemes are run on a voluntary basis, although there is one example where both mentors and ‘mentees’ are paid. None of these schemes appear to have been evaluated:

- Founded in 1992, Washington Works provides pre-employment training for young low-income individuals. After ‘Graduates’ find employment, their Graduate Services Program provides them with a volunteer professional to act as a mentor during their transition to employment, through weekly phonecalls or meetings for the first four to six months of employment.
• An initiative in eastern Kansas, Mentoring Works!, employs successful, college-graduated retirees as mentors for welfare recipients. Some mentors assist case workers by giving job readiness training, referrals to other service providers and additional personal attention. Others are stationed at major employers of welfare recipients, to provide guidance and counselling and address problems that may otherwise lead to new employees quitting or being fired.

• Darke County’s (Ohio) Co-Employee Mentorship program will assist long-term recipients, who need help transitioning into the workforce. A mentor will help individuals develop the ‘proper attitude’, integrate themselves in the workforce and handle other day-to-day concerns. Both mentor and participant will be paid according to the longevity of the job.

• Employment-Youthstart has funded mentoring schemes in Marseille, France, which targeted migrant youth at risk of labour market exclusion. The programme’s aim was to pair up young people with retired persons as their mentors during their participation in training and work experience schemes.

• the EQUAL-funded project (see Section 1.3.3) Techno-Mentoring, implemented by an employment and training centre in Amsterdam with Telford College, Edinburgh, as their UK partner, seeks to “to stimulate young girls and women to find and retain jobs in technical professions by offering them coaching by experienced women working successfully in that sector”.

• Also an EQUAL project, Integration of Disabled People (Integration von Menschen mit Behinderung durch Arbeit und Unterstützende Bildung) implemented by the Disability Association (Behindertenverband) of Rostock, Germany, provides business internship for disabled people supported by mentors and integration counsellors.

Examples were found in the US of independent organisations developing mentoring programmes for other companies or organisations (at a charge) for their entry-level workers. Examples include:

• Established as a mentoring organisation in the 1960s, Women in Community Service (WICS) is ‘nationally recognised as a leader in the field’ of mentoring for entry-level workers. They will analyse a company’s needs and develop a mentoring programme that targets these identified issues, thus promoting retention and advancement. WICS also works with companies who have existing mentoring programmes, by providing tailor made training for both mentors and mentees, workshops for supervisors on coaching techniques, technical assistance and referral services for mentors through a toll-free number for childcare, transportation, housing and other critical issues facing entry-level workers.
Kentucky has developed a model Mentoring Program by suggesting how counties can recruit and screen mentors; conduct orientation and training; develop a programme agenda; evaluate the programme; and develop a budget. The model advises that there should be a commitment of at least one-year of weekly contacts of one or two hours.

6.3 Peer support groups

The previous section has described a number of initiatives that provide new employees with support mechanisms to ease them through their transition to stable employment. Some US welfare to work programmes (both state and non-state provided) include a peer support group element in which new employees can swap experiences and solutions with others in a similar position. Some groups are used for additional training purposes or to run workshops on specific issues (such as budgeting, time management, conflict resolution and workplace communication). All of these kinds of programmes were found to be voluntary rather than mandatory, and none have been separately evaluated.

6.3.1 Welfare to work programmes

In Iowa’s Post-Employment Pilot Project group activities included job readiness and life skills training, general support, and computer training. They were provided in the evenings and/or at weekends. The value of the group workshops varied by site and individual. However it was found that these activities occurred at the expense of one-to-one contact with PEP staff making it more difficult for case managers to build up trust with their clients.

The GAPS program also included peer support groups. However, participation was low, mainly because of difficulties in arranging a time when participants were not at work, difficulties in arranging childcare and transport, and a general disinterest from clients. However, one organisation running the programme had almost half of their clients (45 per cent) attend at least one session, partly because of their location (the office was in walking distance for many participants) as well as the provision of family sessions. The organisers sponsored a women’s leadership group, parenting groups and exercise groups, as well as field trips and special events. Case managers at this site felt that the sessions were ‘key to helping participants establish their own support networks and for boosting the morale of those with low self-esteem’ (Wood and Paulsell, 2000, p.32).

As noted, Pierce County’s STEPS programme found that clients were unwilling to participate in group sessions provided by case managers on career and life planning topics. Clients preferred to now see their peer group as the working population, rather than amongst (ex-) benefit recipients.

A non-profit service provider programme established in 1992, Cleveland’s Job Match has staff who facilitate a community jobs support
group in which graduates from their training and placement program can meet and share their employment experiences and encourage each other. Monthly meetings take place at Job Match offices, but participants set the agenda.

The New York Consortium for Worker Education (offering a variety of employment, education, training, retraining, and childcare programs for union members, dislocated workers and public assistance recipients) is developing a ‘comprehensive post-employment assistance project’. This will provide ‘peer support networks’ to provide contacts for new workers to discuss work-related problems.

6.3.2 Voluntary organisations

Just one organisation was found that solely provides a peer support group. This was the Sister to Sister Network in St Paul, Minnesota, a peer support group for current and former female welfare recipients. Its philosophy is that all members of the group can give as well as receive help in their monthly meetings at which they not only discuss experiences, but also includes dinner, childcare and informational presentations. Participants share information about current welfare changes, personal issues, challenges that they have faced, learning from those that have been in work longest about how to succeed in the workplace and become self-sufficient. The network can be used for as long as necessary.

6.4 Telephone Helplines

Although the majority of programmes reviewed in this study provide in-work support through face-to-face or telephone contact through case workers, in the US some provide telephone helplines or call centres for new employees and/or employers to provide advice about work-related difficulties, and information about retention and advancement and benefit entitlements. Some helplines are provided as an additional service in an existing programme, others are stand-alone programmes.

6.4.1 Telephone helplines for employees

Some helplines for employees are set up (typically at State or county level) to provide emergency support or advice, whereas others provide more general service awareness. For example:

- **Maryland’s Project Retain** (administered by the Maryland Community Services and Family Investment Administrations) provides a toll-free hotline to assist low income individuals with emergency or routine problems that might cause them to lose their jobs. Hotline staff put them in touch with the services they need in their county in the areas of childcare, transportation, housing, emergency shelter and food, substance abuse, health and dental care, family counselling, domestic violence and child support. A number of counties in the project have emergency hotlines to help participants avoid absences from work by offering childcare and transportation. Information about the project is being distributed at local human services (equivalent of social service offices) and job centres.
• **Jobkeeper** is a free, 24-hour hotline for low-income workers’ employment, personal or family issues in San Jose, California. It was set-up in October 1997 by the county TANF agency and is operated by ContactCares, an accredited non-profit hotline provider. Highly trained volunteers answer the calls, supported by professional staff and bilingual operators or translators also available. The anonymous and confidential services include referrals, ‘supportive listening’ and problem-solving.

• Washington WorkFirst created the **Post-Employment Labor Exchange** (WPLEX) call centre in August 1998. Trained staff contact working, former WorkFirst participants to inform them of the wage progression services available to them such as assessment and referrals to training opportunities and higher-paying jobs. They also remind clients of their eligibility for childcare and transportation assistance, food stamps, Medicaid, EITC and other services. Clients are re-contacted at specific intervals. Participation in the services is voluntary, but can be provided for up to two years. They are operated from 8am to 8pm weekdays and 9am to 6pm on Saturdays. In the WorkFirst Survey, just five per cent had used WPLEX, but almost four-fifths (78 per cent) of these thought that the services they received were very or somewhat helpful (although evidence on the role the service played in encouraging sustained employment is unknown) (Klawitter and VanNynatten, 2001).

6.4.2 **Telephone helplines for employers**

Only one example of a helpline for employers only was found. Again it was provided by a US State. The **New Orleans Welfare to Work Collaborative** has an information and rapid response line, which aims to raise awareness amongst employers of incentives available to those who hire ex-welfare recipients and to assist them in addressing any workplace problems that may arise.

6.4.3 **Telephone helplines for both employers and employees**

Interestingly, both the examples found (only in the United States) of helplines for employees and employers were non-State led initiatives (no such state led initiatives were found).

**Goodwill Industries of Greater New York** has created a Member for Life programme to track individuals going through its vocational rehabilitation training programmes (for people with disabilities, those moving from welfare to work and other individuals that have found securing employment difficult). Participants receive regular follow-up phone calls and will have access to a toll-free number to call Goodwill whenever job-related questions or problems occur. Employers are also encouraged to call Goodwill.
Partners in Progress of Ceridian Performance Partners (the business unit of the Ceridian Corporation, a human resources outsourcing company) helps companies hire, train and retain qualified welfare recipients for entry-level jobs. It also provides toll-free telephone access to experienced management professionals who can help employers respond to workplace issues. In addition they provide a toll-free, 24-hour hotline for employees to access counselling professionals to help them assess their problems, offer support and identify resources.
This chapter provides selected details of programmes developed to provide or assist the development of skills and training of new entrants to work. Such development is important for job retention and advancement, particularly for entry-level employees who may lack certain basic or job-specific skills. Improving their skill deficits will enable them to perform successfully in work, which may encourage retention, as well as facilitating progression to other employment (Section 7.1). However, for working parents in particular, it can be difficult to access (out of work time) training and education programmes, primarily because of cost. This can include the cost of transport to the training provider, childcare during training periods, and obtaining the necessary education materials (Section 7.2). Providing training can also be costly for employers, possibly constraining their provision of training for their new or incumbent workers (Section 7.3). Employers themselves may also benefit from training, with regard to the recruitment and retention of new workers (Section 7.4).

Some training and education programmes, typically those that operate once a client has moved into work, are designed to address current skills deficits, or to improve future employment prospects. These may be provided by both government and non-government organisations. Importantly, the majority of these are recognising that working adults (parents in particular) have many commitments and time constraints that make extra training difficult, and therefore more flexible training is required.

In association with employers, some colleges and other organisations are designing programmes to enable entry level workers to improve their job-related and basic skills for their current job. To ensure that employees are able to access the training, some schemes provide it at the worksite, whilst others provide training out of standard workplace hours, to fit around work schedules. Examples of these kinds of programmes include:

- **Nine Star Enterprises Inc.** in Alaska. The Enterprise is encouraging employers committed to hiring welfare recipients to provide skills and basic education training, general education diplomas and English for speakers of other languages, *in work time*. The Enterprise can provide support services for employees, including transportation, mentoring and case management.

- The **Hispanic Associations of Colleges and Universities** also conducts post-employment occupational and basic skills training through “state of the art” interactive computer technology *at the worksite*. Education counselling is provided by mentors and employers supervising the programme.
• **Thomas Nelson Community College** in Hampton, Virginia has a Workforce Development Center (WDC) that provides pre and post-employment training for regional employers. Some programs are generic, but most are customised to each company. One company in particular, Gateway Inc., used the WDC to train its entry-level employees, after finding it difficult to recruit ‘job ready’ workers. The WDC has taken a flexible approach to training and attempts to be responsive to the needs of employers. For example, Gateway’s post-employment training needed to be on a very *flexible schedule* to accommodate shift workers, and therefore includes sessions from 6am to 3pm, 8am to 5pm, 4pm to 1am and 6pm to 3am. The WDC believes that their success has been due to their responsiveness and understanding of the challenges companies face (Jobs for the Future, 2000).

• **Illinois Central College** provides Workplace Basic Skills Enhancement a programme for low-skilled employees. The college determines the skills needed by the employer and the aptitude of the employees. It then provides the training required, from basic education to job-specific skills. The classes are provided to fit in with workplace schedules and at a location suitable for the employer and employee – at the worksite or elsewhere.

• **Washington’s Workplace Basic Skills** programme provides adult basic education to low-wage, low-skilled workers at the worksite through local education providers. Participating employers are those operating in sectors that have a concentration of entry level or low skill level posts, including hotels, nursing homes, and low-level manufacturing industries. Employers can be reimbursed for up to 50 per cent of a qualified employee’s wages during formal, on-the-job training. The programme’s website ([http://literacynet.org/workbasics/home.htm](http://literacynet.org/workbasics/home.htm)) provides a number of ‘success stories’ from employers of 40 to 1400 employees, in a range of sectors. The successes include improved: language skills; communication skills; job performance; team working; problem solving; ability to deal with conflict; productivity; work attendance; and computer literacy.

In 1999, the province of Saskatchewan in Canada launched the **Learning @ Work** project. Its goals are to determine what issues and problems the workforce has in different sectors; to create links between businesses and education providers; and to promote lifelong learning through contacts with businesses and pilot projects. The programmes in use at the moment include: using outside companies to improve literacy skills; employers or sectors developing their own training programmes to deal with shortages and training needs; and learning activity centres on worksites.
A few examples of US states which provide funds to cover the costs of training (other than Individual Development Accounts – see Chapter 4) were found, including:

- In Florida’s Welfare to Work Programme (WAGES) any former programme participant is entitled to a **Retention Incentive Training Account** (RITA) of up to $5000 per year, to cover tuition, fees, educational materials, coaching and mentoring, performance incentives, transportation to and from courses, childcare costs during education courses and other costs deemed necessary to achieve successful job retention and advancement. The courses must be on a list compiled by the regional workforce board and deemed to promote job retention and advancement, and the board must also approve the training providers. The funds will be directly linked to occupations that are in demand or with high potential growth. In 2000, approximately 1500 RITAs were issued, and take-up was expected to rise in 2001. Similarly, New Jersey provides **Career Advancement Vouchers** for those off welfare and employed. These can help to pay for classes or training for a current or new job. Individuals are entitled to vouchers worth up to $4000.

In the US, some states are providing financial assistance towards the cost of on-the-job training programmes (some in the form of a tax credit), to encourage employers to pursue job retention and advancement strategies for their employees. These include:

- **Florida’s On-the-Job Training** (OJT) in which employers are reimbursed up to 50 per cent of the wages that are paid to the participant, for the time it takes for the employee to acquire the skills needed for the positions (reimbursement will not exceed six months). Participants can only take part if they have been assessed by the State welfare agency as being eligible for OJT. Participants receive the same wage rates, benefits and working conditions as similarly situated employees. Workers are ‘very likely’ to remain employed after training is completed. OJT agreements will no longer be entered into with employers who have regularly failed to provide OJT participants with continued long-term employment.

- **Giant Food Inc.** is in partnership with the State of Maryland to place welfare recipients in a range of jobs using a combination of 60 hours of pre-employment training followed by on-the-job training funded by TANF. This partnership gives Giant a steady stream of applicants they claim are ‘eager to work and advance’ and reports an 85 per cent retention rate\(^{26}\) compared to 50 per cent for recruits who have not received the pre-employment training.

Some States are providing tax credits to employers as an incentive for training their new or incumbent employees. For example, established in 1997, North Carolina’s New and Expanding Industry Program provides

---

\(^{26}\) No retention length was given, therefore it is presumed that they are using the most commonly used definition of 90 days.
a **Worker Training Tax Credit** of between $500 and $1000 per employee, in certain industrial sectors (including manufacturing, processing, warehouse and distribution firms) in companies that pay at least 110 per cent of the average county wage. The credit is applied against wages paid to new workers whilst they train or for existing workers whilst they are being trained on new equipment.

In 1997 **Rhode Island’s Employment and Retention Services Unit** introduced four tax credits to encourage the training of new or incumbent workers; the new employment tax credit (described in Section 4.2.1); the job training credit; the adult education tax credit; and the apprenticeship tax. The job training credit covers 50 per cent of an employer’s training expenses for low-paid full-time employees, who remain in the job for at least 18 months after completing the training. Employers must provide wages of at least 150 per cent of the state’s minimum wage after training is completed. The adult education tax credit provides 25 per cent of the cost incurred for providing vocational or basic education for employees that have maintained employment for at least 13 consecutive weeks. Training includes literacy programs, GED preparation, English as a Second Language, vocational training and citizenship studies for immigrants. Finally, the apprenticeship tax was introduced because of a shortage of skilled machinists and plastics process technicians. Therefore this tax credit reimburses employers in these sectors for certain expenses incurred training their apprentices.

Some programmes in the US are attempting to raise employer awareness with regard to reducing staff turnover and encouraging retention amongst entry level employees, by directing training programmes towards staff who have contact with entry level employees.

For example, funded by Ohio’s Jobs and Family Services for the financial year 2000-2001, **Curtis and Associates Inc.** (Clermont County, Ohio) provides training programmes for frontline business supervisors in an effort to help them identify techniques for retention and progression of former and current TANF employees. Training for employers includes how to: provide employment counselling services; hire ex-offenders; and how to identify community services and tax credits available for employees.

The **Sasha Corporation** (a private training company) has developed ‘The Missing Link’ a training package for frontline supervisors. The training videos bought by employers are advertised as effective tools for improving employee retention and, therefore, for saving the company money. The training involves developing appropriate attitudes, listening skills, conflict resolution and teamwork. They have a number of high profile employers already using the service including United Parcel Service, and Xerox Corporation, and have enjoyed press coverage of their various
successes. It is suggested that the video sessions are of greatest use for supervisors of firms employing large numbers of entry-level employees.

**Ceridian Performance Partners** operates Partners in Progress, a programme that provides help for companies to hire, train and retrain qualified welfare recipients for entry-level positions. This includes a short training program for managers, which provides an insight into the characteristics of welfare recipients and the needs of entry-level workers. It also provides helplines for employers and employees (see Section 6.4.3).

The **Welfare to Work Partnership** (described in Section 3.1) aims to tackle some of the additional difficulties that some welfare recipients face (for example, those with a history of substance abuse, or offending) in gaining and retaining employment. This is done through the **BizLink Network**, which aims to provide retention, advancement and re-employment support to 2300 individuals on TANF. Started in 1998, the Network works in collaboration with local welfare to work stakeholders in Los Angeles, New Orleans, Chicago, New York and Miami. The Network recruits, educates and supports small to medium-sized employers, aiming to change the way companies understand, train, retrain and supervise entry level workers with specific problems, such as substance abuse: ‘By serving as a human resource tool, BizLink will provide the extra resources that many small- and medium-sized businesses cannot afford on their own. It will act as a support system for employers and their new hires by providing mentoring, job training, general life skills’ (Welfare to Work Partnership, 2000). Although, no evaluation results were available when conducting this review, the number of firms involved in the partnerships has been growing, suggesting that companies involved have seen improved outcomes. For example in 2001, law firms in the Chicago and New Orleans committed to using the programme, following the ‘successful’ model already underway among law firms in San Francisco.
This chapter reviews in-work support programmes that have a specified emphasis on advancement in the labour market. Existing mechanisms designed to encourage or promote job or employment advancement through career ladders are identified in Section 8.1 and career guidance in Section 8.2. In general, policies that focus on job retention emphasise the maintenance of a static employment state, rather than emphasising any notion of progression or advancement (for example, in terms of job quality, responsibility and status, earnings and promotion). An individual’s ability to advance in the labour market will in part depend on their own personal attributes and employability, as well as opportunities available through employment and the economic environment. However, many welfare recipients will wish to advance beyond their first job to another with improved pay and conditions, although many entry level jobs offer limited opportunities for such advancement. Therefore, new employees may benefit from assistance in planning employment or ‘career’ progression.

However, as advancement is only really possible once sustained employment has been achieved, few programmes have (to date) been successful at achieving job retention fewer. Hence there are relatively few programmes that focus specifically on advancement issues.

8.1 Career ladders and skill supply chains

Career ladders or skills supply chains are essentially an employment or training model that promotes upward progression either in a single occupation or in an employment sector with similar skill-needs. Although there are many training programmes which refer to employment or career ‘ladders’, the majority of them focus on bridges to (retaining) work, rather than any notion of progression or advancement. The programmes reviewed in this section, all found in the US, specifically focus on advancement in work. Few of these programmes focus on the welfare population. Rather, they focus on specific occupational sectors (such as health care) that typically offer low-paid work. These types of initiatives, however, may be useful in considering the promotion of advancement for entry level workers.
Examples include:

- In 1997 Jobs with a Future Partnerships\textsuperscript{27}, Wisconsin, created a training programme in phlebotomy\textsuperscript{28} that provides a new career pathway for low-wage health care workers. The six-week training programme is offered in the evening at a local college, at the end of which, certified nursing assistants are able to move into entry-level phlebotomist positions and are likely to receive higher wages and better conditions.

- A church-based community development corporation in Chicago, Bethel New Life, developed the Health Care Career Ladder in 1997. The hope was to train low-income women working as home health aides\textsuperscript{29} to gain nursing qualifications. Of the 150 who began as home health aides in the past three years 63 per cent (95) have completed basic nursing assistant training but only five enrolled in further advancement programmes. Although the majority of participants’ income rose slightly, none have moved further to better paid technical jobs. In one report, it is suggested that the main reason for this was the difficulty for participants to combine full-time work with long-term training (Fitzgerald and Carlson, 2000). The organisation also runs Environmental (lead and asbestos abatement techniques) and Child Care Career Ladders.

- Cooperative Home Care Associates (CHCA) is a workers’ co-operative founded in 1985 in the South Bronx. The programme is designed to provide enhanced training (over and above federal requirements) to encourage job upgrading in the health care sector. The training programme consists of four weeks on-site classroom training followed by 90 days on the job training. The majority of CHCA’s employees received some kind of public assistance before entering the programme. As a result of the programme, CHCA has far less turnover than most similar agencies. The mechanisms for job upgrading include moves into administrative roles, and continuing education in health care.

- The Tri County Job Ladder Partnership of 34 employers and six community colleges creates career and educational pathways in four main sectors; manufacturing, customer relations, information technology and health services. Individualised career plans are developed by employees, using a database of job and training opportunities across participating employers and colleges.

\textsuperscript{27} The Jobs With A Future project consists of three industry partnerships in the manufacturing, health care, and finance and insurance industries. Initiated in 1996 the partnerships focus on workforce skill and training issues.

\textsuperscript{28} Drawing blood for analysis or transfusion.

\textsuperscript{29} Individuals employed to provide routine, personal healthcare, such as bathing, dressing, or grooming, to elderly, convalescent, or disabled persons in the home of patients or in a residential care facility.
Some more general career ladder programs also exist in the United States, with a focus upon gaining general work-related skills and developing a steady work history. These appear to be more usually developed by state agencies. Examples include:

- **Cuyahoga Work and Training**, a TANF funded agency in Ohio, has partnered with a health care provider with multiple sites. Employees are initially hired into entry-level Tier One jobs, and become eligible to move to Tier Two jobs after a year of continuous employment and a satisfactory work record. The next steps in the development process are to identify Tier Three jobs and the training needs for these jobs. TANF funds are used to subsidise wages and a wide range of supportive services is available including childcare, transportation and counselling.

- After a small-scale pilot in 1998, the **Detroit Job Ladder Program** began in 1999. Administered by the Detroit Chamber of Commerce, it is the creation of a more formal link between employment in the low-paying, part-time, entry-level jobs (typified, but not limited to, the fast food industry) and better paying entry-level jobs in manufacturing, health care or other areas. Employees who demonstrate solid work skills (including a 95 per cent attendance rate) in a low-paying, entry-level job for nine months are placed in a pool for employers with openings for higher paying jobs. The ongoing evaluation has found that (Corporation for a Skilled Workforce, 2001):
  - out of 195 individuals, 27 have successfully progressed from Tier 1 to Tier 2 (with an average hourly wage increase of $2.15);
  - 24 of the 36 employed interviewees said they were moderately satisfied with their employment, but considered the wages and benefit levels to be inadequate; and
  - approximately 65 per cent of those interviewed perceived the programme to have a positive impact on their labour market attachment.

- Similarly, **Memphis Area Chamber of Commerce** has also developed a three-tier skill supply chain. Tier One employees at several call centres are in entry-level jobs that require few skills and work experience. When these employees have demonstrated competencies in basic work skills, several of these call centres then refer them to FedEx, which places them in Tier Two jobs, that require some work experience and a demonstration of work readiness skills. FedEx also provides the training for Tier Three jobs, those requiring advanced skills and a strong work history (no further information could be found regarding this training). It is reported that ‘this arrangement has reduced turnover for the telemarketing firms and provided FedEx with a reliable source of qualified, entry-level workers’ (Freeman and Rubin, 2000, p.22).

8.2 Career guidance    In the US, a few states and organisations are developing proactive and flexible options to try to encourage advancement among those that have moved into employment from welfare. Rather than developing formal
Links for upward movements in the labour market, as in the career ladder models, these programmes provide information to employees on how to advance from their current position. As with many of the other services, organisations are starting to develop advancement programmes that are flexible for working parents, developing with their other commitments and time constraints in mind:

- **The Jobs with a Future Partnerships**, Wisconsin, have established the ‘Upward Mobility’ initiative with the local one-stop career centre. Local job centre counsellors identify low-income individuals who work in entry-level positions and counsellors provide information brochures on how to advance to jobs with higher wages and benefits. The Partnerships have also developed a directory that charts jobs and advancement opportunities in about 30 local firms.

- As noted in section 6.4.1, the **Washington Post-Employment Labor Exchange** (WPLEX) contacts all working, former WorkFirst participants to inform them of the wage progression services available to them such as assessment and referrals to training opportunities and higher-paying jobs.

- **Steps to Success**, Portland Oregon’s welfare to work initiative, is targeting past participants in employment for its post-employment services, because they believe that these parents will already have had a positive relationship with the programme and will therefore be more likely to return for further help. They offer flexible advancement services available at 5.30 to 8.30pm on weekdays and 9am to 3pm at weekends. The services include all the family with free childcare and meals, science and computer activities for children, adult education and English as a Second language classes, vocational rehabilitation services, career planning, computer training and job placement. These extra services have, they say, increased participation amongst busy parents. Providing coupons for free movies, haircuts, the zoo or other similarly inexpensive items has also encouraged continued participation.

- **Salem’s Up With Wages** pilot, established early 1998, found a demand from clients for career development guidance once they had a secure foothold in work. Up With Wages staff work with their clients to develop ‘income improvement plans’ which include thinking about their interests and skills and the steps required to move up to better jobs. In addition, they provide advancement workshops. In this programme, case managers are located at the worksite and their services are available to all employees. It is believed that by being placed at the worksite it is easier for clients to attend sessions and also allows case managers to develop closer working relationships with employers.
• **Jobs Consortium** in Oakland County, California, offers a range of services and incentives through its Follow-Up and Retention Unit including: retention plans with employment goals; counselling and support. They train their clients to ask employers directly about career ladders and consult employers about career ladders within their company and sharing this information with clients. They also offer industry specific training, help obtaining post-secondary and other training courses.
From job seekers to job keepers: job retention, advancement and the role of in-work support programmes

Part three - Overview
This final chapter presents an overview of the findings of the review of in-work support programmes. Section 9.1 reviews the review of different types of in-work support programmes, drawing on the evidence presented in Part II of this report.

Section 9.2 explores issues relating to the delivery of in-work support services, including: involving non-public employment services (Section 9.2.1); involving employers (Section 9.2.2); Co-ordinating post-employment services and support; using case management (Section 9.2.3); identifying and targeting clients (Section 9.2.5); and the costs (and benefits) of in-work support programmes (Section 9.2.6).

This section follows the structure of Part II and thus provides an overview of the following support types:

- Childcare (Section 9.1.1).
- Transport (Section 9.1.2).
- Wage Supplements and other Financial Assistance for Employees (Section 9.1.3).
- Financial Assistance and Incentives for Employers (Section 9.1.4).
- Retention Incentives for Employees and Employers (Section 9.1.5).
- Job Coaching (Section 9.1.6).
- Mentoring (Section 9.1.7).
- Peer Support Groups (Section 9.1.8).
- Telephone Helplines (Section 9.1.9).
- Post-Employment Education and Training (Section 9.1.10).
- Advancement Strategies (Section 9.1.11).

As has been noted elsewhere in this report, systematic and thorough evaluations of the effectiveness of different types of in-work support are scarce. Of those that have been subject to some form of evaluation, the approach rarely separates the various components of the programme to explore their effectiveness in isolation. Furthermore, few evaluations offer an experimental design with comparisons between a control group and an action or programme group formed at random – said to be one of the most effective ways of evaluating the impact or outcome of a programme (Stafford et al., 2002). However, a number of programmes have evolved over several years, providing general lessons for best practice.

---

9.1 A review of different types of in-work support initiatives

9.2 The delivery of in-work support services

---

30 With the exception of the provision of non-financial advice and support, which is considered in Section 9.2 as part of the discussion on case management approaches.
9.1.1 Childcare

Childcare difficulties can contribute to a premature exit from work, particularly for lone parents (Noble et al., 1998). For example, about a third of participants (low income lone parents) in the US JOBS programme encountered difficulties with childcare provision in the first three months of work, relating to caring for a sick child or breakdown of existing childcare arrangements. Evidence from the review of childcare support programmes has found (cf. Section 3.1):

- Very few employers provide childcare support, but those that do report much higher retention rates, less absenteeism, improved work performance as well as reducing costs in the longer-term.\(^{31}\)
- Employers can be encouraged to provide childcare facilities through incentives, for example, by providing tax credits to those employers who provide onsite childcare or matching employer contribution to childcare costs.
- Employees also require childcare support for when a child is ill and cannot attend the usual provider or when childcare arrangements break down. The latter is more likely to occur when using informal childcare (such as friends and family), which is often used by low income working parents (see for example, Ford, 1996 for a discussion of UK lone parents’ childcare choices). In the US, some states purchase slots from childcare providers to provide emergency care at short notice. This would require employers who provide care to be flexible and to have similar strategies in place.

9.1.2 Transport

Inadequate (public) transport facilities have been identified as inhibiting access to and retention of employment. This is particularly the case in the US where places of work and residence can be at great distances from another thus increasing travel-to-work costs. Similar evidence also exists in the UK, particularly in rural areas (Shucksmith, 2000). In the UK the possession of a driving licence is known to increase a person’s chances of obtaining work, and evidence also suggests that people with access to private transport are more likely to sustain employment (Trickey et al., 1998). The latter finding was also evident in the GAPS initiative, although the difference was not statistically significant (Wood and Paulsell, 2000).

\(^{31}\) Although such employers may be more predisposed to ‘good’ employment practice per se.
Evidence from this review suggests that the development of work-related transport systems should consider the following.

**Mapping transport provision to need**
- Mapping of existing public transport provision (both in geographical terms and in terms of timing of services) onto a network of major employers, and a network of neighbourhoods where (low income) workers live.
- Working with transport providers is a necessary part of many existing support programmes. Encouraging provider’s co-operation may require incentives/cash injection until the transport service becomes self-funding (which it does appear to do in many cases in the US). It may also require employers to contribute to the cost of public transport or new transport networks.
- Developing formal mechanisms for identifying and matching employees with similar transport needs – for example, through car sharing.

Providing dedicated local transport or mobility managers to liaise between employees, employers and transport providers.

- Transport systems for workers may also need to consider transport to childcare providers. Solutions in the US have included providing childcare services near to public transport networks and providing transport from childcare providers to the place of work.

**Providing ‘round the clock’ transport services:**
- Providing 24 hour transport cover has been associated with higher job retention (although this has generally been alongside other types of in-work support). This suggests the need to work with employers to encourage them to adapt their working hours to match transport availability, and to consider the implications of demands for overtime, changes to working hours or extending shifts.

**Providing financial assistance for transport costs:**
- Providing financial support to assist with paying for the cost of transport to and from work may include:
  - linking transport support with retention/advancement incentives for employees (for example, car loan schemes where ownership transfers to the worker if a job is retained for a certain length of time);
  - providing financial assistance for running costs if employees have private transport (for example, fuel, insurance, repairs and maintenance);
  - the provision of van/car pools (either through a small contribution from employees, or subsidies by state/employer) to provide cheap and direct access to and from work.
Providing emergency cover

Providing emergency transport may encourage workers with caring responsibilities to work further away from home than they might otherwise consider. Several existing schemes (in the United States) use volunteer ‘on-call’ drivers or have arrangements with taxi companies to provide access to emergency transport to enable workers for workers.

This review uncovered a considerable number of in-work support programmes that provide access to financial assistance, including in-work benefits (for example, assistance with housing costs), loans and savings schemes. Earnings-related reasons for premature exits from work may result from low, and lower than anticipated, take home pay (Lewis et al., 2000), underestimating the ‘costs’ of being in work’, or employers not honouring their commitments (for example, with regard to pay reviews in the early weeks or months). Key issues emerging from the review relate to the importance of knowing in advance net earnings, accessing earnings supplements, the provision of emergency financial support and money management advice. Evidence suggests that there is a demand amongst low-income workers for such support and that it enables them to take and keep a job.

Earnings supplements

Earnings supplements do appear to facilitate job retention, particularly for lone parents (see for example, Ellwood, 1999; Michalopoulos et al., 1999). There is also some evidence to suggest that supplements lead to an earnings increase, but this is more likely to be associated with increased hours worked, rather than progression. There is little evidence, therefore, that they promote advancement. Evaluations of the Back to Work Allowance in Ireland, and the New Deal for 50+ evaluations here in the UK both suggest that some workers find it difficult to retain their job when the earnings supplement ends (DSCFA, 1997; Atkinson et al., 2001), suggesting insufficient progression (in terms of earnings at least) to enable self-sufficiency in employment. There are numerous other reasons why people leave work or find sustaining work difficult and extra income may not be sufficient in isolation; new workers may also require non-financial support to sustain employment.

Providing emergency financial support

New workers generally have little financial capital to ‘fall back’ on in times of need. Difficulties accessing mainstream credit facilities for many low-income workers (for example because of poor credit ratings or inflexible repayment terms) mean that having access to an alternative emergency fund can be critical. Providing emergency financial assistance (in the form of grants or low cost loans) has, qualitatively, been reported to improve retention. In the US the majority of demands for loans/
grants from ex-welfare recipients appears to be for transport (repairs to a car, for example), food, clothing, housing or childcare costs.

Some initiatives are encouraging new workers to save money (such as, by making deductions from wages into a savings account) which can be accessed for crisis purposes. Access to the funds may be linked to sustained periods in employment. Some US states match savings if the participant agrees to deposit a regular amount over a certain time period. Employers may also consider this option as a job retention strategy. Care must be taken, however, to ensure that direct deductions do not significantly reduce take-home pay, or aggravate financial stress.

**Money management advice**

A significant proportion of ex-welfare recipients may have concerns about managing their money once in work. Financial planning or money management skills (including budgeting advice and debt management etc) have been offered by many programmes, particularly in the United States (where some programmes make it a condition for accessing loans).

9.1.4 **Wage subsidies for employers**

Employers may be reluctant to recruit unemployed people, particularly if they have a poor employment history or repeated spells of unemployment (cp. Bunt et al, 2001). To encourage the recruitment of (long-term) unemployed people, several countries have programmes that offer financial incentives to employers. In the UK, the take-up of such incentives (such as wage subsidies) has however, generally been low (Snape, 1998; Kellard et al., 2001; Beinart, 1997). Other evidence suggests that up to half of employers retain new recruits after the subsidy to employers has ended (Kellard et al., 2001), mainly because of the employees’ personal characteristics rather than for firm business reasons. Additional review evidence suggests that alongside the provision of financial incentives, recruitment and retention of employees can be increased if:

- employers are committed to providing training or other support mechanisms for the employee. This commitment needs to be monitored (to minimise churning and displacement);
- employers are assisted (both financially and through advice) with workplace adaptations for disabled people (both new recruits and existing employees with an onset of disability).

9.1.5 **Retention incentives**

Some schemes promote the use of retention incentives, payable to the employee or the employer. Receipt of such incentives are linked to the length of time an individual stays in work. However, there are some concerns that such incentives may encourage an individual to stay in a job which has limited potential for skill development or progression.
Retention incentives for employees

In the US a number of schemes pay retention incentives to employees, typically for reaching three and six months in work (although not necessarily in the same job). Some offer cash incentives, others use vouchers or gifts. However, few have been evaluated and there is no evidence to suggest that they are any more (or less) effective as a retention strategy than other forms of financial assistance (such as access to emergency financial help).

Retention incentives for employers

There are also a number of schemes that pay retention incentives to employers who retain former welfare recipients. Such provision is often accompanied by advice on retention strategies and monitoring to ensure that the employer also provides some form of training or development for individuals. Again, there is little evaluative evidence to suggest that this is a particularly useful tool (certainly if used in isolation) for job retention, but may benefit some smaller employers.

9.1.6 Job coaching

Some employees may require more intensive practical assistance with particular aspects of their job. In a job coaching service, case managers or other designated professionals provide practical assistance to individuals with the tasks needed for their job. These services are most usually provided at the start of a job but in other programmes clients can 'buy' time from the trainer when necessary - an in-kind emergency support. The evidence suggests:

- providing such services requires good working relationships with employers to develop appropriate programmes;
- for people with severe disabilities job coaching is usually more intensive and consequently requires smaller caseloads;
- caution is advisable to ensure that coaching does not restrict integration into the workforce. Support should decrease gradually over time until the services are no longer required;
- job coaching can be a useful tool. However, it is often an integral part of larger, more comprehensive pre- and post-employment programmes. This makes isolating the effect of job coaching on job retention difficult, if not impossible.

9.1.7 Mentoring

In mentoring schemes the new employee is matched with a mentor to help them adjust to being in employment. When provided by employers, mentors are usually existing members of the workforce and help new employees’ transition into the company by ‘showing the ropes’, and introducing co-workers. Schemes provided by independent organisations usually use volunteers from outside the employee’s company, who then helps the individual with personal matters affecting and affected by the transition into employment. There is little systematic evidence of the
effectiveness or otherwise of mentoring on job retention, although the experience of employer-based programmes in the US indicates that these programmes can contribute to increased retention and lower absenteeism. Preliminary evidence suggests that consideration needs to be given to the significant life change required for new entrants to work (from unemployment), a change which may affect not only the individual but also their family or household. Some new employees have chosen not to accept a mentor because of concerns that it may place further demands on their time particularly if it requires significant contact outside of the workplace. A workplace-based mentor may therefore be more acceptable to employees. More research is needed to determine barriers to introducing mentoring schemes, given that they appear promising as a low cost but effective job retention tool.

Peer support groups have been developed in some welfare programmes to provide mutual support for new job entrants. Access to social networks has been identified as important in easing the transition into (sustained) employment (Trickey et al., 1998), particularly for lone parents. Peer support groups are used to share experiences, talk through problems and build workplace networks as well as providing a learning forum for issues related to moving into work (such as time management or conflict resolution). Evidence suggests that participants can find peer support groups useful particularly if the nature and purpose of the groups is defined by the participants.

It is also important to ensure that these support groups do not replace case management functions as this may impede building the relationship between the case manager and the client.

However, there is no substantial evidence of the impact of peer support groups on job retention.

Telephone helplines provide a contact for clients or employers when problems arise (such as childcare or transport, workplace disputes or absenteeism) that may affect the sustainability of employment. They are designed primarily to provide practical ‘remote’ assistance, rather than one-to-one support.

For employees

- Telephone helplines can be especially useful if case managers do not offer ‘round the clock’ support or are not available when an emergency arises.
- Helplines should anticipate the likely needs of callers. They must have the necessary language skills, access to emergency provisions and knowledge of the local services and benefits available.
- There is no evidence to suggest that they are successful (or otherwise) as a tool to enhance job retention.
For employers

- Helplines can provide advice and support to employers if problems arise with members of their workforce.
- They may also advise employers on availability of, and access to, benefits and incentives.
- They can be an important method for raising employer awareness of retention strategies, including 'best practice' and the (financial and other) benefits in hiring ex-welfare recipients.
- Again, there is no evidence to suggest that they have any impact on job retention.

9.1.10 Post-employment education and training

Post-employment education and training can be used to help employees develop in their current job, or advance to another job. Basic or job-specific skills are often provided by external organisations and funded by the public sector/or employers. There is little conclusive evidence of the impact on job retention. However, the experience of such programmes suggests:

- education and training programmes need to be developed to match the needs of both employers (to ensure continued funding and use) and employees (to ensure that the training is an effective use of their time and that they continue to participate);
- it needs to be flexible, fit in with work (and home) schedules and take into consideration the time constraints of working people. Courses are often best provided at the work site;
- cost of providing such training can be an inhibitor for some smaller employers but they can be encouraged with government financial support;
- the cost of training outside the workplace can be large for low-income employees. In order to encourage take-up, many workers require financial assistance – not just for the course itself but for related costs such as childcare, transport and materials;
- as with helplines, training for employers can assist them to develop suitable supervisor/managerial skills and company procedures to deal with new employees.

9.1.11 Advancement strategies

To date, there has been limited programme emphasis on employment advancement. This may be because effective job advancement strategies need to build on successful job retention policies, which are still in their infancy. The lack of family or social support can also inhibit advancement. For example, the Local Development Programme operating in Ireland found that lack of support from family and friends created a significant challenge for individuals attempting to sustain, and progress in, employment (Area Development Management Ltd, 2000).

Advancement strategies distinguish between ‘career ladder’ and ‘career guidance’ approaches.
Career ladders

Career ladders are formalised progression routes often in particular industrial or occupational sectors or between identified groups of employers. The experience to-date indicates that:

• progression through career ladders requires considerable investment, both in time and financially;
• schemes between employers working in similar industries have the potential of enhancing career move opportunities. Although relatively new, they appear to have some success although it is difficult to establish whether progression would still have occurred without this formalised approach.

Career guidance

Career guidance mechanisms are a fairly new development for entry-level workers, and provide information to employees about how to advance in employment. Their experience so far suggests that:

• the information and guidance they offer needs to be provided to employees at their convenience, often outside of the workplace;
• a proactive approach is needed since employees are unlikely to know how to progress without assistance, and are unlikely to know what career development or guidance is available;
• ‘good practice’ employers can be used to highlight opportunities for advancement, and how best to achieve this. Information should also be available on any incentives/benefits on offer, such as funds for training, tax credits or transitional benefits;
• Such services should be available to all employees so they are not seen as a stigmatised service.

9.2 Issues in the delivery of in-work support programmes

The previous Section (9.1) summarised the principal lessons from the different types of in-work support programmes reviewed in this report. In this Section some issues, which are considered central to the design of policy to promote job retention and advancement for low-income workers in the United Kingdom, are discussed, namely:

• Involving non-public employment services in the delivery of post-employment support (Section 9.2.1).
• Involving employers in post-employment services (Section 9.2.2).
• Co-ordinating post-employment services and support through case management (Section 9.2.3).
• Identifying and targeting clients for post-employment support (Section 9.2.4).
• The costs (and benefits) of in-work support programmes (Section 9.2.5).
9.2.1 Involving non-public employment service organisations in the delivery of post-employment support

Support services are usually provided through state or government channels (either central or local), who may contract out certain services to private, voluntary or community based organisations.

**The advantages of involving non public employment service organisations**

The initiatives reviewed in this report generally support the involvement of non-public employment service (non-PES) organisations in the provision of in-work support. There is some indication that participants can resent the continued involvement of government welfare organisations once they have moved into employment. Clients may feel that there is a stigma attached to continuing to receive public assistance; in some cases this has been reflected in a reluctance to let case managers contact employers (such as in the PESD programme: see Haimson and Hershey, 1997). Such concerns have meant that, in many cases, voluntary participation appears to be greater in programmes where non-public employment services are involved. For example, the GAPS programme, which used community-based organisations, served 600 participants from one county. This compared with 95 clients served in four counties under Iowa’s Post-Employment Pilot, where a mixture of Iowa Workforce Development staff and outside contractors were used (although the programmes also varied in other ways).

There may be substantial benefits to be gained from breaking the conceptual and factual link between pre-employment services, typically associated with benefit receipt and unemployment, and post-employment services for the employed in order to reduce the risk of stigma. However, evidence to support such a claim is anecdotal. For instance, one PESD site service provider found that, after changing its name and logo to disassociate itself from the welfare agency, participant involvement increased.

There is also support for using non-PES organisations that are neighbourhood or community-based. Having outlets in the neighbourhoods where clients live can enable face-to-face contact to occur on a more regular (or ad-hoc) basis. Local organisations are more likely to have knowledge of the other local services available and have developed good relationships with them. Project Match offices in Chicago, for example, are based at a health centre and a Head Start centre, which means easy access for referrals and for rapid response to clients. Neighbourhood-based services sometimes mean that programme recruitment is easier as they are within close proximity to clients and, if successful, word of mouth can spread rapidly.
The disadvantages of using non-public service organisations

There are, however, some disadvantages in using outside agencies for the delivery of post-employment services. One concern is that they will have less awareness of the issues that some client groups face, or limited knowledge of the administrative procedures of the welfare agency (for transitional in-work benefits, for example). This is particularly the case if the organisation has not had any pre-employment involvement with the clients. Furthermore, it can be argued that if government or welfare departments have successfully worked with clients to help them find work, then the clients are more likely to continue to be involved in receiving post-employment services from them. Qualitative findings from the New Deal for Lone Parents studies, for example, suggest that lone parents who build a positive 'pre-employment' relationship with their Personal Adviser are more likely to continue to receive support from them in work (Lewis et al., 2001).

A final possible challenge facing non-PES organisations involved in the provision of post-employment services is that it may be more difficult for such organisations to engage with employers (if required) than for government agencies to do so. From the employers' perspective, non-PES organisations may lack the experience necessary to understand and anticipate the implications for private business of employing (long-term) unemployed people, and to develop adequate responses and measures of support. While similar claims have in the past been made about public employment services, non-PES organisations may face the added disadvantage of lacking the authority that public organisations often have to intervene in matters of workplace practices. As a result, employers may feel less accountable to these organisations. They may also fear that non-PES organisations themselves lack clear structures of accountability internally and externally. This may raise concerns about the risk of engaging in business matters, which might be of a commercial, and hence potentially confidential, nature.

Recent research by Evans and Kazis (nd) indicates that the concerns of employers may be alleviated if, at the pre-employment stage, intermediary organisations develop two distinct roles: as advisers or advocates for job seekers, and as employment specialists for employers. A recent evaluation of Employment Zones in the UK (CPC, forthcoming) indicates that such a separation of roles may be crucial in gaining the support of employers, and ultimately placing clients in more sustainable jobs.

Despite such concerns, there is support for the involvement of non-public employment service organisations in the provision of other in-work support, particularly training. Increasingly, private and voluntary organisations are involved in the delivery of training for ex-welfare recipients. There is little evaluation evidence to suggest that their
outcomes are any better than state or government provision (for example, through colleges). However, organisations themselves believe that they are able to offer more flexibility and are more responsive to the needs of employers. Although their tailor-made training programmes may not necessarily lead to recognised qualifications, provider organisations such as Minnesota Pathways and Wildcat believe they match employers’ requirements better. Indeed, the ability to match training very closely to employers’ needs appears to be crucial to the success of its clients in work. The evaluation of the Annie E. Casey Foundation Jobs Initiatives, which uses a variety of private training organisations and colleges, may highlight what types of schemes work best (the project is due to end in 2003). However, success partially depends on the amounts of money invested, as well as employers’ involvement in the design.

The use of non-public employment services (such as voluntary or community organisations) to deliver in-work support programmes raises important questions about the regulation of this emerging sector and the monitoring of the quality and quantity of its services. US case studies provide examples of performance benchmarks that third-party providers have been set and of incentives that are paid when these benchmarks are met. However, these have not been independently evaluated. Should benchmarks be used to monitor third-party providers in the UK, this will require decisions as to the relative weight attached to individual benchmarks and the financial incentive or reward associated with achieving them.

Employers have a critical role in facilitating job retention, through the provision and promotion of in-work support strategies, as well as the nature and quality (financial and non-financial) of the jobs they offer. A key incentive for employers who participate in this process is the prospect of reducing staff turnover and, consequently, recruitment costs.

Employers may benefit from providing in-work support services

Earlier chapters in this report have highlighted the importance of transport and childcare in promoting job retention, but have noted that there are very few employers who provide any such assistance to newly placed ex-welfare employees. This is largely because employers are concerned about the costs of providing such services. Moreover, some employers are reluctant to provide such services solely to ex-welfare recipients on grounds of equity with other workers. Extending such provisions to all employers, however, might further increase the costs of provision.

Employers may nonetheless be encouraged to provide such services through financial incentives, and by promoting the longer term advantages to employers in providing such support. For example, the findings from the Welfare-to-Work Partnership employer studies (see Chapter 3) suggest
that providing childcare can have significant benefits for employers in the longer term, in terms of reduced turnover (hence lower recruitment and training costs), reduced absenteeism, and improved productivity.

**Improving workers’ soft skills is also important**

Whilst financial inducements may encourage some employers to recruit and retain ex-welfare recipients, the findings of this review suggest that improving welfare clients’ softer skills (for example, their job readiness) may act as a better recruitment and retention device. This is demonstrated by the relative successes of customised training programmes (for example, Wildcat, Lewisham College). Although employers are usually charged for such services, the benefits are that they receive job-ready staff with specific tailor-made training.

**Retention bonuses for employers**

The relatively small retention bonuses that are on offer to employers seem unlikely to make the difference for large companies, but may be of more benefit to smaller employers (although there is no substantial evidence to support this). Furthermore, it seems unlikely that an employer will retain an employee who is unsuitable (for whatever reason), regardless of whether or not they receive an incentive.

**Employers’ relationship with the case worker**

It is possible for governments to contribute to raising awareness amongst employers of the needs of new employees and the benefits and services available to employers and employees to assist job retention. However, involving employers in post-employment support can be difficult, and relies on the skill and experience of mediating organisations. Case managers may find it difficult to persuade employers to spend time with them, or to provide information about employees’ progress. Nevertheless, some case managers in welfare-to-work organisations have successfully involved employers particularly where they have had more contact over time and hence have built up a relationship with employers prior to placement.

In smaller companies without dedicated human resource personnel, the support available through case workers may be of considerable value. For example, the US Project Match programme found that although large employers with their own human resource teams were reluctant to have involvement with case managers, small companies without such support valued working closely with them. Other programmes that have successfully involved employers have welfare staff stationed at the worksite to enable closer working between the employee, the employer and the welfare organisation. For example, Oregon’s JOBS Plus programme has found that outstationing case managers at employers sites has emerged as a ‘best practice for improving retention’ (MDRC, 2001).
Proactive promotion of employment services

Some welfare organisations have ‘job developers’ or ‘job facilitators’ (for example, in Dublin and in Vocational Foundation Inc., New York). These are responsible for contacting employers and encouraging them to use their services when vacancies in their companies arise (local employer ‘account managers’ are also being introduced in the UK as part of the new Jobcentre Plus). This is done proactively, with the company as a business customer, through cold-calling, presentations or workshops to promote their services and their clients. Wildcat, for example, has been able to build on its successful reputation because its first customer, Salomon Smith Barney (an investment banking and securities brokerage firm), saw a substantial reduction in turnover rate (one-third less than for similar jobs), a more efficient recruitment and hiring process (because of the reduction in the number of candidates) and savings equivalent to $600,000 in temporary office service costs and tax credits.

There may be advantages in separating the roles of ‘case managers’ and ‘job developers’ because of the different skills required for the two jobs (see Section 9.2.1). As noted earlier, in a number of initiatives case managers were not properly equipped or trained to deal with the wide variety of roles that they were expected to undertake (for example, the Austrian Arbeitsassistenz and Iowa’s PEP), and often struggled to deliver an effective service because of excessively high caseload sizes.

Building relationships gradually over time

Maintaining and possibly increasing the co-operation of employers in the delivery of post-employment services may add to their quality and scale, as well as enhancing employers’ awareness of the needs of employees with interrupted work histories. The evidence available suggests that employers’ involvement may be best increased gradually, starting with pre-employment services providing (screening of) placement candidates, via low-level post-employment services (workplace introduction, induction) to higher-level services (job coaching, mentoring) that require the presence of service providers at the workplace.

Effective support through mentoring

There is a growing body of evidence to support the use of mentoring for new or entry level employees to assist them in adapting to the workplace environment. The best approach to mentoring appears to be where the mentor is an existing established employee, of equivalent status. Mentoring is a relatively low cost support mechanism, and as well as benefitting the new entrant, can also be rewarding for the mentor. There is little evidence to suggest that a mentor from outside of the workplace is as effective. A possible exception is mentoring for disabled people, who may benefit from a mentor to accompany them prior to job entry, and who then
works intensively alongside them in the early stages of work, assisting both the mentee and the employer in making the necessary adjustments to enable the new entrant to remain in the job.

9.2.3 Co-ordinating in-work services and support: case management

In-work support requires multiple services

In-work support provision may centre around a specific intervention (for example, transport), or may provide multiple services. However, in reality very few post-employment services have a single focus. The diverse support needs of clients is such that single-focused services may be insufficient to fully facilitate clients’ re-integration process into work. As pre-employment services become more successful and/or the client population changes, pressures on post-employment services are also likely to increase and single-focus services may be difficult to sustain. For instance, sites in the Bridges to Work demonstration were forced to include job-readiness training prior to transport provision and retention services because it was found that clients were increasingly ‘harder-to-employ’ and needed special preparatory training. Although providing financial assistance to ‘make work pay’ can increase retention, certainly for as long as these incentives remain in place, the effectiveness is increased if additional non-financial support is provided. This may be particularly the case for those who have been some distance from the labour market, or those who are ‘hard to place’ for other reasons.

The case worker as a broker of services

The provision of post-employment support is usually delivered through a case management approach, whereby ‘case workers’ have a portfolio or ‘caseload’ of clients with whom they work. One of the central aims of a case management approach is for the case worker to work on a one-to-one basis with the clients. This enables them to develop knowledge of the client’s circumstances and needs, and to assemble a tailor-made package of support and advice. Case management provision varies in intensity, ranging from weekly or monthly contact (through both face to face and telephone contacts) to 24 hours a day/7 days a week access. The latter type is usually provided for those with significant and multiple difficulties, or where the case worker works with the family as a whole, rather than only the individual new employee. The majority of programmes in this review place time-limits on access to case worker support (primarily due to resource constraints), but often demand for such services has required programmes to extend provision – in some cases this has been for up to five years.

The take up of voluntary case worker services has generally been low, but the experience of those that have used case worker-led services has been positive, and demand for contact with case workers often exceeds that typically available). However, experimental programmes have reported only small (but significant) effects on retention. Programmes evaluated using methods other than random control designs have reported increased retention over time (by comparing annual waves of participants).
However, it is difficult to establish how far this is solely attributable to the case worker role.

One reason for low take-up is reluctance of clients to have a continued association with a (government) welfare service. This may suggest the need for third party involvement, for example, through voluntary, community or private organisations, or possibly a separate government agency, specifically and solely providing a ‘job transition’ service.

A number of key lessons for the delivery of case management have emerged from this review. These relate to:

- access to case worker services;
- the provision of pre- and post-employment support;
- the intensity of support;
- the duration of support;
- caseload size;
- the type of advice and support provided;
- providing emergency support; and
- referrals to specialist services.

Each are discussed in turn below.

**Access to case worker services**

It is important for clients to be able to contact case workers outside of work, particularly if they are reluctant for employers to know of their past involvement with a welfare agency. Case worker services need to be voluntary, but promoted widely and proactively.

**The provision of pre and post-employment support**

There are arguments for and against the same case manager being used for both pre- and post-employment services. Case managers who work with participants both pre- and post-employment may have more time to build their relationship, and to encourage clients to continue to use their services post-employment. Case managers who work with clients pre and post employment may also be more aware of the barriers that their clients face on moving into work. In addition it becomes more difficult for clients to ‘slip through the cracks’ as there is continuity of provision.

However, employment retention services can be quite different to placement services and therefore post-employment case managers may need different knowledge and skills. In addition, if the programme remains tied to the welfare agency, it may mean that clients will be less willing to be involved (because of stigma). In recognition of this, many programmes include pre- and post-employment services, but have different staff to
deliver them. If services are to be offered by different individuals and/or agencies, it is necessary to have an overlap in provision, to ensure that relationships are developed (through knowledge, confidence and trust), and that there are no service gaps, particularly at the most critical transition stages.

A strong long-term relationship of trust between clients and case managers can significantly contribute to a programme’s success. There is therefore an argument in favour of retaining a link between pre- and post-employment services, and retaining the same case worker throughout both support phases. As already noted, however, extending contact between clients and case workers over different support phases will almost inevitably add to the already significant demands on case workers’ skills and expertise. It is also likely to increase case workers’ training needs and reduce their capacity to manage large caseloads. Issues of caseload size, of service range and of the duration of support, therefore, ought not to be seen in isolation, but as interwoven.

**The intensity of post-employment support**

Help in the early weeks and months of employment is crucial to new workers to ensure that all supports are in place and any initial problems that might be encountered in and out of the workplace are resolved as early as possible. After this, support is usually provided through once-a-month contact. In the four GAPS programmes, clients who were contacted by case managers the most regularly were the most satisfied with the programme. However, the most successful service provider (in terms of sustainable employment) in the GAPS and other programmes, such as Project Match, employed a two-way system of communication, whereby clients could contact them when necessary rather than waiting for a scheduled appointment. Although in the GAPS programme this meant fewer contacts overall, case managers spent more time with the client at each contact.

**The duration of post-employment support**

In the programmes reviewed in this report, the length of time for which support was provided varied considerably. In the GAPS programme most case managers felt that a year of support was long enough, but that programmes should allow clients to continue to contact the programme if emergencies arise. However, in three of the PESD sites up to half of clients still required services after one year. The needs of early clients led Project Match to commit to support clients for between three and five years. In the Steps to Career Success programme in Pierce County Washington, clients’ needs for services remained high for much longer than anticipated and continued to occur intermittently throughout the programme (which lasted for two and a half years, from 1992). These findings suggest that the duration of support demanded by clients is far greater than many programmes provide.
**Caseload size**

Caseload size depends on the type and range of services provided, the intensity of such services, and the demands of the client group served. The quality and intensity of case management may suffer if caseload sizes are too large for individual case workers to manage them effectively. In the case worker approach of the Job Facilitators (part of the Back To Work Allowance in Ireland), average caseload sizes of 330 were found to be far too high to provide any effective post employment services (either to clients or to employers). Caseloads of between 100 and 170 for PESD case managers were also found to be too high to enable them to provide an effective service. In Project Match, case managers support 75 clients (pre- and post-employment) at any one time, which allows for peaks and falls in clients demands as they progress through employment, with only a small portion of the clients requiring intensive services at any one time (usually in the first year, and at transition points). Clients with specific and severe barriers to job placement and retention may require even more intensive support. For example, one programme that worked specifically with people with disabilities had a caseload limited to around 20 clients (Arbeitsassistenz in Austria).

Large caseloads reduce the scope for intensive help. Where services successively build upon one another, those that are to be provided at the later stages of a support programme may be neglected, as may be the case when pre- and post-employment services are combined. This was shown to be the case in the UK, where the low take-up of New Deal in-work support services was attributed to insufficient resources, as a result of which Personal Advisers were not able to proactively pursue or promote the provision of in-work support (Millar, 2000).

Maintaining and enhancing expertise and, therefore, the training of case workers also become important issues. As demands on the skills and expertise of case workers increase, this may require reductions in the caseload that case workers are expected to handle or may call for the greater use of case worker teams, as is now happening in Norway’s Arbeid med Bistand programme for disabled jobseekers.

**The type of advice and support provided**

The counselling, support and encouragement role that the case worker provides has consistently been cited by clients as the most important in-work support service they receive. However, in isolation, these services have not been proven to significantly enhance retention rates. Although very few in-work support demonstrations have been successful as a whole, the evaluations have suggested that parts of each programme point towards additional services that may improve results, such as referrals to specialist services, access to transitional benefits and emergency financial assistance.
Case worker roles therefore need to be flexible in the kind of support they provide, as clients’ needs or circumstances change. There is evidence to support separating help with financial services (such as accessing appropriate in-work benefits) from other types of help (such as developing soft skills or workplace adjustment). Resolving financial difficulties in the early weeks in work (for example by ensuring that benefits or tax credits are paid speedily and accurately) could arguably be done by someone working on behalf of a client in work (such as a specialist advocacy worker). This would increase the capacity of case workers to assist the client with other needs.

The first job is not necessarily the right job (hence the concern about using retention incentives, noted earlier). It is likely to be at entry level and may offer limited opportunity for progression. The case worker role could include helping people to move on in work, to make successful transitions into better jobs. Whilst continuing to provide support for new entrants to the labour market, they may also encourage them to make further transitions to ‘better’ jobs once they have established a secure foothold in the world of work. This suggests that access to support be provided for much longer than is currently the case in many initiatives. However, this kind of support may not need to be as resource intensive as in the early stages of entry to work. It could be an organisational, team or agency function, who can advise on career advancement strategies and planning, and accessing training or education (see career guidance).

Providing emergency support

As shown in Part II, many programmes are providing emergency financial assistance, with the recognition that access to additional money at times of emergency can make the difference between participants remaining in or leaving employment. Being able to cope with emergencies, and receiving the necessary support to do so, is vital to clients whose new employment is often precarious, and who are still adjusting to the change in activity. If a client believes that a case manager can help, they are more likely to contact them in a crisis, which increases their use of the service. The most successful GAPS programme was, among other differences, the one which provided emergency financial assistance to clients, which was also the case in the Community Solutions programme.

Referrals to specialist services

Ensuring that participants have access to all the in-work benefits to which they are entitled often provides essential extra capital and support to assist the successful transition to, and continued success in remaining in, employment. This means ensuring that clients are aware of such benefits, as well as helping them gain access to them, giving assistance filling out the forms required and following up outstanding payments. This is not only necessary at the start of employment, but also when changes in
employment status and/or earnings occur. However, dealing with benefit matters, particularly with any miscalculations by benefit processors (a reportedly frequent problem) has been shown to consume a large amount of case managers’ time and therefore there may be a case for passing this function on to another, specialist, service provider. This would also ensure that case managers are not involved in any benefit-related problems which may undermine the trusting relationship that they are working to create with their client.

Referrals to the necessary support services (such as childcare and transportation, housing, substance abuse treatment and health care) are vital services for many welfare recipients entering work. Schemes working with those with particular difficulties or barriers (for example, ex-offenders or disabled people) require considerably more intensive case management, with very small caseload sizes. Specialist case workers can be trained to deal with specific client groups and associated issues. The majority of these ‘special’ client groups are more likely to require job readiness training and other support prior to employment.

In summary, therefore, combined with additional services, a number of factors appear to be associated with successful caseworking, including:

- building a long-term relationship with a client;
- working with small case loads;
- providing sufficient resources, training and support for case-workers;
- having detailed local knowledge (for example, knowledge of the provisions available, transport networks, local labour market);
- widening support to extend beyond work issues (for example, parenting skills).

In the majority of privately led welfare to work initiatives, post-employment support is offered (if not always taken up) to all those that have been through their programme. In state-led initiatives, however, this is not always been the case.

**Targeting support services may reduce costs**

There are arguments for and against targeting post-employment services to those that appear to need it most. Targeting services to those most in need reduces costs, and may ensure the most effective use of (limited) resources. The PESD sites did not target support and found that a considerable amount of case manager time was spent trying to contact individuals that clearly did not want or need such support (although arguably some may have benefited from such services).
Identifying and targeting those most in need is difficult, and costly

However, there is some evidence to suggest that those hardest-to-employ or those with the most barriers to employment are more likely to use the services. These are typically clients with multiple barriers to job entry and retention. In Iowa’s PEP programme, for example, those participating were the more likely to have severe barriers to employment and this led the evaluators to suggest that programme resources might be more effectively targeted on the hard-to-employ. However, it was recognised that this could introduce case manager subjectivity and lead to clients questioning why they are receiving different levels of support to their peers. In addition, it can be extremely difficult to make an early identification of all the barriers that clients may face, particularly those that can be hidden (for example, substance abuse, criminal records or difficult family circumstances). In the Project Match programme, for example, counsellors dealt with the easily identifiable barriers at the outset, such as childcare and transportation, waiting for the relationship between themselves and the client to develop before they detected, or their client revealed, barriers to sustained employment. This can be seen as a form of self-identification of need, as problems are revealed to the case manager when trust is built up. Again, this points to the central importance of the case worker and client relationship.

It also appears that some particular client groups appear less able and/or willing to come forward to ask for assistance. In a number of projects, analysis has found that those of ethnic minorities (for example, Hispanics in the PESD and Asians in the Seattle Jobs Initiative) were less likely to come forward to receive support. This may be because of different cultural values (for example, on self-sufficiency) as well as language difficulties. (This was not the case in the GAPS programme where participants had similar demographic characteristics to the overall TANF population.)

Targeting may also be stigmatising

Targeting post-employment support on some a priori category may also lead to concerns about stigmatisation. In recognition of this, a few programmes (for example Salem’s Up With Wages initiative) have widened access to all employees at the worksites at which their case managers are based. However, the ‘self-identification of need’ approach may be insufficient in isolation in encouraging those with significant needs to take up services. The PESD case managers found that, through perseverance, some of those who were initially reluctant to be involved in support interventions did take up some services upon realisation of the support that case managers could offer.
Mandatory participation can be problematic and resource intensive

Discussions about the identification of clients who may require targeting of services raises the question as to whether participation in in-work support programmes should be mandatory or voluntary. The evidence suggests that there is little to be gained from implementing a mandatory programme. Although it may make recruitment easier, the processes required to measure compliance and respond to non-compliance make it more administratively burdensome for the case managers (as found in the PESD and PEP). Also, as already noted, some clients are unhappy about the welfare agency being involved once they have moved into employment. Making participation mandatory may also adversely affect the development of a trusting supportive relationship between client and case manager, already identified as critical. It may only be feasible in such cases where the programme administrators have some kind of leverage or right of sanctioning non-participants. This again might have adverse effects on participants’ commitment, might encourage pre-emptive exit from, for instance, benefit receipt to unknown (non-employment) destinations, and might in fact further the stigmatisation of programme participation.

The review did not find any evidence for the success, or otherwise, of this strategy, although mandatory participation is currently underway in Virginia through six months of case management, with both face to face and telephone contacts.

Closely matched services may be more effective than targeting

It appears that if the services on offer (and its delivery) match the needs of the clients, then enforcing participation would not be necessary, and may be counter-effective. Also, as suggested above, it would appear best that clients are not given a ‘now or never’ entry requirement as this may disengage clients that may well need and want services at a later date.

9.2.5 The costs (and benefits) of in-work support programmes

Costs reflect the scale and intensiveness of support

The cost of in-work support programmes can vary immensely, but usually reflect the scale and intensity of the support as well as the number and degree of job retention barriers faced by clients. Around-the-clock support service, services that facilitate instant access to case/support workers (for example, by providing portable electronic means of contact such as pagers or mobile telephones) may be particularly costly to run, as are services that aim to be pro-active, promoting their role to employers and employees through direct approaches. At the other end of the cost scale are largely reactive programmes, such as telephone helplines.
A balanced approach to participation is required

Programmes that use direct and pro-active strategies to involve employers and employees have been shown, in the US at least, to increase programme participation. However, they may not equally increase service outcomes, of which job retention rates are arguably the most important ones, once participation is accounted for. The review has encountered no comparative cost-benefit evaluation of different service approaches, which isolates the effects of individual service elements – an intrinsically difficult task. The available evidence, nevertheless, suggests that a very low-key approach yields few results and probably fails to reach the most critical cases in need of support. Very high-intensity services risk dispensing large volumes of resources on tracing and tracking (potential) clients, many of whom may in fact not require any services. High-intensity services may also increase demand and possibly stretch available resources. Both decrease cost-effectiveness.

Post-employment services in the US benefit from the voluntary involvement of employers and employer consortia, which provide or buy-in post-employment support services, including more costly services, such as childcare and transport. They thus contribute to reducing the cost of programmes to state governments. Greater involvement of the private sector in providing such services independently may also be an option in the UK.

9.2.6 Issues for future research

This review has provided substantive background information on the range and scale of post-employment services internationally. In doing so, the review has also raised new questions, several of which were specifically addressed in the preceding sections of this chapter. The dearth of high-quality, reliable empirical evidence of the effectiveness of post-employment services warrants further monitoring of progress in research and evaluation in this field. In the meantime, more research, detailed study and reflection is required to provide clearer guidance on the design, implementation and management of post-employment services.

With respect to design, the critical issues include determining whether post-employment services should be separated from pre-employment services, or not. In addition, there seems to be no agreement as yet how long post-employment services should last and whether there may be an ‘optimum programme length’.

In order to facilitate the implementation of post-employment programmes, further investigation may be required into the most effective delivery of post-employment support services through third-party organisations and the question how this sector should be regulated or incentivised. Could decentralised, neighbourhood-based delivery services be implemented so to increase the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of post-employment services, especially of the high-intensity kind? Research may also look
more closely at means to increasing the active involvement of employers in the provision of post-employment services.

Finally, management issues surrounding the provision of post-employment services include the scope for case worker teams to deliver these services, possibly in conjunction with pre-employment services, and what facilities need to be put into place to train case workers.
In this scheme AFDC recipients and applicants who were randomly assigned to the programme were eligible for the following financial incentives:

- welfare until their income reached 140 per cent of the poverty line (in AFDC there were sharp reductions in benefits as earnings increased).
- childcare subsidies paid directly to the provider whilst recipients worked and received welfare (under AFDC childcare payments were reimbursed through the AFDC grant).

In the Full MFIP programme long-term welfare recipients (receiving welfare for 24 months out of the past 36 for single parents and six out of the last 12 for two-parent families) had to participate in employment and training activities.

A second programme the Incentives Only programme was created to disentangle the effects of the incentives and the employment and training activities. Long-term single parent recipients could also be randomly assigned this programme (two-parent families were not included in this experiment), in which they did not face the employment and training activities requirement, but did receive the incentives.

A.1.2 Data collection instruments

1 Baseline Characteristics Data completed by all sample members prior to being randomly assigned to cover demographic information. This was collected for 98.6 per cent of the research sample.

2 Administrative data (unemployment insurance and public assistance benefits records) were collected for all those eligible to receive MFIP or AFDC. The length of time for which data was available from these records varied between the urban and rural counties because of the time in which random assignment was completed. Whilst 11 quarters of data were available for all urban sample members, only nine quarters of follow-up information were available for rural sample members.

3 A survey using a subset of the full sample was undertaken to collect data on other aspects of family well-being, plus additional employment information. Families with children aged between two and nine were also asked about their child’s well-being and other family circumstances. Of a survey-eligible pool of 4586, 3720 responded; a response rate of 81 per cent (80 per cent of single parents and 83 per cent of two-parent families). The evaluation used the responses of 3245 (presumably as not all were eligible for MFIP or AFDC, although this is not clear). Analysis by the evaluators found that the survey response sample is reliably representative of the full sample. Response rates were similar.
across the research groups (that is, split by single and two-parent families, urban and rural residents and long-term recipients and recent applicants). Comparing the administrative records impacts (employment, earnings and public assistance receipt) for the respondent sample and the full sample there were consistent outcomes. Among those responding to the survey there were a few significant differences by research group status and these were accounted for by ‘standard regression adjustments’.

A.1.3 Stage of random assignment

The programme began in April 1994. Recipients and applicants for public assistance between April 1994 and March 1996 completed the Baseline Information Form and were then randomly assigned to either the MFIP group (Full MFIP), the MFIP Incentives Only Group or the AFDC group (control group) after which their eligibility for MFIP or AFDC was determined. In the three urban counties, only a proportion of the caseload was included in the random assignment process because not all the urban caseload was needed to attain the sample sizes required for the random assignment evaluation design. In the rural counties however, the whole caseload was randomly assigned to gain the necessary numbers. Therefore rural counties were over-represented and were weighted down when impacts for both areas were combined.

A.1.4 Received treatment

The proportion that received treatment was measured as the proportion of the Full MFIP group assigned to receive treatment that ever (in the three years follow-up) participated in any employment or training activity.

Table A.1 Proportion of the full MFIP group participated in employment or training related activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th></th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(impact)</td>
<td>(80.3)</td>
<td>(74.9)</td>
<td>(79.6)</td>
<td>(61.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19.7*** )</td>
<td>(16.4** )</td>
<td>(19.4*** )</td>
<td>(1.5)</td>
<td>(4.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in two parent families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(impact)</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>N/a</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ( ) percentage point difference from AFDC; *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.1

A.1.5 Impacts measured

Several impacts were measured for each of the research groups comparing MFIP and AFDC, and, where valid, MFIP Incentives Only using mean differences. These were:

- participation in employment and training activities;
- average quarterly employment rates;
- average quarterly earnings;
- average quarterly welfare receipt rate;
- average quarterly benefits ($);
• average quarterly rate of welfare being only source of income;
• average quarterly income from welfare and earnings;
• income from welfare and earnings with estimated tax and EIC benefits;
• marital status;
• earnings growth;
• hours per week worked in current or most recent job;
• hourly wage in current or most recent job;
• employer provided benefits in current or most recent job;
• income and poverty in last three-quarters;
• income and poverty in last three-quarters with estimated taxes and EIC benefits;
• income sources;
• material hardship;
• health insurance coverage;
• residence and residential moves;
• average quarterly employment rates and earnings in year three by education level, prior employment, prior welfare receipt and housing status (for long-term urban single parents only).

Selected impacts of the Full MFIP group include the following:

Table A.2 Quarterly average impacts of urban, single parent full MFIP recipients compared to AFDC recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarterly average during first 10 quarters</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control Group Mean</td>
<td>Difference (Impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment rate (%)</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>12.9***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings ($)</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>176***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare receipt (%)</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>4.7***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare only source of income</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>-11.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from welfare and earnings ($)</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>352***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.1
### Table A.3 Impacts of full MFIP for long-term urban single parent recipients compared to AFDC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact (difference between MFIP and AFDC)</th>
<th>Control Group Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recipients who went to work in first 12 months and stayed employed for more than 12 months</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of recipients who got jobs after a short employment spell (less than 12 months)</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly employment rate by education level:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- at least high school degree</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- no high school degree</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly employment rate by prior employment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- did not work in year prior to random assignment</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- did work in year prior to random assignment</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly employment rate by prior welfare receipt:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- five or more years</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- less than five years</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly employment status by housing status:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- public/subsidised housing</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- private or other housing</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: *** * p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.1

### Table A.4 Full MFIP impact for two-parent families compared to AFDC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly average during first 10 quarters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment rate (%)</td>
<td>Control Group Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings ($)</td>
<td>2682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare receipts (%)</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare only source of income</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from welfare and earnings ($)</td>
<td>3769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female recipients who went to work in first 12 months and stayed employed for more than 12 months</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: *** * p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.1

#### A.1.6 MFIP incentives only

The comparison of MFIP and MFIP Incentives Only allows a comparison of two different schemes treated under exactly the same conditions. The differences reveal that including employment and training related activities with a wage supplement scheme improves employment outcomes compared with simply offering financial incentives.
In the three years of follow-up Full MFIP recipients were between six and ten percentage points more likely to be employed than those receiving MFIP Incentives Only (p < 0.01). Full MFIP recipients were also more likely to be employed for more quarters, for example they were five percentage points more likely to be employed for nine to 11 quarters (p < 0.05). They also had higher average quarterly earnings in each year ($113 to $266 higher) and lower welfare receipt.

Any adult in the target areas (two zip [postal] codes) whose income was below 150 per cent of the federal poverty level and who worked at least 30 hours per week, or who was willing to find work of 30 hours per week, could apply for New Hope. They were then randomly assigned to the control or programme group. If assigned to the programme group and working 30 hours a week, or when they found work of 30 hours per week (which they were assisted in doing by New Hope staff) participants received:

- an earnings supplement which raised their income to the poverty level and reduced the proportion of each additional dollar earned that was lost to taxes or reduced benefits;
- affordable health insurance if the participant did not already have access to such provision through an employer or government-provided health plan;
- childcare subsidies – paying ‘most’ of the expenses incurred – for parents of children aged 13 or less for the licensed childcare arrangements parents found.

Those willing, but unable, to find work of 30 hours per week could undertake Community Service Jobs (CSJ)— wage-paying positions with local non-profit organisations for which participants had to apply. Each of the CSJs was limited to six months, but they could be undertaken for a total of 12 months.

A.2 Milwaukee’s New Hope Demonstration (US)
A.2.1 The programme

A.2.2 Data collection instruments

1 Administrative data (unemployment records and AFDC, Food Stamp and Medicaid data) were used for the 1357 applicants to the programme.

2 Two-year follow-up survey to cover: employment histories; job characteristics; additional income sources; material hardship; health care access; feelings about their financial situation, job security and, for programme group members, experiences with the programme. All programme and control group members were approached for this survey. Non-response because they could not be found or refused to participate left a sample of 1086.

3 Child and Family Survey expanded the follow-up survey and was targeted at 745 adults with children. It was completed by 591. It included age-appropriate modules for respondents’ children giving a sample of 927 children. In addition, if children were at school their teachers were sent a questionnaire with scales measuring behaviour and performance in school. The sample for this questionnaire was 420 children.
New Hope management information system data for programme group members were added to the administrative data. These included details of participation in the programme, use of programme benefits and earnings from CSJs. Also used to estimate programme costs.

The summary reports available did not address issues of non-response to the surveys.

**A.2.3 Stage of random assignment**

Random assignment took place at the start of the project in August 1994 and continued until December 1995. Participants could receive New Hope benefits for three years from the date they become part of the demonstration.

**A.2.4 Proportion of eligible population that enrolled**

This information was not explicit in the summary report available. However, it can be assumed to be lower than expected as recruitment was more challenging than anticipated by staff. There was a sustained promotional campaign over many months, and expansion of the original target neighbourhoods. Even directly after the recruitment campaign, 86 per cent of eligible residents reported that they knew nothing about New Hope. Among the difficulties encountered were: “the constraint imposed by geographic targeting to two relatively small areas that could not be described easily; the resulting inefficiency of using many outreach tools such as newspapers, television, and radio that served the entire metropolitan area; residents’ unfamiliarity with New Hope; people ‘tuning out’ new messages because of information overload; and the possible negative effects on word-of-mouth recruiting and willingness to enrol created by the research requirements, including the random assignment process. Once contact was made, some people had trouble understanding or believing the New Hope offer; the arbitrary feel of the geographic restrictions, the unfamiliarity of the package of New Hope benefits, the complexity of the earnings supplements and co-payment requirements, and the ‘too good to be true’ nature of the offer all had to be overcome.”

Of those who attended the New Hope orientations and were eligible for the New Hope offer, ‘most’ (unspecified) applied for the programme. No analysis was presented of those who did not apply after attending orientation, but it was reported that ‘The research sample appears representative of the eligible residents in the target neighbourhoods’.

**A.2.5 Received treatment**

Of those assigned to the New Hope programme group, 79.2 per cent received at least one programme benefit:

- 78.0 per cent received at least one earnings supplement;
- 47.6 per cent used the health plan;
- 27.9 per cent used the childcare assistance; and
- 32.0 per cent worked in a CSJ.

However, few received such benefits every month of the two-year follow-up. Those who received any financial benefit did so for an average of 10.8 months of the possible 24.
Dividing the groups between those employed and not employed full-time at random assignment, the impacts measured for the programme group compared to the control group were:

- rates of employment;
- number of quarters employed;
- earnings;
- total hours worked;
- number of months with weekly hours: below 30; above 40; above 50;
- hourly wage of last job;
- job benefits (paid sick days; paid vacation; health plan/insurance; pension);
- number of months receiving AFDC;
- amount of AFDC received;
- number of months receiving Food Stamps;
- amount of Food Stamps received;
- sources of income in years one and two;
- poverty;
- housing problems;
- stress and worries;
- satisfaction with standard of living;
- parenting;
- child’s perception of parent–child relations;
- children in care or other programmes (by gender);
- school achievement; school behaviour; educational expectations; occupational expectations (by gender).

Selected impacts presented below.
Table A.5 Employment and earnings impacts of New Hope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employed Full-time at Random Assignment</th>
<th>Not Employed Full-time at Random Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Group</td>
<td>Control Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever employed (%)</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both years</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never employed (%)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of quarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both years</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>10,277</td>
<td>10,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>10,662</td>
<td>11,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both years</td>
<td>20,889</td>
<td>22,030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p< 0.1

Not highlighted specifically as a programme component, New Hope participants received ‘frequent’ (unspecified) contact with project reps who provided advice assistance and emotional support. The report states that ‘these services were particularly valuable to participants who were employed full-time at random assignment and were less likely to find case management in other venues’.

Table A.6 Impact of social support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employed Full-time at Random Assignment</th>
<th>Not Employed Full-time at Random Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Group</td>
<td>Control Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received practical</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advice/assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received emotional</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support/counselling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p< 0.1
A final report is due in 2002 to report on five-year follow-up results.

In the Self Sufficiency Project (SSP) single parents in the Canadian provinces of British Columbia and New Brunswick who had been on Income Assistance for at least one year were randomly selected (from IA rolls) to participate in the project. If they agreed to participate they were randomly assigned to a programme or control group. The programme group had one year from being randomly assigned to find full-time work (if they were not already working) of at least 30 hours per week and to stop receiving IA. If the recipient did not sign up in this period, she could never receive the supplement.

The level of the supplement was the difference between the participant’s earnings and an earnings benchmark. (In the first year this was $30,000 in New Brunswick and $37,000 in British Columbia. These levels were adjusted over time to reflect changes in the cost of living and the levels of IA.) The supplement was reduced by 50 cents for every additional dollar earned.

Participants could not receive IA whilst in receipt of the supplement, however, participation in the supplement programme was not mandatory. Participants could return to IA (as long as they gave up receipt of the supplement and met the eligibility requirements) at any time, and equally could return to the supplement programme within the three years of eligibility.

A Baseline Survey was conducted on all sample members just before random assignment. It collected demographic, family and employment information.

Follow-up surveys at approximately 18 and 36 months after random assignment were completed by most sample members.

Administrative data sources provided monthly IA and SSP supplement payment information.

Of the 5685 that completed the baseline survey and were randomly assigned, 4961 completed the 36-month follow-up survey – a response rate of 87 per cent (approximately five per cent lower than the 18-month survey response rate). In the 36-month survey differences between programme and control group members were small and statistically insignificant. In the baseline survey sample there were ‘sporadic differences’ that were reported to be ‘infrequent enough and small enough … (to be) … very likely due to chance’. The differences between programme and control groups were the same in the baseline and the 36-month survey sample, with only one exception. Therefore ‘36-month respondents in the programme group appear to be similar to respondents in the control group, and there is little reason to think that the impacts presented in the report because of different response rates for the two research groups’.
The impacts from the baseline data and 36-month survey sample were also compared for: receipt of IA, receipt of IA or SSP supplement, IA payments and total payments from IA and SSP. This was to determine any non-response bias in the 36-month survey. The evaluation found that whilst ‘the 36-month report sample overstates the program’s impacts on IA alone, it provides accurate impacts on receipt of IA or the SSP supplement, as well as payments from IA and supplement. Thus, the implications of the 36-month report sample on overall government spending appear to be fairly accurate’.

A group of approximately 6000 single parents in the two provinces who had been on IA for at least a year were selected at random from the IA rolls, between November 1992 and March 1995. Of recipients who were randomly selected and agreed to be part of the study, 2880 became the programme group and 2849 the control group.

In total 35 per cent had received the supplement at some point during the first year.

Supplement receipt increased quickly throughout the months of the first year after random assignment, peaking at approximately 25 per cent towards the beginning of the second year. From months 15 to 36 the proportion receiving the supplement declined gradually to just below 20 per cent.

Two main reasons were identified for relatively low uptake of the supplement: about 40 per cent who never received the supplement reported that they were unable to find a full-time job within the year and approximately 30 per cent had physical or family problems that limited their ability to work.

A.3.3 Stage of random assignment

A.3.4 Received treatment

A.3.5 Impacts measured

- Percentage employed full-time.
- Percentage receiving IA.
- Percentage receiving IA or SSP.
- Monthly full-time/part-time employment rate.
- Average earnings.
- Monthly rate of IA receipt.
- Average IA payments.
- Monthly rate of receipt of IA or SSP.
- Average payments from IA and SSP.
- Hourly wage rate.
- Hours worked per week.
- Sources of individual and family income.
- Projected taxes and net transfer payments.
- Family expenditures.
- Hardship.
• Savings.
• Debt.
• Childcare type/extent/stability/expenditure/use of.
• Length of first spell of full-time employment.
• Stability of full-time employment.
• Months employed full-time.
• Percentage remaining employed full-time of those employed full or part-time or not at all at random assignment.
• Distribution of wage growth between end of year one and end of year three.
• Attitudes towards welfare, work and self-efficacy.

Subgroup impacts compared:
• marital status/cohabitation by:
  - age;
  - age of youngest child;
  - employment status at random assignment;
  - enrolled in education/training at random assignment;
  - marital status;
  - number of children;
• supplement receipt rate, number of months of full-time employment and cumulative income by:
  - age of youngest child at random assignment;
  - high school diploma/equivalent or not;
  - employment status at random assignment;
  - IA receipt over past three years;
  - reported limiting physical condition.

The evaluation also included a non-experimental investigation of wage growth comparing the programme and control group. The investigation:
• inferred the baseline characteristics of people who went to work because of the supplement offer;
• calculated and compared wages of supplement responders over time to indicate how much wage growth they experienced.
Selected impacts:

**Table A.7  SSP impacts on employment, earnings and income assistance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Programme group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Difference (impact)</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly full-time employment rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>6.6***</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>12.7***</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>9.6***</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly part-time employment rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>-2.3***</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>-3.0***</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>-2.4***</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average earnings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>2793</td>
<td>2208</td>
<td>584***</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>4451</td>
<td>3198</td>
<td>1254***</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>4717</td>
<td>3852</td>
<td>865***</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly rate of IA receipt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>-6.3***</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>-12.9***</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>-9.4***</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.1
### Table A.8  SSP impacts on employment stability and months of full-time employment in first three years after random assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Programme group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Difference (impact)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First spell of full-time employment (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time in month 1 to 18</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>15.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First spell lasted 1 to 12 months a</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>4.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First spell lasted 13 or more months</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stability of full-time employment (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time in months 1 to 18</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>15.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed full-time or unstable full-time employment in months 19 to 34</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>4.8***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable full-time employment in months 19 to 34</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed full-time in months 1 to 18</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>-15.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed full-time or unstable full-time employment in months 19 to 34</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>-14.8***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable full-time employment in months 19 to 34</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Months employed full-time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months employed full-time</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.3***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever employed full-time (%)</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>11.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For those ever employed full-time:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months before first full-time job obtained h,c</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>-2.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining months of follow-up after first full-time job obtained i</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>2.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total months employed full-time after first full-time job obtained i</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of months employed full-time i</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>5.7***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: *** p < 0.001; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.1

a   measured from date of random assignment for those working at random assignment
b  zero for those employed full-time at random assignment
c  non-experimental comparison
Table A.9  SSP impacts on the distributions of wage growth for those working at least two of the three months from month 12 to 14 and at least two of the three months from month 32 to 34 between the end of year 1 and end of year 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Difference (impact)</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wage growth for all workers (%) in each category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not work</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>-8.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked but wage unreported</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage decreased</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage increased &lt; than 5 per cent</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage increased 5 to 10 per cent</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage increased 10 to 20 per cent</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage increased &gt; 20 per cent</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wage growth for full-time workers (%) in each category | | |
| Did not work | 81.8 | 91.8 | -10.0*** | 1.0 |
| Worked but wage unreported | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Wage decreased | 3.9 | 2.2 | 1.8*** | 0.5 |
| Wage increased < than 5 per cent | 3.8 | 1.5 | 2.4*** | 0.5 |
| Wage increased 5 to 10 per cent | 2.3 | 0.9 | 1.5*** | 0.4 |
| Wage increased 10 to 20 per cent | 4.4 | 1.2 | 3.1*** | 0.5 |
| Wage increased > 20 per cent | 3.8 | 2.5 | 1.3*** | 0.5 |

Key: *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p< 0.1

A.4  Self-Sufficiency Project Plus (Canada)

A.4.1  The programme

A small group of New Brunswick IA recipients were randomly selected to be part of the SSP Plus programme. Participants that agreed to be part of this programme could be randomly assigned to three groups an SSP Plus programme group, a regular SSP programme group (as above) or a control group. If in the SSP Plus programme group participants could access a range of pre- and post-employment services as well as the earnings supplement outlined above. The employment services, which were available both before and after receipt of the supplement, included drawing up an employment plan, help with resumes, job clubs, job coaching (here meaning case management), access to job leads, and self esteem and other workshops. These were not available to regular SSP programme group members who only had access to a small resource library that provided information on other agencies that offered jobsearch and other services and SSP staff were able to answer their queries about outside services. All three groups could access NB Works (a work experience programme), FOCUS (an employment programme for IA recipients) and the Canada Employment Centre (a job bank, employment counselling and jobsearch assistance available to all Canadians).

A.4.2  Data collection instruments

A Baseline Survey, as for SSP, was scheduled for all parents randomly selected to participate. ‘Very few’ (unspecified) could not be located (interviewers tried for three months to contact them). No details were provided on this survey’s non-response.

1
A Follow-up survey approximately 18 months after random assignment. This was similar to the baseline survey with additional questions to the two programme groups about their initial level of interest in the supplement offer and why they had or had not taken it up. Non-response was three per cent.

IA records for monthly IA data.

Management Information System data provided programme office records on programme participation, employment and supplement payments.

In addition, the evaluators carried out field research on the operation of SSP and provincial IA programmes and focus group data on takers and non-takers of the supplement.

### A.4.3 Stage of random assignment

Respondents to the baseline survey were randomly assigned to one of three research groups: the SSP Plus programme group (293 parents), the regular SSP programme group (296) and the control group (303). Random assignment took place between November 1994 and March 1995.

### A.4.4 Received treatment

Participation in SSP Plus was reported for using each employment service at least once and take-up of the supplement:

- 94 per cent completed an employment plan;
- 71 per cent received job coaching at least once;
- 67 per cent used the resume service;
- 61 per cent received job leads;
- 25 per cent attended the job club;
- 52 per cent received the supplement at some point during the first year.

### A.4.5 Impacts measured

Impacts comparing SSP Plus to regular SSP:

- service use;
- supplement take-up by:
- work experience;
- employment status at random assignment;
- highest education grade completed;
- IA receipt over past three years;
- whether or not could find trustworthy childcare;
- whether or not has limiting physical condition;
- could not work because of illness/disability;
- could not work because of personal or family responsibilities;
- attitudes to family and work;
- monthly supplement receipt.
Impacts comparing SSP Plus to regular SSP and control group:

- full-time/part-time employment rate;
- average earnings;
- receiving IA;
- receiving IA or SSP;
- average income from IA and SSP;
- average net family income.
### Table A.10  SSP plus impacts on supplement take-up rate by subgroup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job readiness</th>
<th>SSP Plus Program Group</th>
<th>Regular SSP Program Group</th>
<th>Difference (Impact)</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Significance of variation in Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never worked</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.8***</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more years</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>14.2**</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status at random assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed, looking for work</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>20.9**</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed, not looking for work</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>16.2***</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest grade completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9 or lower</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 or 11</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>23.0***</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>19.9***</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 13 or higher</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA receipt over past 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-23 months</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-35 months</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>16.0**</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all 36 months</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>20.0***</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If got a job, could find trustworthy childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>17.6***</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>30.1***</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No childcare needed</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported physical condition that limited activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>20.9***</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn’t work because of illness or disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>19.8***</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working, question n/a</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn’t work because of personal or family responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>38.4***</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>14.8***</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working, question n/a</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.1
### Table A.11 SSP plus impacts on employment, earnings and IA receipt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SSP Plus Program Group</th>
<th>Regular SSP Group</th>
<th>Control SSP Program Group</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FT employment rate (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 3</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>17.4***</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.4*</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>17.4***</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PT employment rate (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average earnings ($/month)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 3</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>140***</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64**</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 5</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>120***</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average IA payment ($/month)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 3</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>-70***</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 5</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>-146***</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.1

#### A.4.6 What worked

Comparing SSP and SSP Plus find that including employment services greatly increased the proportion taking up the supplement, particularly with those less job-ready and with greater barriers to employment. The take-up of the supplement, at least in the short-term, improved full-time employment outcomes and increased earnings.

#### A.5 Post Employment Services Demonstration (US)

##### A.5.1 The programme

Between spring 1994 and autumn 1996, the Post Employment Services Demonstration (PESD) operated in four sites (Chicago, Illinois; Portland, Oregon; Riverside, California; and San Antonio, Texas). When welfare recipients who had participated in the state’s JOBS programme and found employment between March 1994 and December 1995, they were enrolled in the demonstration and randomly assigned to either a programme or control group.

Case management was the central element to the programme. Case managers aimed to have regular contact with their clients in order to identify emerging problems with their clients employment and provide services to help alleviate them. The main services case managers provided were: counselling and support; jobsearch assistance (for those who lost their job or wished to advance to a better job); help with benefits; service referrals (for example health care, childcare, education and training); and support service payments for work-related expenses.
For the final report administrative records data were collected for all sample members enrolled in the programmes. These were used to measure quarterly earnings, monthly AFDC receipt and benefit amounts and monthly Food Stamp receipt and benefit amounts.

The evaluators stated that administrative welfare data provides accurate information on benefit receipt and the amounts received. Information about earnings from administrative wage records, although fairly accurate, excludes self-employment earnings and earnings from out of the state. In addition some types of ‘underground’ jobs (for example childcare and domestic services) tend to be under-reported. Finally, administrative wage records are not as comprehensive as employment information usually available from survey data.

Interim report findings (not reported here) used survey data collected from a random sub-sample of individuals in each site about a year after programme enrolment. This contained detailed information on employment and earnings not available from administrative data. This sample was representative of the full sample but its relatively small size meant that its ability to detect statistically significant impacts was limited. Comparing the survey data with administrative data (for those for whom it was available at the time of the interim report) found that the employment and earnings estimates were ‘generally consistent’. However, welfare impacts for the two samples were found to be ‘somewhat different’. Where these differences were substantial they were noted in the discussion, but not adjusted.

As noted above, after JOBS participants found employment between March 1994 and December 1995, they were randomly assigned to the programme or control group.

The percentage of clients that were contacted by one month after enrolment were as follows:

- Chicago – 86.8 per cent;
- Portland – 96.8 per cent;
- Riverside – 88.6 per cent;
- San Antonio – 74.7 per cent.

However the proportion who went on to receive different case management services during the first six months after programme enrolment were much lower.
### Table A.12 Incidence of different case management services within six months of programme enrolment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage of PESD Clients Who Ever Received Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobsearch Assistance</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with Accessing Benefits</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral to Childcare Provider</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral to Other Services</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Expense Payments</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sample Size | 552 | 357 | 500 | 290 |

### A.5.4 Impacts measured

The final report measured impacts by simple mean differences. These were regression-adjusted to take into account any observed pre-existing demographic and economic differences between programme and control groups that might have arisen by chance.

For each site the following impacts were measured:

- percentage of two-year follow-up period employed;
- annual earnings during two-year follow-up;
- percentage employed by quarter after intake;
- average number of quarters employed;
- average quarterly earnings by quarter after intake;
- percentage ever employed;
- percentage of time receiving AFDC during two-year follow-up;
- average monthly AFDC benefits during two-year follow-up;
- percentage receiving AFDC by month after intake;
- average monthly AFDC benefits by month after intake;
- percentage receiving Food Stamps by month after intake;
- average Food Stamp benefit by month after intake;
- average annual income from earnings, AFDC and Food Stamps during two-year follow-up;
- incomes as a percentage of poverty level.

Sub-group analysis of earnings improvement and welfare receipt compared programme and controls by:

- age;
- age of youngest child;
- education;
- previous employment;
• race/ethnicity;
• welfare history;
• programme enrolment period.

Selected Impacts:

Table A.13 Employment, earnings and AFDC impact of PESD during two-year follow-up period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of Time Employed</th>
<th>Average number of quarters employed</th>
<th>Average quarterly earnings (in 1996 $)</th>
<th>Percentage of time receiving AFDC</th>
<th>Average annual income (in 1996 $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control Group Mean</td>
<td>Difference Group Mean</td>
<td>Control Group Mean</td>
<td>Control Group Mean Mean</td>
<td>Control Group Mean Mean Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Impact)</td>
<td>(Impact)</td>
<td>(Impact)</td>
<td>(Impact)</td>
<td>(Impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-year period</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>3.0*</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>3.9*</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>-2.9*</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>-3.9**</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11032</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>10548</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>10460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: * p < 0.1; ** p < 0.05

A.6 Project NetWork (US) In Project NetWork all Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) beneficiaries and applicants for and recipients of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) for disabled and blind individuals living in the service areas of the participating Social Security Administration (SSA) field offices could voluntarily take part in the demonstration. The volunteers were assigned to a programme group that received case/referral management services and waivers of specific SSI or SSDI rules or to a control group that only received the waivers.

There were four models of case/referral management services each implemented in different sites.
Table A.14 Case/referral management services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Service provider</th>
<th>Case management or referral management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSA Case Manager Model</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>SSA staff</td>
<td>Case management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Contractor Model</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Private rehabilitation organisation staff</td>
<td>Case management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR Outstationing Model</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>State Vocational Rehabilitation Agency staff outstationed at local SSA offices</td>
<td>Case management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA Referral Manager Model</td>
<td>Tampa/Carrollwood</td>
<td>SSA staff</td>
<td>Referral management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spokane/Coeur d'Alene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * referral management means locating case management and other services provided by other agencies for clients.

The waivers came in two different forms, both for a 12-month period:

- for SSDI beneficiaries the waiver meant that earnings were exempted when trial work period months were computed and it prevented benefit suspension for those who had already exhausted their trial work periods32;
- for SSI recipients earnings above $500 a month would not result, as it would normally, in a medical review of disability.

1 SSA administrative data provided information for all the sample on the receipt of SSDI and SSI benefits on a monthly basis, earned and unearned income, impairment and basic demographic characteristics.

2 Baseline Survey with a sample of treatment, control and non-participant group members was undertaken between March 1993 and December 1994. It included questions on education and training, health, limited activities, employment history, knowledge of SSA work incentives, emotional stability, drug and alcohol use and cognitive functioning.

The sample was stratified to balance the sample across the demonstration sites and to over-sample SSI applicants and recipients aged 18 – 30 (and subsequently weighted to reflect this). Response rates were 87 per cent for participants, 53 per cent for non-participants currently receiving benefits and 49 per cent for non-participant new SSI applicants.

A.6.1 Data collection instruments33

32 SSDI beneficiaries are counted as having a trial work period month if their earnings exceed $200 a month or they have been self-employed for more than 40 hours a month. Beneficiaries are allowed nine trial work period months during the five most recent years after which benefit eligibility is assessed and may be altered or suspended.

33 These data collection instruments are for the impacts report discussed here only. Other reports on the implementation, the decision to volunteer and a non-experimental analysis of the demonstration waivers used different instruments.
A Follow-up Survey (June – November 1996) attempted to capture all treatment and control group members who completed the Baseline questionnaire and who were randomly assigned from June 1993 (this date was chosen so that the maximum possible length of follow-up was 36 months). The survey covered health and limited activities, education, receipt of training and rehabilitation services, transport and childcare, employment, attitudes, income and benefits. An assessment of Project NetWork and an understanding of SSI and SSDI rules was also undertaken.

The response rate was 83 per cent. Respondents to the two surveys were in general very similar to the full sample of volunteers. The statistically significant differences that existed were ‘generally quite small’. The impact estimates in the report are controlled for on all measured baseline characteristics (gender, age, type of benefit, months of benefit receipt, primary impairment, race and education).

Case Management Control System – management information system information was used in the demonstration sites to record demographic information about all volunteers and, for the treatment group, participation in the case/referral management services.

A.6.2 Stage of random assignment

After a three-month pilot period to test and refine demonstration procedures, individuals who expressed an interest in the demonstration (new applicants were informed at the time of applying, current beneficiaries received mail information) were interviewed by a case manager who explained the demonstration requirements, the services it offered and random assignment. Those who volunteered after this meeting were then randomly assigned to either the treatment or control group. The intake period was for 15 months and the demonstration was operated at all sites for 24 months.

A.6.3 Proportion of eligible population that enrolled

The enrolment targets for each site set by the SSA were met or exceeded in all but one site (Fort Worth which achieved 72 per cent of its target). A total of 4160 individuals volunteered.
Table A.15 Project NetWork proportion of eligible population enrolled by site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Proportion of eligible population enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Phoenix/Las Vegas</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tampa/Carrollwood</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spokane/Coeur d’Alene</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.6.4 Received treatment

Control group members could receive services from other providers, but not from Project NetWork or the Project NetWork case managers. The proportions receiving each service, as shown below, were also compared by type of impairment (not shown).

Table A.16 Receipt of education, training and rehabilitation services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service participated in since random assignment</th>
<th>Control group mean</th>
<th>Treatment group mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobsearch assistance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business skills training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related training</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other rehabilitation/ training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life skills training</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational therapy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College classes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of work potential</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical therapy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological counselling</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any service</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: significantly different at the following levels: *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.1

A.6.5 Impacts measured

Impacts of Project NetWork on SSI and SSDI benefit receipt were based on administrative data and therefore included the whole sample of programme and control group members. The impact estimates are regression adjusted using baseline variables. The outcome variable is regressed using these independent variables and eight dummy variables which are the treatment status interacted with the site dummy variables. This estimate procedure also includes a site-level heteroskedasticity correction – a two stage regression process that adjusted for ‘the possibility that the size of residuals is related to site’.
The overall impact is an average of the eight site-level impact coefficients weighted so that each coefficient contributes equally to the overall impact. Therefore the weights for each individual in the sample adds to a total of 0.125. The impact estimates for each model weights each of the two sites by one-half. The impacts by sub-group – primary of impairment and title of eligibility – use the same person weights (i.e. a site’s impact here will not necessarily contribute one-eighth).

Using the survey data the same procedure is used but ‘weights down’ young people as they were originally over-sampled.

Average annual earnings from administrative data are based on simple, unweighted calculations of means without regression adjustments.

Impacts measured overall and by sub-groups of title of eligibility and primary impairment:

- Average annual earnings – also by programme model and site, age, gender and duration of prior benefit receipt.
- Total hours worked.
- Average number of months employed.
- Average hourly wage.
- Presence of fringe benefits.
- Average number of months employed.
- Percentage of months receiving SSI/SSDI – also by programme model, age, gender and duration of prior benefit receipt.
- Average monthly SSI/SSDI benefit - also by programme model, age, gender and duration of prior benefit receipt.
- SSI/SSDI participation rate - also by programme model, age, gender and duration of prior benefit receipt.
- Overall health – also by programme model.
- Functional and life skills limitations – also by programme model.
- Use of alcohol and drugs – also by programme model.
- Measures of emotional state – also by programme model.
- Mini mental state examination – also by programme model.
- Measures of work limitations - also by programme model.

Table A.17 Impacts on annual earnings by follow-up year, based on administrative records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-up period</th>
<th>Average annual earnings ($)</th>
<th>Difference ($)</th>
<th>Standard error ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>1757</td>
<td>215**</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>224**</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 – 2</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>220**</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest Year</td>
<td>2427</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p< 0.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-up period</th>
<th>Control group mean</th>
<th>Difference (Impact)</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total hours worked</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 – Year 2</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest Year</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average number of months employed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 – Year 2</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest Year</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.1
The Employment Retention and Advancement Evaluation Project is sponsored by the US Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, with additional support from the US Department of Labor. The evaluation is being conducted by MDRC. MDRC and the Lewin Group are providing technical assistance to the states developing ERA programmes. Fourteen sites have been chosen to develop programmes to assist employment sustainability and/or improve career progression amongst current or former TANF recipients or other low-income families.

The evaluation has three main analysis components. MDRC has defined them as the following:

- ‘Process/implementation analysis. What services are provided, how are they delivered, who receives them, and why? What problems are encountered when implementing the programs and how are they addressed?’

- Impact analysis. To what extent do the programs improve employment retention, advancement, and other outcomes for participants and their children? What approaches are most effective and for whom? All sites will use a rigorous random assignment design to assess program impacts.

- Cost–benefit analysis. What are the costs of the programs, and to what extent do their benefits outweigh their costs from the perspectives of program participants, taxpayers, employers, and society overall? How do these findings vary by program type and participants characteristics?’

(http://www.mdrc.org/WorkingPoor/ERA.htm)

The following table presents the initiatives being undertaken in each of the sites, their target group and the design of the impact evaluation. At present there is no further information available about the sites’ services, nor the service delivery mechanisms that they will be using. However a process and implementation report is expected to be ready for public release in a few months time from HHS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Education and training (E&amp;T) focus: financial incentives to encourage E&amp;T; outreach; job search assistance</td>
<td>Employed former welfare recipients</td>
<td>E&amp;T vs. minimal services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Mixed services, emphasis on advancement, work hour flexibility</td>
<td>Recipients employed for 30 or more hours per week for six months or more</td>
<td>Mixed vs. limited services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Enhanced Job Club – look for better job</td>
<td>TANF recipients</td>
<td>Enhanced vs. Traditional Job Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Mixed post-employment services, intensive case management, work with employers, E&amp;T, lower caseloads, work hour flexibility</td>
<td>TANF recipients employed full time</td>
<td>Mixed vs. limited services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Mixed post-employment services, intensive case management, work with employers, E&amp;T</td>
<td>To be decided</td>
<td>To be decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside, CA</td>
<td>E&amp;T-focus: intensive outreach and flexibility of work hours to encourage E&amp;T</td>
<td>Recipients employed 20 or more hours per week</td>
<td>Less flexible vs. more flexible vs. limited services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside, CA</td>
<td>Mixed, enhanced services</td>
<td>Employed TANF leavers</td>
<td>Enhanced vs. limited services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Mixed: enhanced case management (home visits), E&amp;T, work support/career development</td>
<td>TANF leaver during 1997-2000</td>
<td>Mixed model vs. minimal services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Mixed: enhanced case management; pre-employment services; work support; E&amp;T; focus on family</td>
<td>Job-ready TANF applicants and recipients</td>
<td>Mixed model vs. limited services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Mixed: enhanced case management; incentives E&amp;T; pre-employment services; work support/career development</td>
<td>TANF applicants and recipients</td>
<td>Mixed model vs. limited services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hard-to-employ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County, Minneapolis</td>
<td>Work focused, with emphasis on barrier removal</td>
<td>Long-term TANF recipients</td>
<td>Intensive services vs. limited services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC - PRIDE</td>
<td>Work-focused, with emphasis on education and work experience</td>
<td>Public assistance, mental/physical disabilities</td>
<td>Intensive mandatory vs. voluntary limited services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC – Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Intensive case management to increase participation in treatment</td>
<td>Public assistance, substance abuse</td>
<td>Case management vs. ‘screen and refer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>Mixed services</td>
<td>TANF returnees</td>
<td>Intensive services vs. limited services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C  ALPHABETICAL INDEX OF PROGRAMMES BY COUNTRY

C.1 Australia  Disability Program

Experience Pays

Indigenous Employment Wage Assistance
http://www.workplace.gov.au/Workplace/WPDisplay 0,1251,a3%253D382%2526a0%253D0%2526a1%253D517%2526a2%253D524,00.html

Job Match
http://www.workplace.gov.au

Supported Wage System

KPMG Consulting, no date

Wage Subsidy Scheme
Department of Family and Community Services, 2001

Western Post Employment Support Service Inc.

Youth Employment Scheme

C.2 Austria  Arbeitsassistenz – Austria
Blumberger, 2001
http://peerreview.almp.org/en/AUSTjan01.htm

Dynamo
Arbeitsmarktservice Österreich, 2000
Integration von Menschen mit Behinderungen
https://equal.cec.eu.int/equal/jsp/dpComplete.jsp?cip=AT&national=1B-16%2F106

Re-integration Initiative
Arbeitsmarktservice Österreich, no date

C.3 Belgium  Double Start
https://equal.cec.eu.int/equal/jsp dpComplete.jsp?cip=BEnl&national =01%2FEQ%2F1.A%2F001
jobsustaining network
https://equal.cec.eu.int/equal/jsp/dpComplete.jsp?cip=BE&national=01%2F2%E2%80%992F1.A%2F008

U-turn
https://equal.cec.eu.int/equal/jsp/dpComplete.jsp?cip=BE&national=01%2F2%E2%80%992F1.A%2F003

C.4 Canada
BladeRunners Program
PEPNet, 1999, pp. 28-29
http://www.nyec.org/pepnet/index.html

Canada’s Self-Sufficiency Project
http://www.mdrc.org/WelfareReform/SSP.htm
Michalopoulos et al., 2000
Bloom and Michalopoulos, 2001
Quets at al., 1999

Employability Improvement Program
Human Resources Development Canada, 1995

Employment Generation Program
http://www.gov.nf.ca/nlwin/No_Frames/Home/ECS/generati.htm

Learning @ Work
http://www3.sk.sympatico.ca/liters/about.htm

C. 5 Denmark
AKIU, Aktørorienteret integration
https://equal.cec.eu.int/equal/jsp/dpComplete.jsp?cip=DK&national=1

C.6 Europe
CREATIF (partners in France, Spain, Germany and Belgium)
European Commission, no date a

Job Rotation
http://www.eujob.dk/

C.7 Finland
MAJAKKA
https://equal.cec.eu.int/equal/jspdpComplete.jsp?cip=FI&national=32

C.8 France
AGEFIPH
Grapin et al., 1998

Emploi-Jeunes 2001
http://www.nsej.travail.gouv.fr/

Marseille, France – mentoring
European Commission DG5, no date b
C.9 Germany  
Arbeitsassistenz – Germany  
http://www.isl-ev.org/article/87.html

Eingliederungshilfe für Behinderte  

Integration of Disabled People (partner in The Netherlands)  

Job Integration Assistance  

Lohnkostenzuschuß für ältere AN  

C.10 Ireland  
Back to Work Allowance  
http://www.welfare.ie/welfare/59-391298.xml

WRC Social and Economic Consultants, 1997

Job Advocates  
Fitzgerald et al., 2000, p. 98

Roscommon EQUAL Partnership  
https://equal.cec.eu.int/equal/jsp/dpComplete.jsp?cip=IE&national=6

C.11 Italy  
Arci Solidarieta (partners in Greece, Spain, France, Ireland and the UK)  
European Commission DG5, 1997

C.12 Netherlands  
Techno–Mentoring (partner in the UK)  

C.13 New Zealand  
Domestic Purposes and Widows Benefit Reforms  
Ministry of Social Development, 2001

In-Work Support Co-ordinator  

New Zealand Job Connection Programme Bellet, 1997

C.14 Norway  
Arbeid med Bistand  
The Labour Market Administration, no date  
Blystad and Spjelkavik, 1997

Flexible Jobb  
Personal Communication with Dag Robin Simonsen, Directorate of Labour, Norway
C.15 Portugal
Emprego Apoiado

C.16 Sweden
Sweden’s Activity Guarantee
Sweden’s Action Plan for Employment, 2000
http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/empl&esf/naps00/napsv_en.pdf

C.17 United Kingdom
Glasgow Works
http://www.glasgowworks.co.uk/

Speke Garston Partnership
Evans and Kazis, no date

Wise Group
Marshall and Macfarlane, 2000

C.18 United States
Advanced Works
Hill and Pavetti, 2000, p.12

Alabama – emergency cash grants
State Policy Documentation Project
http://www.spdp.org

Alethia House Supportive Housing Program
http://www.hud.gov/
Wood et al., 1999, pp. 92-94

Amazing Grace Garage
Texas Workforce Commission, 2001

American Society of Employers “Stay the Course” Mentoring Program
http://www.aseonline.org/main.cfm?section=wfDlpmt
Personal communication with Kathy Tuck, Program Co-ordinator, ASE

Anne Arundel County – provision of low cost cars

Arizona – provision of low cost cars
Strawn and Martinson, 2000, p.125

Arkansas – emergency cash grants
State Policy Documentation Project
http://www.spdp.org
Better People  
Buck, 2000, pp. 11-21, 27-28  

Bizlink Network  
http://www.welfaretowork.org/wtwpapps/WTWPHOME.nsf  

BMC Enterprises  
Roberts and Padden, 1998, pp. 22-32  

Bridges to Work  
http://www.ppv.org/  
http://www.hud.gov/  
Elliot et al., 1999  
Reardon (ed.), 2001  

Career Advancement Vouchers  
http://www.state.nj.us/humanservices/dfd/post-tanf.html  

Ceridian Performance Partners  
http://www.ceridianperformance.com/  

Charity Cars (International)  
http://www.charitycars.org/  
East-West Gateway Co-ordinating Council, no date, p. 7  

Cleveland’s Job Match  
Wood et al., 1999, pp. 37-40  

Clinton Community Action  
Ohio Job and Families Services, 2001, p. 9  
http://www.state.oh.us/odhs/owf/prc/prcdr_vol03.pdf  

Co-Employee Mentorship  
Ohio Job and Family Services, 2001, p. 11  
http://www.state.oh.us/odhs/owf/prc/prcdr_vol03.pdf  

Community Solutions  
Paulsell and Wood, 1999  
Paulsell and Stieglitz, 2001  

Connecticut – rent assistance  
Clymer at al., 2001, p. 14  

Connecticut Welfare to Work Transportation Access Group  
http://www.ctaa.org/ntrc/atj/pubs/innovative-old/full_print
Cooperative Home Care Associates
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 22
Dresser and Rogers, 1997, pp. 8-9
Fitzgerald and Carlson, 2000, pp. 3-4

Curtis and Associates Inc.
Ohio Job and Families Services, 2001, p. 8
http://www.state.oh.us/odhs/owf/prc/prcdr_vol03.pdf

Cuyahoga Work and Training
Freeman and Rubin, 2000, p.22

Dallas County Local Workforce Development Board
Texas Workforce Commission, 2001

Detroit Job Ladder Program
Personal Communication with Vonda Turner, Director, Entry Level Workforce Initiatives, Detroit Regional Chamber

Economic Initiative Program of the City of Phoenix Housing Department
Wood et al., 1999, pp. 43-46

Employer Assistance Project
Personal communication with Rosemary Barnhart, Career Planning and Employment Consultant

Family Loan Program / Ways to Work
http://www.alliance1.org/Default.htm
Lengyel, 2001
Mueller, 1995

Family Self-Sufficiency Program
Sard, 2001
Wood et al., 1999, pp. 15-30

First Wheels Program
http://www.ctaa.org/ntrc/ati/pubs/innovative-old/full_print

Florida – childcare
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 13
http://www.fcforum.org

Florida Developmental Disabilities Council
http://www.fddc.org/
Kramer, 1998, p. 18
Florida – On the Job Training
http://www.wages.org/wages/employers/incentives.htm

Florida’s WAGES - Work Supplementation and Retention Incentives for Employers
http://www.workforceflorida.com/wages/wfi/employers/emp-incentives.html

Full Employment Council, Kansas
http://www.fullemploymentcouncil.org/
Texas Workforce Commission, 2000, p. 8-7
http://www.twc.state.tx.us/welref/wtwtag.pdf

GAPS Initiative
Wood and Paulsell, 1999
Wood and Paulsell, 2000

Georgia – help with transport costs
State Policy Documentation Project
http://www.spdp.org

Giant Food Inc.
Kramer, 1998, p. 19
Texas Workforce Commission, 2000, p. 8-5

Good News Garage
http://www.goodnewsgarage.org/main.htm
East-West Gateway Co-ordinating Council, no date, p. 14

Goodwill Industries of Greater New York
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 14

Health Care Career Ladder
Fitzgerald and Carlson, 2000, pp. 2-3
www.bethelnewlife.org/empty.html

Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities
http://www.workforceatm.org/articles/template.cfm?results_art_filename=prodes.htm

Illinois Bus Company
Prince, 1999b, p. 4

Illinois Central College
http://www.icc.cc.il.us/basic_studies/wbsehome.asp

Indiana – help with transport costs
State Policy Documentation Project
http://www.spdp.org
Individual Development Accounts
http://gwbweb.wustl.edu/csd/statepolicy/
National Governors’ Association, 1997

Integrated Resources for Independence and Self-Sufficiency Program
Tout et al., 2001, p. 8

Iowa’s Post-Employment Pilot
Hill et al., 2001

JOBKEEPER
US Department of Labor, 1999, p. 4

Jobs Consortium
Corbett and Weber, 2001, p. 42

Jobs-Plus Community Revitalisation Initiative
Bloom and Blank (ed.), 2000
Kato et al., 2001
Riccio, 1999

Jobs with a Future Partnerships
http://www.cows.org/projects/jwf.php
National Governors’ Association, 2001, p. appendix

Juma Ventures
http://www.jumaventures.org/
PEPNet, 1999, pp. 36-37

Kansas – emergency cash grants
State Policy Documentation Project
http://www.spdp.org

Kansas – provision of low cost cars
Sweeney et al., 2000, p. 12

Kansas – help with transport costs
State Policy Documentation Project
http://www.spdp.org

Kentucky – emergency cash grants
http://cfc.state.ky.us/help/AboutKTAP_2.asp
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 22

Kentucky – mentoring program
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 18
Kentucky – retention incentives
State Policy Documentation Project
http://www.spdp.org

Maryland’s Project Retain
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 19

Memphis Area Chamber of Commerce
Freeman and Rubin, 2000, p. 22
Mills and Prince, 2001, p. 8

Mentoring Works!
US Department of Labor, 1999, p. 4

Mesa County Workforce Center, Colorado
Hill and Pavetti, 2000, p.14

Michigan – help with transport costs
State Policy Documentation Project
http://www.spdp.org

Michigan Project Zero
http://www.mfia.state.mi.us/PROJZERO/
http://www.ctaa.org/ntrc/atj/pubs/innovative-old/full_print
Roberts and Padden, 1998, pp. 93-105

Milwaukee’s New Hope Project
http://www.mdrc.org/WelfareReform/NewHope.htm
Bos et al., 1999

Minnesota Family Investment Program
http://www.mdrc.org/WelfareReform/MFIP.htm
Knox et al., 2000
Miller et al., 2000
Bloom and Michalopoulos, 2001

Monmouth County – alternative bus services
http://www.ctaa.org/ntrc/atj/pubs/innovative-old/full_print

MY TURN
PEPNet, 1999, pp. 56-57

Nebraska – provision of low cost cars
Sweeney et al., 2000, p. 12

New Gateways to Collaboration
Strawn and Martinson, 2000, p. 55
New Jersey – rent assistance
Clymer et al., 2001, p. 14

New Jersey Substance Abuse Research Demonstration
Personal communication with Annette Riordan, New Jersey Department of Human Services
Morgenstern et al., 2001a
Morgenstern et al., 2001b
http://www.nga.org/special/1,1260,C_MIN I_WEB_SITE^D_1733,00.html

New Jersey’s Supplemental Work Support
http://www.state.nj.us/humanservices/dfd/post-tanf.html

New Jersey Transportation Program
http://www.state.nj.us/humanservices/dfd/post-tanf.html

New Orleans Welfare to Work Collaborative
http://www.workforceatm.org/articles/template.cfm?results_art_filename=prodes.htm

New York Consortium for Worker Education

Nine Star Enterprises Inc.
http://www.workforceatm.org/articles_template.cfm?results_art_filename=prodes.htm

North Carolina – van or car pools and alternative bus services
http://www.ctaa.org/ntrc/atj/pubs/innovative-old/full_print

Oregon’s GATEWAY
Kaplan, 1998, p. 8

Oregon’s JOBS Plus
http://www.afs.hr.state.or.us/jobsplus.html
Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 2001
Roberts and Padden, 1998, pp. 66-80

Partners in Progress of Ceridian Performance Partners
http://www.ceridianperformance.com/
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 9

People Incorporated of South West Virginia
East-West Gateway Co-ordinating Council, no date, p. 18
Post-Employment Labor Exchange
http://www.wa.gov/WORKFIRST/briefing/wplex.htm
Klawitter and VanNynatten, 2001

Post-Employment Retention is Key Clymer et al., 2001, p.21

Post-Employment Services Demonstration
http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/3rdlevel/pesd.htm
Haimson et al., 1995
Haimson and Hershey, 1997
Rangarajan et al., 1994
Rangarajan, 1996
Rangarajan, 1998a
Rangarajan, 1998b
Rangarajan et al., 1998
Rangarajan and Novak, 1999

Post-TANF Wrap-Around Fund
http://www.bcbss.com/wraparound.htm

Pride Industries
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 38

Project Match
http://www.pmatch.org/
Herr and Wagner, 1995
Brown et al., 1998b, p.36
Kramer 1998, pp. 15-16

Project Network
Kornfield et al., 1999
Gardiner and Fishman, 2000, pp. 44-45

Project RIO
US Department of Justice, 1998b

Reaching Independence Through Employment
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 17

Retention Incentive Training Accounts
http://www.workforceflorida.com/wages/wfi/partners/faq.html
http://www.nga.org/center/frontAndCenter_1,1188,C_FRONT_CENTER^D_1902,00.html
Botsko et al., 2001, p. 12

Rhode Island’s Employment and Retention Services Unit
http://www.dhs.state.ri.us/dhs/dbusinfo.htm
Safer Foundation
Buck, 2000, pp. 11-21, 29-30
US Department of Justice, 1998a

Salem’s Up with Wages
Strawn and Martinson, 2000, p. 44, 88, 97, 100-101

Sasha Corporation
http://www.sashacorp.com/mlink.html

Scott County – using services of volunteers
Kaplan, 1998, p. 8

Seattle Jobs Initiative
http://www.aecf.org/jobsinitiative/
The Annie E. Casey Foundation (no date)
Foundation (2000)
The Annie E. Casey Foundation (2001)

Seneca County, Ohio – wage subsidies
Ohio Job and Family Services, 2001, p. 37
http://www.state.oh.us/odhs/owf/prc/prcdr_vol03.pdf

Sister to Sister Network
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 21
Kramer, 1998, p. 16
US Department of Labor, 1999, p. 4

Social Security Administration
www.ssa.gov
Texas Workforce Commission, 2000, p. 8-14

Southeastern Kansas – using alternative bus services
Kaplan, 1997, p. 3

South Forty Corporation
Buck, 2000, pp. 11-21, 30-31

STEPS TO CAREER SUCCESS
Leon-Guerrero at el., 1996

Steps to Success
Strawn and Martinson, 2000, pp. 85-99
STRIVE/East Harlem Service
http://www.strivecentral.com/
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 17
Corbett and Weber, 2001, p. 42
PEPNet, 1999, pp. 130-131
Ofori-Mankata and Won, 1993

Substance Abuse and Enhanced Employee Assistance Program
http://www.dhhs.state.nc.us/dss/ei/ei_wf_subst.htm

Supported Employment Program
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 36

Tennessee Regional Transportation Brokers
http://www.ctaa.org/ntrc/atj/pubs/innovative-old/full_print

Texas – provision of low cost cars

Texas Welfare to Work Substance Abuse Initiative
http://www.nga.org/special_11260.C_MINI_WEB_SITE^D_1736.00.html

Thomas Nelson Community College
http://www.tncc.cc.va.us/workforce/default.htm
Jobs for the Future, 2000

Trades Mentor Network
Clymer et al., 2001, p. 27

Transit Benefit Program
Strawn and Martinson, 2000, p. 126

Tri-County Job Ladder Partnership
Corbett and Weber, 2001, p. 36
Strawn and Martinson, 2000, pp. 90-91

Trumbull County, Ohio
Ohio Job and Family Services, 2001, p. 39
http://www.state.oh.us/odhs/owf/prc/prcdr_vol03.pdf

United Airlines – mentoring
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 18
Prince, 1999b, p. 5
US Department of Transport Liveable Communities Initiative
Utah’s Employment Services Program  
Brown, et al., 1998b, p. 9  
Kramer, 1998, p. 18  

Vocational Foundation Inc.  
Proscio and Elliott, no date  

Washington WorkFirst  
http://www.wa.gov/WORKFIRST/  
Klawitter and VanNynatten, 2001  
Lerch and Mayfield, 2001  

Washington’s Workplace Basic Skills  
http://literacynet.org/workbasics/home.htm  

Washington Works  
Gooden, 1998  
http://www.mdrc.org/Reports/WashingtonWorks  
WWCaseStudy.html  
http://www.welfareinfo.org/washwork.htm  

Ways to Work / Family Loan Program  
http://www.alliance1.org/Default.htm  
Lengyel, 2001  
Mueller, 1995  

West Florida – employers providing transport  
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 13  
Strawn and Martinson, 2000, p. 126  

Wisconsin Employment Transportation Assistance Program  
http://www.dwd.state.wi.us/desw2/transportation.htm  
http://www.dwd.state.wi.us/dws/programs/transportation/mobility.htm  

Wisconsin Works  
http://www.dwd.state.wi.us/desw2/jal.htm  
Brown et al., 1998b, p. 22  

Women in Community Service  
http://www.wics.org/  

Worker Training Tax Credit  
Regional Technology Strategies, Inc., 1999, pp. 69-78  

Working Connections Child Care Program  
http://www.wa.gov/WORKFIRST/briefing/subchild.htm


Corporation for a Skilled Workforce (2001), Detroit Regional Chamber Job Ladder Evaluation Report Executive Summary. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Corporation for a Skilled Workforce.


Employment Service website (http://www.employmentservice.gov.uk)


Sweeney, K. (1996), Destinations of Leavers from Claimant Unemployment in Labour Market Trends, October.


The Labour Market Administration (Norway) (nd a), *Arbeid med Bistand, Guidelines, PB-0690e*. Oslo: The Directorate of Labour.

The Labour Market Administration (Norway) (nd b), *Arbeid med Bistand, Directives, PB-0692e*. Oslo: The Directorate of Labour.
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